

## The Enquiry Conducted By T. Hollis Walker, K.C.

(Continued from page 7.)

Q.—Were there any other amounts like that?

A.—That was the only amount that ever went into the Trust account.

Q.—In any other account?

A.—I do not know anything about the R. A. Squires account. I did not enquire as to what deposits Sir Richard Squires may have made personally.

Q.—You say that this amount was deposited to meet that draft of Globe and Rutgers?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were you ever called upon suddenly to find any other large amount at any time?

A.—That's what I was doing, rendering old accounts.

Q.—Was there any other accounts, or any other demand upon the firm that you had to get money for like the Globe and Rutgers account?

A.—I cannot recall any just now.

Q.—Did you ever hear of the Twysden estate?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did you ever hear of any sudden demand being made in connection with that estate?

A.—That was one of the old accounts I rendered when I went there.

Q.—You mean there was a demand?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the nature of that demand?

A.—I would have to look back to 1920. It was an estate that had been taken from the office, but the accounts had not been rendered, and it was one of the old rent rolls that I was looking after.

Q.—And you owed this estate some money?

A.—The office, yes.

Q.—Was that money paid the estate when you went in the office?

A.—Yes. The accounts were not rendered until I went there. The money was supplied by Sir Richard Squires, as far as I know.

Q.—What was the amount?

A.—I would have to have the records to tell that.

Q.—Was there not a sudden demand?

A.—The office record would tell the dates and the amount.

Q.—Did the money come out of the office account? As a matter of fact did you not get a letter from a firm of lawyers?

A.—I do not remember any of the correspondence. I merely did the rent roll and found out the amount due, and it was settled. My recollection is that it was settled before the trust account was opened.

Q.—Was not the amount something like nine thousand dollars?

A.—I do not recollect. That it was a large amount is all I know.

Q.—How was it paid?

A.—I think Sir Roger Twysden was here himself at the time and got payment.

COMMISSIONER—Just let me look

Q.—How was that amount paid?

A.—By cheque. I think, I am not sure. Yes. I have a record here of it.

MR. HOWLEY objects on the grounds that these questions are pressing into the private transactions of Sir Richard Squires which have no relevance to the Enquiry.

COMMISSIONER—The question is how a particular payment was made, and it is put to test his evidence with regard to the way in which he says payments were made, which we have to deal with.

WITNESS—I have a cheque stub here as Sir Richard Squires account.

COMMISSIONER—Showing that money was paid out in respect of this Twysden transaction.

A.—There was a cheque issued by Sir Richard Squires.

Q.—Does that show that money was paid out in respect of this Twysden transaction?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now then, will you show us all that appears in your books. Find the entry in your book.

A.—A cheque was issued when Sir Richard Squires.....

Q.—Find the entry, please, in your book.

MR. FRASER—It was an entry I made at Sir Richard Squires request.

COMMISSIONER—Can you find the entry. I don't want to go into a private matter but I want to know can you find the entry. You say you have the stub?

A.—I have not got the stub. That is what I was trying to say.

Q.—It looks like a stub book?

A.—That is what I was trying to explain, but I didn't get the chance. Sir Richard issued a cheque without entering it in the book afterwards for a matter of record.

Q.—This is a stub book and this paper is put in between the 23rd and 24th of June. Does that suggest when you made the entry?

A.—I have found the entry.

MR. WARREN—What year?

A.—1921.

COMMISSIONER—What is the date?

A.—The entry went through my cash book on June 23rd.

Q.—Now you are being asked whether it went through the cash book?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Showing that the money was paid out?

A.—Yes.

MR. WARREN—Was it made from the account of Sir Richard personally?

A.—From the R. A. Squires' Account.

Q.—That is shown?

A.—They were afterwards entered in both accounts through 1921.

COMMISSIONER—Just let me look

## MOTHER!

Child's Best Laxative is  
"California Fig Syrup"



Hurry Mother! A teaspoonful of "California Fig Syrup" now will thoroughly clean the little bowels and in a few hours you have a well, playful child again. Even if cross, feverish, bilious, constipated or full of cold, children love its pleasant taste.

Tell your druggist you want only the genuine "California Fig Syrup" which has directions for babies and children of all ages printed on bottle. Mother you must say "California." Refuse any imitation.

at it; just show it to me and then you can show it to the Attorney General. COMMISSIONER—That appears to be in the book in two places and as far as I can see in the proper places. MR. WARREN—May I have a look at that entry again?

Q.—Was that Sir Richard Squires' account; an office account or a private account?

A.—It was used for both purposes.

COMMISSIONER—It was the Bank of Nova Scotia Account not the Commerce account?

A.—No, it was the Nova Scotia account.

