

The Enquiry Conducted by T. Hollis Walker, K.C.

(Continued from page 11.)

ard on his arrival in Montreal the result?

A—Yes, I did.

Q—In 1923?

A—Yes. That is quite correct.

Q—And you, I suppose, told him the result of your conversations on the train?

A—Yes.

Q—Did you tell him you had talked with McDougall?

A—I did. I don't know that I mentioned the details of the conversation, but I gave him the conclusion I had arrived at.

Q—Did you tell him that you talked with McDougall alone at first?

A—I don't know.

Q—Did you tell him that you talked with McDougall and Gillis?

A—I don't know that I did.

Q—Did you tell him you talked with McDougall, Gillis and Miller?

A—I have said before I gave him the result of my conversations with McDougall, but as to whether I gave him the details of who was present or not I cannot tell you. I don't think I did. I did not think that it was necessary.

Q—What did Sir Richard say?

A—Sir Richard turned the subject off. He said we shall let that stand for the present, or words to that effect, and then he said we now have other matters to discuss.

Q—He said that?

A—Yes.

Q—Did you testify to that?

(Commissioner reads extract from his notes on Mr. Meany's previous testimony.)

COMMISSIONER—That is a statement of what occurred; that Sir Richard said to let that matter stand, and you then discussed labour troubles.

WITNESS—Yes.

MR. LEWIS—How long prior to Sir Richard's departure from New York was it that he made that statement to you?

A—I don't know.

Q—Was it not on the eve of his departure?

A—I guess it was.

Q—Is it not true that he left there that night for New York?

A—I am not quite sure. He might have left that day or the next day. I am not sure of that.

Q—You did not talk any further with him on that subject before he left?

A—Not on that subject.

Q—Did he go to New York from Montreal?

A—Whether he went to New York or Toronto, I am not sure. He left Montreal at any rate.

Q—Did you say you saw Mr. McDougall several times after Sir Richard left?

A—I did not say so.

Q—You remained in Montreal?

A—I don't know how long I remained in Montreal before I went to other places.

COMMISSIONER—You went to Sydney, did you not?

A—Yes, that is quite true.

Q—You spent some time in Sydney?

A—I went to Sydney at Sir Richard's request in connection with the labour business, and I came right back from Sydney to Montreal.

MR. LEWIS—Is it not true that you remained there several days after Sir Richard had gone to New York?

A—He was gone when I arrived at Montreal from Sydney.

Q—Is it not true that while you were in Montreal after Sir Richard left you saw McDougall several times?

A—Not to my recollection, and I don't remember having said it. Perhaps I said it, but I don't recall having done so. I think now, Mr. Lewis, that you are speaking of 1921.

Q—Well you think now that you did not see Mr. McDougall after Sir Richard left?

A—I might have seen him, but I cannot recall that I did, except at Sydney.

Q—Did you see him at Sydney?

A—I did.

Q—Did you have any conversations with him?

A—One.

Q—And was this matter the subject of your conversation?

A—What matter?

Q—This money matter, was it the subject of your conversation?

A—No, sir, not to my recollection.

Q—Did you testify in your direct examination, Mr. Meany, that after your conference with McDougall, and Gillis you regarded the matter as hopeless?

A—After my conversation with McDougall, I did not regard it as a thing possible of accomplishment, and consequently I did not lose any time over it. McDougall was too busy a man to lose any time over it either. It was an idea which he was not going to entertain.

A—Did you give that in your report to Sir Richard?

A—I told you of my report to Sir Richard in a previous answer.

Q—Did you say to McDougall at that time that it was \$300,000 or nothing?

A—I did not say that.

think the desirability of amendment of the contract was very much on his mind.

Q—Did you tell him of the activities of Mr. McDougall, or of your knowledge of Mr. McDougall's desire to bring the amendment about?

A—I did not mention those private matters to him.

Q—Did you make any reference to them at all?

A—I told him nothing of the conversations.

Q—Just what was said in that conversation?

A—The subject of the conversation was the amendment of the Besco Contract.

Q—But what was said?

A—I have already told you that he was very much interested.

Q—No, you are telling me something which you concluded was the result of the conversation.

Q—I think you should tell me "I said this to him" and "he said this to me."

A—I don't recollect anything, he said to me any more than I have told you.

Q—That was his wish: to have the Contract amended and the meat (which would be of course those two clauses) taken out?

A—Oh, no.

COMMISSIONER—Was that Sir William Reid's expression?

MR. LEWIS—No. I asked him if that was Sir William Reid's wish to have the contract amended and the meat taken out.

COMMISSIONER—I gather then that is the discussion between you and Meany—as to whether it is the meat, one view and the Newfoundland public may have an entirely different view.

COMMISSIONER—I don't care what they think. I want to see whether or not he has anything to do with it. I think Mr. Meany told you candidly what he had to do with it.

MR. LEWIS—(To Witness): When did that conversation take place?

A—in 1921.

Q—How many times were you in Montreal? In 1921, 1922 and 1923?

A—No. I went there in December, 1921, came back in January, 1922, and went there in January, 1923 and came back in February.

Q—Have you been there since?

A—No.

