

Q. Mr. Cameron was Attorney General of Manitoba at the time?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Howell refers, on page 64, to \$3,000 being received on 23rd of October, 1896, have you any knowledge of that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that in the list you gave?—A. Yes, sir, the first item.

Q. He says that \$1,000 was paid, to be exact "while I was away at court somewhere there was a pressing need of \$1,000 and Mr. Cameron handed into my office \$1,000 in my absence." Do you know anything of that?—A. I see here an entry of \$995.30 on 2nd February, 1897.

Q. It was probably this to which he refers?—A. I think so.

Q. Because he states: "I credited that in my account;" is there any other item that would refer to it?—A. No, sir. I think Mr. Howell was mistaken in saying it was while he was at Portage; I think he was down here at Ottawa.

Q. He does not say that. He says it was while he was away somewhere at court?—A. Oh, that is all right, at the Supreme Court.

Q. On page 65 Mr. Howell says in answer to this question, as follows:—"Q. Did you render a statement of these disbursements? A. Yes. Q. Have you got it there? A. The first rendering was the \$3,000, you know. Q. But I understand that that was in a separate account? A. Yes." Can you add anything to the statement in explanation about that separate account?—A. I know of no account being rendered only the one which is in evidence as Exhibit "V" in the printed evidence last year.

*By Mr. Fitzpatrick:*

Q. You were the book-keeper for the firm of Archibald & Howell?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. On through the years 1895-96-97?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you look at page 138 of the minutes of evidence of last year, and especially at that portion on which is to be found the amount for disbursements paid out, \$7,315.08; can you say whether or not the document produced as Exhibit No. 15 shows the details or the summary of the disbursements?—A. It does.

Q. And then the document, Exhibit 16, is the detail of Exhibit 15?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that you produced detailed statements of all these disbursements verified by vouchers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you have now in your possession the vouchers to show that every dollar of that amount was expended with the exception of \$3 or \$4 you have spoken about?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you came here, you brought with you all the documents and papers of every description that you had in your possession or that Mr. Howell had in his possession with respect to the prosecutions?—A. Yes, with the exception of some that followed me.

Q. You brought them or they were sent to you afterwards?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is Mr. Howell's position at the Winnipeg bar?—A. I would claim he was the leader.

Q. Is he much employed there?—A. Yes, sir; he is very busily employed.

Q. Are you in a position to give us any information as to the fees which Mr. Howell is in the habit of charging for his per diem allowance?—A. Yes.

Q. What is his usual charge for attendance at court per diem?—A. In some cases \$100 per day.

Q. Had he been heretofore employed by the Manitoba government?—A. He has for many years, as Crown prosecutor.

Q. What fees are allowed him per diem by the Manitoba government?—A. His fees are by arrangement \$70 per day.

Q. Is there an arrangement to that effect?—A. There was an arrangement with the Attorney General's Department.

Q. Which has been in existence for many years past?—A. Since the Greenway government came into power. Before that he got larger fees.