MR. WARREN—According to you there was a deposit made of in the Trust account on the 31st; but it was paid out of the R. A. Squires account?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that is charged in this book?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Here is a credit deposit of \$250.00 in the bank account. Does that appear in your book?

A.—That would be something Sir Richard sent down himself and I would not know about it.

Q.—Up to that time had you been keeping the R. A. Squires' account in that book?

A.—The R. A. Squires' account was used for office entries several times.

Q.—But not altogether?

A.—No.

Q.—Are the deposits made from time to time to the account of Sir Richard Squires, in that book?

A.—The R. A. Squires' account was used for office entries several times.

Q.—But not altogether?

A.—No.

Q.—Are the deposits made from time to time to the account of Sir Richard Squires, in that book?

A.—I used the R. A. Squires' account to finance notes and I would call upon it from time to time to cover the notes.

Q.—Why is the payment to Twysden's account, which was paid out of the R. A. Squires' account; why does that appear in the books at all?

COMMISSIONER—You had to do with the books at that time.

A.—I had to debit the account.

MR. WARREN—But you debited the bank account?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What was the use if you did not credit the bank account with the deposits from time to time?

A.—There was no comparison between the bank account and my book. As regards the bank account, I could do nothing but keep a record of what was paid.

Q.—So you can trace nothing from that book?

A.—I can see which account it was charged to by looking up the bank account.

Q.—How did you know about your credits?

A.—All my debts go to the trust account.

Q.—Now trace the \$250.00; it does not appear?

A.—That was Sir Richard's private matter.

Q.—How can your books be any

good to you as to your bank account?

A.—By your means as to the conditions of the bank account?

Q.—Yes.

A.—In those days there was so way of doing it.

Q.—It is alleged now, Mr. Fraser?

A.—Yes, I have my account pretty decent.

Q.—Just one last question Mr. Fraser, you say that during the period after which you had given the balances from month to month the book was written up by Miss Reader, would she have charge of the cash?

A.—I don't know, I was not there.

Q.—Have you asked Miss Reader for an account?

A.—She had left before I went there and she is not there now.

COMMISSIONER—That appears to be the evidence as far as the first section is concerned, and as regards the second section, I take it with the exception of Mr. McNamee's evidence. Has he arrived yet, I understand the "Digby" was due this morning.

MR. JENKINS—The "Digby" docked this morning at eleven o'clock.

COMMISSIONER—Would it be more convenient for him to give his evidence to-morrow morning?

A.—I have not seen him but I know he is not a very good sailor.

COMMISSIONER—With regard to the first section, it seems to me what I am invited to consider is whether money which ought to have been paid into the Exchange Account in the Bank of Montreal was not paid into that account but was paid to private individuals instead.

MR. MEANEY—I am invited and I may have to find that there was money paid by you to certain individuals instead of into the Exchange Account at the Bank of Montreal, do you desire to address me upon that?

MR. MEANEY—The second question, Miss Miller, is that those moneys were received by you. Do you want to make any observations on that?

MISS MILLER—No, Mr. Walker.

COMMISSIONER—The third matter, Mr. Howley, I take it, you will deal with as to whether Sir Richard Squires in any way a party to those transactions.

MR. HOWLEY—Yes sir. Might I say as it is a quarter to one.

COMMISSIONER—May I ask you, how long do you think you will require for your address to me?

MR. HOWLEY—I haven't any idea but I shall be as short and as brief as possible.

COMMISSIONER—Will two hours be sufficient?

MR. HOWLEY—I think so.

COMMISSIONER—Then the three to five minutes ought to be complete?

MR. HOWLEY—Yes.

COMMISSIONER—Very well, we will adjourn now until three o'clock.

MR. HOWLEY, K.C., ADDRESSES THE COMMISSIONER REGARDING THE FIRST SECTION OF THE ENQUIRY.

Practically the whole afternoon session of the Enquiry was taken up by Mr. Howley in delivering his address on behalf of Sir Richard Squires in reference to the allegations made under paragraph 1. Opening his address, Mr. Howley stated it was his desire to compress his observations as much as possible. The Enquiry under the particular paragraph was in relation to the Liquor Control Department, and under this head three points had to be considered, viz: Did money pay out monies of the Department? Did Miss Miller receive these monies for Sir Richard Squires? and was it done with the knowledge of Sir Richard. Counsel pointed out that certain details of the evidence given would be inapplicable if Sir Richard's business and political activities were not first considered. He then stated that through the years down to 1919, Sir Richard gave him personal supervision to his office affairs, but from that time when he embarked on his career as Prime Minister he threw his law business to the four winds. He then found himself

at the head of a political organization on which there were heavy demands, and as a consequence was compelled to personally, in many instances, solicit funds for his campaign. Funds flowed in sometimes from known contributors, at other times anonymously. The sources of these he could not be expected to account for. During the period of his tenure of office the burden of extraordinary labor difficulties also fell on his shoulders. I am, said Counsel, compelled to mention these facts, not for political effect, but rather for the purpose of beginning from a proper viewpoint.

