

Mr. HUGHES.—The point I wish to make out is that Mr. McLaughlin came down here in 1897 on this business, and I have reason to believe that Mr. McLaughlin made his charges for another matter?—A. The time I came down with Mr. Macdonald was a year ago. I think some person has said that if a man kills two birds with one stone he is entitled to both birds. You speak about the case of John Macdonald. We got a charter, in which John Macdonald may have been interested, in June last or in 1898, and that is the only time I was ever down in connection with this.

Mr. Sutherland pressed for a ruling on his objection.

The CHAIRMAN.—What the witness says is that this case of Mr. John Macdonald, to which Mr. Hughes has made reference, was in 1898, and has no connection with these cases.

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. Mr. McLaughlin has not said that some of these trips were not charged to other accounts?—A. They were not charged to other accounts.

Q. You acted as government agent in these matters?—A. No, I did not, with one exception. There was one claim that was settled but the conveyance was not drawn when I was appointed agent of the Department of Justice. In that case I acted for the government and was paid for the conveyancing, and I got my retainer for having obtained an agreement between the client and the government.

Q. How much did Mr. Brown get?—A. \$100.

Q. What was charged the government for doing his conveyancing?—A. I do not know.

Q. I find on the next page \$28 paid for his conveyancing and you charged him \$18? Then there is Mr. Byrnell. Do you remember what he received?—A. I have a list here somewhere. I think it is in the Auditor General's report somewhere. I am quite glad to give any information I can, but really I do not think the detail of what I charged each client in these cases is a matter which is anything but private business. So far as I am personally concerned I do not think it is of any interest.

The CHAIRMAN.—You can give it if you like, but you are not bound to give it.—A. I am quite satisfied I should not make these things public. I give the total. The total I received was \$365.

By Mr. Cowan:

Q. What portion of that was disbursements?—A. There was at least \$150. Practically, it was all office work, which was being done by a man whom I was paying a salary of \$75 a month to at that time, and if I counted that it was practically all disbursements.

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. When you were agent of the Minister of Justice, you looked after all these claims, didn't you?—A. When I am acting as agent to the Minister of Justice I follow the ordinary rule followed by all solicitors in all business the same way as if acting for a private party. If the party has no solicitor at all acting for himself I would investigate the title, and if there was anything necessary in the way of conveyancing or anything of that kind, I would see that it was done. It was not part of my duty in the Fitzgerald cases. I found no such cases.

Q. Will you say whether Fitzgerald was subject to any other charge for another lawyer?—A. I do not know if he had another lawyer or not.

Q. But you would know, receiving papers from him?—A. I dealt directly with him.