Q—But you have been on other trips?

A—Yes. I went to New York.

Q—What brought you to New York?

A—The labour trouble principally.

Q—Naturally they were not all.

A—No. I also went to New York to negotiate for the contribution from the Commercial Cable Company for Sir Richard. I was going to get \$15,000.00 contribution from Mr. Ward.

Q—Who was he?

A—A member of the Commercial Cable Company. I should not like to go into particulars as both men



Nothing Else Matters with a good appetite and a generous portion of Pan Cakes for Breakfast, and our Pure Maple Syrup.

ELLIS & CO.,
Limited,
203 WATER STREET.

Pan Cake Flour.
Buckwheat Flour.
Rye Flour.
Graham Flour.
Hunter's Oatmeal.
Pettibon's Breakfast Food.
Malt Breakfast Food.
Cream of Wheat.
Grape Nuts.
Puffed Rice.
Hominy Grits.
Robinson's Patent Barley.
Robinson's Patent Groats.

Fresh Smoked Haddies.
Fresh Smoked Kippers.

Canadian Turkeys.
Milk Fed Chicken.
P.E.I. Ducks.
New York Corned Beef.
Beech Nut Bacon.
Beech Nut Ham.
Fresh Pork Sausages.
Fresh Beef Sausages.
Tomato Sausages.
(All our own make).

are dead now. I wanted to show you what it was that brought me, but I should not like to go into it, and shall not do so unless I am asked.

Q—Did you get the \$15,000.00?

A—No.

Q—Then it fell through?

A—No. I don't say that it fell through. Had the principal been alive when I went there, it may not have fallen through. Do you want to know the full particulars of it?

Q—No. I am not going into that matter as it does not relate to this.

COMMISSIONER—But I thought you asked him what his business in New York was.

MR. LEWIS—I asked him for what purpose did he go back and forth.

WITNESS—Well I told you.

Q—I asked for any other business in connection with this situation?

A—You led me up to tell the whole.

COMMISSIONER—I think you made it inevitable for him to tell the whole.

MR. WARREN—(To Mr. Lewis)—You can have the particulars if you want them.

MR. LEWIS—Does your Honor intend to proceed any further before lunch?

COMMISSIONER—Shall you be much longer with this witness Mr. Lewis?

MR. LEWIS—I have several other subjects to take up with the witness, and they will probably take part of the afternoon.

COMMISSIONER—Then we shall adjourn until 3 o'clock.

MR. Meany cross-examined by Mr. Lewis (Continued).

MR. LEWIS—Mr. Meany, on your return from Sydney to Newfoundland I think you said you found Mr. Miller here?

A—I do not remember making that statement.

COMMISSIONER—What he said was, he went back to Montreal after being in Sydney.

MR. LEWIS—Well on your return from Montreal you found Miller here?

A—That is not correct. What happened was, after my return to Montreal myself and Miller later on went to New York and we both contracted New York "fla." if you wish to call it such. We were both ill when we arrived home.

Q—And Miller was seriously ill. I understand?

A—He was.

Q—And there was some expectation that he might not recover, was there not?

A—I do not think so. I know he was under the treatment of Dr. Burden for quite a while.

Q—Did you see him while he was ill at his home?

A—I did at his request at first; later I visited him on my own account.

Q—Miller showed you a letter he had received from Mr. Gillis about this forty-six thousand dollars, did he not?

A—He did.

Q—Did he ask you to take the matter up with Sir Richard Squires?

A—Yes.

Q—Did you do as he requested?

A—I did.

Q—And you took it up by writing Sir Richard a letter?

A—Yes.

Q—You did not go and see him personally?

A—No.

Q—Did you have any particular reason for writing him?

A—I had no particular reason at all for writing him, except to place the matter fully before him.

Q—But you could have laid the matter before him personally?

A—Perhaps; but I thought the way I did it was the best way.

Q—Do you think if you wanted to see him that you would have much difficulty to see him?

COMMISSIONER—Everybody else had.

WITNESS—He was always a busy man and one would experience some difficulty in trying to see him personally.

MR. LEWIS—Was it not your real purpose in writing that letter to put to him in written form, as a self-serving declaration, a statement that would be available to you in the event of inharmonious relations between Sir Richard Squires and you?

A—That was not my intention. It was a friendly act done by me to Sir Richard Squires.

Q—You say that you were doing him a friendly act?

A—Absolutely.

Q—And without any thought of hostility towards him?

A—I think that the document speaks for itself.

Q—But there came a time when your relations with Sir Richard became hostile, was there not?

A—Subsequently, yes.

Q—When was that?

A—After the general election of 1923 the hostility began on his part.

Q—You had some reason then for feeling hostile?

A—I repeat, he showed his hostility to me first.

Q—Well, did you not have any hostility to him?

A—Yes, after he showed his hostility to me.

Q—Can you fix the date of that situation, that is, when the hostilities opened up?

A—After Sir Richard was securely returned to power in May, 1923.

Q—Well then, from May, 1923, down to the present time your relations with Sir Richard have been of a very hostile character, have they not?

A—I have been quite indifferent to his attitude towards me; I have been open and above board to him.

