

Public Accounts Committee.

Q. Yes?—A. These deductions represent the first taxation of the bill. At Mr. Hall's instance the taxation was revised, and where you see a pencil mark put through it, it means that Mr. Hall protested, and I think, as a matter of fact, he was allowed more than the amounts mentioned.

Q. On the 10th and 11th of June there is attendance at Court of Queen's Bench all the morning, and so on, for which \$50 was allowed?—A. Yes.

Q. On the 12th of June there is an item for attendance at the Court of Queen's Bench, for which \$50 was charged?—A. There are two telegrams and a letter in addition.

By Mr. Powell:

Q. And how many attendances?—A. When the Solicitor General says attendance, I understand that he means these three attendances.

By Mr. Fitzpatrick:

Q. Three attendances on the same day, on the same court and on the same case?—A. I would not put it that way, as a lawyer. I would include in that going back after lunch, and so on.

Q. On the 15th another item of \$50 was allowed on the same case before the same court?—A. On the 15th?

Q. No, the 13th, I think it is?—A. On the 13th, yes. There is attendance and a letter that day with a copy of the stenographer's notes.

By Mr. Powell:

Q. How much allowed for that?—A. \$50 apparently.

By the Solicitor General:

Q. This was for attendance at court while the bill was before the grand jury, because the case never got beyond the grand jury?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know whether Mr. Hall did anything before the grand jury except to go in and explain the case; that he was not allowed to marshal the witnesses?—A. Yes.

Q. He was not allowed to marshal the witnesses?—A. Yes. I don't know whether he went before the grand jury.

Q. And the grand jury threw the bill out?—A. Yes.

Q. So that practically Mr. Hall was paid for standing around the doors \$50 a day?—A. Well, I do not think that was Mr. Hall's explanation of it.

Q. Now, would you tell me in a summary what the bill amounts to for this information laid before the grand jury and the preliminary investigation before the magistrate?—A. Well, I make out that Mr. Hall was paid \$4,535.75.

Q. For these services?—A. For these services, including a number of disbursements amounting to about—well, I am not sure of the exact amount, but they amount to about \$1,000 or thereabouts.

Q. Is it not \$703.10?—A. That is only part of them. There is another account for \$996.90 paid for disbursements.

Q. Can you tell me from the accounts now before you how much was paid to Hall, Cross, Brown and Sharp, for services rendered in connection with the information laid before the police magistrate and the subsequent proceedings before the grand jury?—A. That is Mr. Hall's entire bill.

Q. Let us get the whole bill and then take the disbursements?—A. Mr. Hall was paid, as I make it out, \$4,535.75. That included a certain amount of disbursements for stenographers' fees and things of that kind, amounting, I see here, to \$996.90, but I think in addition to that there was another bill of disbursements.