

Public Accounts Committee.

Q. Was there any understanding as to how the legal expenses were to be borne?
—A. Each party was to contribute according to what he received, the costs being borne *pro rata*.

Q. And the statement was made, that you did not think it would exceed 20 per cent?—A. That it would not exceed 20 per cent.

Q. And the charge which you actually made, did it exceed 20 per cent?—A. No.

Q. So that your fee, if you had charged your bill at the ordinary rates as between solicitor and client, your bill would have been—?—A. My bill would have been \$600.

Q. And what was the total you charged?—A. \$365.

Q. Has there been any complaint come to you from any of these people for whom you were acting, concerning the charges you made?—A. None whatever. Everybody was well satisfied.

Q. And are even yet, from what you know?—A. Yes. I have been complimented very strongly by some of those interested, who said these cases had been done up all right, and that there was no politics about it. I have letters from Mr. Brynell; I may say the Conservative clients were especially grateful. Mr. Sackett thanked me very much; also Mr. Brown and others. I have not thought it worth while going around to the parties to get letters, but I can justify anything I did.

Q. On page 5149 Mr. Hughes also states that you were present at the time the valuation was made: the words he used are as follows:—"He," meaning yourself, "was there to screw up the price as high as possible in order that he might get his 20 per cent. If the reports along these waters are true, these farmers are not at all satisfied. They find that this man could not bulldoze and browbeat the valuator, that the valuation he made was an honest valuation." Were you present for the purpose of browbeating and bulldozing the valuator?—A. I was present for the purpose of getting my clients what I could get for them. I was not working for the government, but so far as browbeating and bulldozing the valuator is concerned, I think I know enough about the practice of my profession not to make a fool of myself in that way. I may have urged their claims strongly. My own opinion was, my feeling—perhaps I was naturally partial to my clients—but my feeling was, that I did not get enough for them. The valuator, the first time he came up, said that about two thousand dollars was enough, and said the government would not allow him to give more than that. But I thought we should have had another thousand.

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. You stated that these claims were made as far back as 1891?—A. No, I said they raised the dam in 1891.

Q. Did you ever hear of the dam before 1895?—A. I heard of the dam being raised, but did not know of any claims. Your statement was, that the dam was not raised until about that time.

By Mr. Cowan:

Q. Just read that over again about the dam?—A. The statement is: "Not one farmer ever had any claim prior to 1895. The dam was only raised—I will not say the exact year—but the dam was only raised a short time previous to that year."

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. Not a claim was made before 1895?—A. The dam was raised in 1891.

Q. And the water was not raised until after that a considerable time?—A. The water was raised when the dam was raised.

Q. The Postmaster General read a letter from you, saying there was a meeting of farmers in the fall of 1895?—A. I do not think so. I did not say in the fall of 1895.