Q—Has that hostile feeling increased to any extent by the fact that you were suspended from the liquor control department?

A—I do not feel any hostility to him to-day.

Q—You would not consciously do him an injury?

A—I don't have to. As a man I have no hostile or unfriendly feeling towards him; I am quite indifferent as to what the matter is.

Q—Were you indifferent in the Summer of 1923 after you were suspended?

A—After May, 1923, when I found he was double-crossing me about my appointment to full controller I did not conceal my resentment of it.

Q—What do you mean by double-crossing?

A—I thought that was a term that you, coming from America, could easily understand.

Q—How did he double-cross you?

A—His Executive had given me the appointment to full control and although the appointment had been sanctioned by the Executive and with the consent of Sir Richard, yet it was held over by him and piece-mealed.

Q—It was true, was it not, that you and Sir Richard's clerk had been exchanging I.O.U.'s and that she had been exchanging I.O.U.'s in his name and her own for your cash at that time?

A—He had long preceding that had knowledge of these transactions.

Q—But he had no knowledge of it in May, 1923, at the time he refused to permit you getting the appointment to full control?

A—He had knowledge long before that.

Q—And he must have asked for your suspension long before that?

A—He was at liberty to do anything he liked for all I cared.

Q—You must mean at the time his Executive proposed to make you full controller?

A—He proposed it himself.

Q—You said a moment ago that your appointment was made by the Executive and with his consent?

A—Yes, I said his Executive made the appointment and he sanctioned it.

Q—Well, then, his Executive voted to make you full controller and he gave it his consent?

A—Yes.

Q—Do you think he gave the appointment his sanction with the idea of placing you until after he was entrenched in power?

A—Certainly I do.

Q—But did he not have reason to believe that you had not been faithful in the performance of your public duties?

A—That had nothing to do with it. Sir Richard Squires knew all about my public duties and how I carried them out long before.

Q—And later you conferred with Mr. Higgins?

A—Yes, I conferred with Mr. Higgins, who is my personal counsel.

Q—When was that?

A—About two weeks preceding the resignation of Sir Richard Squires.

Q—His resignation took place on what date?

A—He suspended me on the 23rd of June, 1923, and he resigned on the 23rd of July, 1923. He had a month's grace.

Q—Well, then, you had company going out of office, didn't you?

A—No, I was out of office a month before him.

Q—When you called on Mr. Higgins did you give him all the facts in your possession at that time?

A—I did not.

Q—Just what facts did you give him?

A—I stated my case briefly, but did not tell particulars of it. I gave him an outline of the situation that I may be confronted with.

Q—To what extent?

A—I asked him, in the event of something happening that would bring me in clash with Sir Richard Squires, where would I stand in bringing this thing on in my own defence.

Q—Did you tell him all that you had in mind on that point?

A—I did not tell him the particulars.

Q—Did you give him any particulars?

A—None. I stated the case as if it were impersonal.

Q—Will you state the case now as you stated it to him?

A—I said supposing it was shown that Sir Richard Squires had obtained money from my department and he had not returned it, where would I stand?

Q—Is that all?

A—That is about all.

Q—Did you say anything about I.O.U.'s to him at that time?

A—Not at that time.

Q—Did you say anything about his relations with BESCO or with any of the subordinate companies?

A—No, I just laid before him the circumstances of the unreturned cheques.

Q—Did you tell him or indicate to him that the cheques had been cashed with the monies of the Government?

A—That is what I indicated to him.

CORRECT DRESS WEAR FOR ALL OCCASIONS



Full Dress Shirts

With Soft Pleated Fronts.
Soft Tucked Fronts.
Linen Cuffs.

WHITE DRESS VESTS
BLACK FANCY TUXEDO VESTS

GREY AND WHITE SILK GLOVES

WHITE KID GLOVES
GREY SUEDE GLOVES

BLACK SILK SOCKS
Plain or with Clocks.

DRESS SHOES
HANDKERCHIEFS
MUFFLERS.

Ayre & Son
LIMITED

Jan 16, 23.36

BLACK AND GALV. PIPE!

Get Our Prices Before Placing Your Order.

Scottish Tube Co., Ltd.,
Glasgow.

WM. HEAP & Co., Ltd.
AGENTS.

Mr. Higgins. I do not think anybody else was present. Mr. Higgins was invited by me to be present, because I was not going to have a conference without his presence.

Q—And you think the conference was between Mr. Higgins of the one part and the Attorney General and Sir William Coaker on the other part. Was there anybody else present outside the Executive?

A—Yes. Jim Miller was present. He came there after I had arrived and remained while the conference was on. Both of us left at the same time.

Q—Are you able to fix the date when that happened?

A—I cannot.

WITNESS—It was shortly after I had my second interview with Mr. Higgins.

Q—And in that conference with the Attorney General and the others present, did you disclose anything about the liquor control department and forty-six thousand dollar matter?

A—I disclosed nearly all I knew.

Q—Did you tell about the \$100,000 and the \$300,000 matters?

A—Yes, I think I did. I laid all my cards on the table, so to speak.

Q—Of course, the Attorney General

(Continued on page 12.)