Mr. Howley then referred to Sir Richard obtaining the assistance of Miss Miller to take care of the business of his law office. He then began a review of the facts of evidence starting with Miss Meeney's testimony that Sir Richard, being short of funds for his business transactions, had asked her to secure them first from her brother and then from Mr. Meeney. He said Sir Richard denied the allegations, claiming that at the time he had sufficient funds represented by his personal notes, which he left with Miss Saunders, to cover his obligations. When Miss Miller made it known to him that she had borrowed \$4,000 from Mr. Meeney, he promptly repaid the amount. The allegation that the \$5,000 she had deposited to his credit was obtained from Mr. Meeney did not stand, because shortly after he had brought two messages to Miss Saunders to be coded to Sir Richard, and there was no suggestion in these messages that she had obtained the money, much less that it was his first knowledge that she had borrowed from Meeney. There was not the slightest suggestion in the request that she wanted the money to repay Meeney. If this amount was borrowed from Mr. Meeney it was not listed by him, and his statement of the shortage in the Department would be \$29,385 plus \$2,125 instead of \$27,260 as he reported. This positive statement of the amount of the shortage was contradicted. Another point dealt with at some length was Sir Richard's resignation. He took full responsibility for the course the Prime Minister took in this connection. After Sir Richard had stated to him that he knew of the charges, he urged upon him that to resign was the right and proper course for him to pursue.

Mr. Howley then went on to a consideration of the evidence given by Mr. Meeney. He referred to Miss Miller's account of her first transac-

tion with Meeney, and as to the certainty of the evidence of the witness as to whether it was after Sir Richard's return in Dec. 1920, or before.

The COMMISSIONER interposed—I got no such recollection. If you can refer me to that passage of her evidence, do it. It is not in accordance with my recollection.

MR. HOWLEY stated that in the course of her cross-examination it became evident that the cheque of Dec. 11, 1920, was not the first transaction with Meeney, as she recalled her first statements.

COMMISSIONER—That had only reference to an obvious error in the date of the first cheque, to say the least of it.

MR. HOWLEY suggested that it was far from conclusive and referred to the examination of the witness by Mr. Hunt on Jan. 8 between 8.30 and 4 when she stated that Sir Richard was in town at the time and that he suggested she should go to Meeney.

COMMISSIONER—I do not say that she ever stated that it was after his

return. Her story was that it was before his departure, not after his return, according to my recollection.

MR. HOWLEY—I submit that according to her story as it was told first and before we had—

COMMISSIONER—No doubt she took it that December 11th was the first time she visited Meeney for the first cheque until it was shown to her to be wrong at a later stage. While I have no doubt that it was mentioned that the incident might have taken place after the return of Sir Richard; still I always thought it was before his departure.

MR. HOWLEY—My recollection is that she never stated positively, but she did state that to the best of her recollection.

COMMISSIONER—That had only reference to an obvious error in the date of the first cheque, to say the least of it.

MR. HOWLEY suggested that it was far from conclusive and referred to the examination of the witness by Mr. Hunt on Jan. 8 between 8.30 and 4 when she stated that Sir Richard was in town at the time and that he suggested she should go to Meeney.

COMMISSIONER—I do not say that she ever stated that it was after his

return. Her story was that it was before his departure, not after his return, according to my recollection.

MR. HOWLEY—I submit that according to her story as it was told first and before we had—

COMMISSIONER—No doubt she took it that December 11th was the first time she visited Meeney for the first cheque until it was shown to her to be wrong at a later stage. While I have no doubt that it was mentioned that the incident might have taken place after the return of Sir Richard; still I always thought it was before his departure.

MR. HOWLEY—My recollection is that she never stated positively, but she did state that to the best of her recollection.

COMMISSIONER—That had only reference to an obvious error in the date of the first cheque, to say the least of it.

MR. HOWLEY suggested that it was far from conclusive and referred to the examination of the witness by Mr. Hunt on Jan. 8 between 8.30 and 4 when she stated that Sir Richard was in town at the time and that he suggested she should go to Meeney.

COMMISSIONER—I do not say that she ever stated that it was after his

return. Her story was that it was before his departure, not after his return, according to my recollection.

