

Public Accounts Committee.

Q. As you made the deductions originally you deducted \$101?—A. That is including a deduction for the next item over the page.

Q. No, I think up to that point that is the amount?—A. Well, in this item, "perusing letter from Mr. Hogg," there was a dollar taken off on the next item on the 16th.

Q. That will be \$101 you taxed off the original, or intended to tax off, rather?—A. Yes, \$100.

Q. Well, now, on the 13th of October, is there a charge of \$25 for drafting information?—A. That is just what I have been at. That is included in this.

Q. No?—A. It is included in my \$356.50.

Q. No?—A. Yes it is.

Q. On the 12th and 13th, is there a charge of \$100 there?—A. Yes.

Q. And a charge of \$25 for drafting the information on the 13th?—A. Yes, and that is included in the \$356.50.

Q. The \$356 includes the whole amount up to the time the information was drafted?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, on the 17th there is another charge of \$100?—A. That is "to examination and perusal of three volumes of evidence, exhibits, plans, &c., received from the commission, \$100."

Q. On the 16th is there a charge for \$5?—A. There is. "Perusing letter from Mr. Hogg giving information as to the documentary evidence in the case, and advising that he had forwarded the evidence taken before the commission and would forward pay lists and checks, and inclosing copy of information in the civil suit about to be taken against St. Louis, \$5."

Q. Is there another charge on the 18th of \$10?—A. On the 18th?

Q. On the 18th, of \$10?—A. "Perusing letter from Mr. Hogg inclosing statement prepared by Mr. McLeod and giving information generally as to the nature of the charges—examining statement, \$10."

Q. Look at the 22nd, and see if there is another charge of \$20?—A. "Further examination of the evidence and exhibits and report to the Deputy Minister of Justice as to other proceedings that might be taken, \$20."

Q. Would it be fair to say that substantially all the charges up to that time are for the examination of evidence and writing letters?—A. And drafting the information.

Q. Yes, and drafting the information?—A. I should think so.

Q. The charges up to that period would amount to \$440?

By Mr. Powell :

Q. And consultations with Mr. Hogg, going to Ottawa, and some days of service?—A. I beg your pardon, I did not catch the question.

By Mr. Fitzpatrick :

Q. The charges up to that period would amount to \$440?—A. \$420?

Q. \$440?—A. It would amount to more than that.

Q. Simply for perusing the evidence independently altogether of the letters?—A. I think so.

Q. About that?—A. About that, approximately so.

Mr. POWELL.—Is that taxed?

Mr. FITZPATRICK.—We cannot tell about the taxing until we get to the end of it.

Q. For reading a letter I see he charged on the 16th, \$5, for receiving this letter from Mr. Hogg, doesn't he ; you referred to that before?—A. It seems to cover a little more than that. He says "advising." Oh, yes, that is Mr. Hogg's letter.

Q. Have you got it there?—A. Yes, I think so. It is on the 18th, he charged \$10 for reading and receiving another letter from Mr. Hogg. Yes. No, that includes examining the statement whatever that may be.