

## Public Accounts Committee

would not take the percentage, but as there was some question about the expenses coming too high, I told them it would not exceed 20 per cent, as a matter of fact, our bills of cost exceeded that amount, but on account of our guarantee that it would not exceed 20 per cent, we were forced to take less.

Q. You stated that you had been subjected to considerable costs in this matter. What costs were there?—A. I was three times at Ottawa in connection with the matter, twice in connection with getting the government to make a compromise and send a valuator up to settle the matter. Another time it was to get some title that the agent of the Minister of Justice refused to pass through, and once in Toronto in connection with getting some titles fixed, and of course there was a great deal of correspondence, and I was over the ground with the government valuator, representing the farmers.

Q. Was that the first time the valuator came up?—A. No; he went at first to make a general report on such matters around there, and of course what his report to the Minister of Justice was, I do not know. As a result of his report and an interview I had with the ministers, he was ordered to come up and see if the matter could not be compromised and settled without the expense of elaborate surveys and the taking of levels; and when he came up the second time, I went with him.

Q. And these trips to Ottawa; do you remember the dates?—A. No, I cannot give you the dates; some time during the fall or winter of 1896 the first two trips were, and the trips as to title would be in 1897.

Q. You cannot remember the exact dates?—A. No.

Q. Was the House in session, do you remember?—A. I think it was in session once when I was here, but the other two times I don't think it was.

Q. And the time it was in session, I suppose, you had other business at Ottawa, had you?—A. Any time I came to Ottawa, of course, if there was anything else I could do, of course I would do it. But as a matter of fact, this business at Ottawa was the only thing I ever had at Ottawa where I had paying clients. Any other business was simply political, I may say.

Q. You were down on some deputations, were you not, in 1896?—A. I was here on the Trent Valley deputation and paid my own expenses. But I do not remember having anything to do with this. At any deputation I ever came down on I paid my own expenses.

Q. You were down on a railway deputation here, however?—A. I have been instrumental in obtaining a couple of charters. I have been to Ottawa three or four times a year probably, probably oftener, for a great many years, and these trips were during the session time.

Q. I mean when you came down on these trips regarding land damages for Fenelon you had no business with the railway deputation at all?—A. I think not; I have no recollection. The first time I came down on a railway deputation would be during the session of 18—, it was two years ago. These matters had been practically settled so far as any action of the minister was concerned before that.

Q. This trip in 1897, at the time you came down on that, were you not down on a railway deputation with Mr. John Macdonald?—A. 1897, I do not think so.

Q. You don't say you were not down?—A. I am well satisfied I was not. Of course, I haven't charged my mind with these things.

Q. The expenses of that trip in 1897, that trip to Ottawa, did you receive payment from anyone, or have you made a charge against anyone, for any expense in connection with this trip to Ottawa?—A. No.

Q. Did not Mr. Macdonald pay?—A. I do not think that matter has anything to do with this. I have a couple of small railway charters in connection with which I have no pay at all.

Mr. Sutherland objected that this was going into a man's private business that had no connection with any public business.