

By the Hon. Mr. Landry:

Q. Have you that document which contains the supplementary report you sent—that sheet explaining about the report?—A. I do not think I have a copy here, but one has been filed. They are at my room.

Q. There are three of those reports. Two of them have a letter annexed on the first page. The third report has the letter bound in by a fastener?—A. Yes.

Q. You remember that?—A. Yes.

Q. Were those copies furnished by those who have the original?—A. Were they certified by the department?

Q. Yes?—A. My impression is, that that one with the pin in it was not certified. That is my impression now, but the other two were certified.

Q. Were those copies obtained from the department?—A. Yes.

Q. Prepared by the department?—A. No, they were not prepared by the department; they were prepared by us. We sent most of them up already prepared, and we certified—

Q. Were they sent to the department with those letters annexed?—A. Yes.

Q. In the three cases?—A. No, the one pinned, my impression is, was not certified at all; but the two others were certified.

Q. In those two cases, was there a document that was glued—one that had been glued before and taken off and another one put on?—A. On one of them you find underneath—I think that a letter that the New York department wrote in answer was on there and taken off. I think that had been taken off. I think there was a place where the paper had been glued and taken off.

Q. Scratched off?—A. Yes.

Q. Part of the cover was gone?—A. Yes.

Q. And a newspaper put in?—A. That paper was pasted above, but there was a place where something had been pasted and taken off. I noticed that. May I make one statement in regard to two or three matters that the counsel has overlooked, about which my explanation was asked, page 34 of No. 3? He asked me for certain discrepancies.

By Mr. Coster, K.C., Counsel for the Committee:

Q. Is this new evidence?—A. No. When you asked me for certain explanations of differences which had gone into the schedule on page 34, the first discrepancy, \$56.92, between the disbursements and schedule C. Schedule C represents expenses simply as regards the real estate owned, while the disbursements given in the schedule for disbursements relate to all of our investments, and the difference was a matter of expenditure in connection with the mortgage. The same is true in 1898 and in 1899 and in 1890, as you will note the difference is against schedule C, while in 1901 it is in favour of schedule C. Those represent the taxes that we disputed with the city of New York and refused to pay, but in 1901 we made the full payment of the taxes for the three years, and, therefore, that covers those discrepancies. I desire also to say that in the expenses of real estate in the early history of these liens, the interest on the investments was charged as an expense and was charged to the amount of \$75,366.

THOMAS BRADSHAW, of the city of Toronto, actuary, sworn and examined by Mr. Geoffrion, counsel for the company.

Q. What is your position?—A. I am actuary of the Imperial Life Insurance Company of Canada, vice-president of that company.

Q. Have you had some experience as an actuary?—A. Yes, I have been about twenty-three years in life insurance.

BRADSHAW