MR. HOWLEY—I submit that according to her story as it was told first and before we had—

COMMISSIONER—No doubt she took it that December 11th was the first time she visited Meeney for the first cheque until it was shown to her to be wrong at a later stage. While I have no doubt that it was mentioned that the incident might have taken place after the return of Sir Richard; still I always thought it was before his departure.

MR. HOWLEY—My recollection is that she never stated positively, but she did state that to the best of her recollection.

COMMISSIONER—That had only reference to an obvious error in the date of the first cheque, to say the least of it.

MR. HOWLEY suggested that it was far from conclusive and referred to the examination of the witness by Mr. Hunt on Jan. 8 between 8.30 and 4 when she stated that Sir Richard was in town at the time and that he suggested she should go to Meeney.

COMMISSIONER—I do not say that she ever stated that it was after his

return. Her story was that it was before his departure, not after his return, according to my recollection.

MR. HOWLEY—I submit that according to her story as it was told first and before we had—

COMMISSIONER—No doubt she took it that December 11th was the first time she visited Meeney for the first cheque until it was shown to her to be wrong at a later stage. While I have no doubt that it was mentioned that the incident might have taken place after the return of Sir Richard; still I always thought it was before his departure.

MR. HOWLEY—My recollection is that she never stated positively, but she did state that to the best of her recollection.

COMMISSIONER—That had only reference to an obvious error in the date of the first cheque, to say the least of it.

MR. HOWLEY suggested that it was far from conclusive and referred to the examination of the witness by Mr. Hunt on Jan. 8 between 8.30 and 4 when she stated that Sir Richard was in town at the time and that he suggested she should go to Meeney.

COMMISSIONER—I do not say that she ever stated that it was after his

return. Her story was that it was before his departure, not after his return, according to my recollection.

MR. HOWLEY—I submit that according to her story as it was told first and before we had—

COMMISSIONER—No doubt she took it that December 11th was the first time she visited Meeney for the first cheque until it was shown to her to be wrong at a later stage. While I have no doubt that it was mentioned that the incident might have taken place after the return of Sir Richard; still I always thought it was before his departure.

MR. HOWLEY—My recollection is that she never stated positively, but she did state that to the best of her recollection.

COMMISSIONER—That had only reference to an obvious error in the date of the first cheque, to say the least of it.

MR. HOWLEY suggested that it was far from conclusive and referred to the examination of the witness by Mr. Hunt on Jan. 8 between 8.30 and 4 when she stated that Sir Richard was in town at the time and that he suggested she should go to Meeney.

COMMISSIONER—I do not say that she ever stated that it was after his

return. Her story was that it was before his departure, not after his return, according to my recollection.

MR. HOWLEY—I submit that according to her story as it was told first and before we had—

COMMISSIONER—No doubt she took it that December 11th was the first time she visited Meeney for the first cheque until it was shown to her to be wrong at a later stage. While I have no doubt that it was mentioned that the incident might have taken place after the return of Sir Richard; still I always thought it was before his departure.

MR. HOWLEY—My recollection is that she never stated positively, but she did state that to the best of her recollection.

COMMISSIONER—That had only reference to an obvious error in the date of the first cheque, to say the least of it.

MR. HOWLEY suggested that it was far from conclusive and referred to the examination of the witness by Mr. Hunt on Jan. 8 between 8.30 and 4 when she stated that Sir Richard was in town at the time and that he suggested she should go to Meeney.

COMMISSIONER—I do not say that she ever stated that it was after his

return. Her story was that it was before his departure, not after his return, according to my recollection.

MR. HOWLEY—I submit that according to her story as it was told first and before we had—

COMMISSIONER—No doubt she took it that December 11th was the first time she visited Meeney for the first cheque until it was shown to her to be wrong at a later stage. While I have no doubt that it was mentioned that the incident might have taken place after the return of Sir Richard; still I always thought it was before his departure.

MR. HOWLEY—My recollection is that she never stated positively, but she did state that to the best of her recollection.

COMMISSIONER—That had only reference to an obvious error in the date of the first cheque, to say the least of it.

MR. HOWLEY suggested that it was far from conclusive and referred to the examination of the witness by Mr. Hunt on Jan. 8 between 8.30 and 4 when she stated that Sir Richard was in town at the time and that he suggested she should go to Meeney.

COMMISSIONER—I do not say that she ever stated that it was after his

return. Her story was that it was before his departure, not after his return, according to my recollection.

MR. HOWLEY—I submit that according to her story as it was told first and before we had—

COMMISSIONER—No doubt she took it that December 11th was the first time she visited Meeney for the first cheque until it was shown to her to be wrong at a later stage. While I have no doubt that it was mentioned that the incident might have taken place after the return of Sir Richard; still I always thought it was before his departure.

MR. HOWLEY—My recollection is that she never stated positively, but