

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

(Continued from page 7).

views examination Mr. Curtis you said you wanted separate accounts, a firm account and Sir Richard Squires' own account.

A—Yes.

Q—Why was that?

A—Sir Richard had personal notes running and I thought it better to have two accounts, the one with the office and his own personal account as I had my own personal one.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—Because Sir Richard had notes and other outstanding liabilities that you as a partner in law did not want to be responsible for them. You knew as a lawyer you would be responsible.

A—I did not want to go into accounts.

Q—You say you were a partner in law, then, does that mean you did not want to be a partner in the firm of the business?

A—I wanted Mr. Fraser to tell us at the end of the year how much money we made.

Q—You have already stated that you wanted separate accounts, and that the reason for that was that Sir Richard had outstanding liabilities that you did not want to come into the firm account.

A—I did not say that. He had some outstanding matters I said.

Q—What do you call a note?

A—That may not be a liability.

Q—Do you know of any note that is outstanding? Now if Sir Richard's account was in credit why did you want it separate from the firm account? If you knew of any liability why did you want it separate? Was it because his account was in debit or in credit?

A—Because I had no power to sign cheques.

Q—But you wanted two separate accounts. Now you have told us that Sir Richard had some notes outstanding and I ask you again was it because Sir Richard's account was in credit or in debit you wanted it kept separate?

A—I wanted an account in the bank by which somebody in the office could sign cheques.

COMMISSIONER—As up to that time the business matters of the firm and the private matters of Sir Richard and Squires had both been entered in one account?

A—Yes.

Q—The question I understood the Attorney General to ask was about the state of that account. Now was it at the time you want in the firm in debit or in credit?

A—I do not know.

COMMISSIONER—Did you look through it?

A—I never looked through Sir Richard's private account.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—Did you look through the firm's accounts?

A—I did.

Q—Why did you say the other day that you did not want to carry the "Star" account? Did you ever hear of the "Star" account being carried in your books?

A—No.

Q—You had no knowledge of the firm carrying the "Star" account?

A—I knew there was a "Star" account but I knew nothing about it.

Q—What did you know about it, merely that the "Star" account was being carried in your books?

A—I knew there may have been a "Star" account.

Q—Did it cause you any anxiety at all?

A—Not a bit.

Q—But without knowing anything about the accounts, without knowing whether Sir Richard's account was in debit or credit you sent away for

a special accountant and insisted on having a firm account apart from Sir Richard's and all without your knowing anything at all as to how the accounts stood?

A—I wanted the firm account kept separate.

Q—I suggested to you that you sent away for a special accountant, got him out of the Bank of Nova Scotia and you insisted upon Sir Richard's account being kept separate from the firm account and you did this without any knowledge whatever as to the state of the books.

A—Yes.

Q—Do you agree to that?

A—Yes, I do.

Q—Do you swear that you did not know that the "Star" was being financed through Squires and Curtis or through Sir Richard Squires?

A—I do not remember.

Q—Do you swear that at no time you knew that the "Star" was coming to your office for money?

A—I have no personal knowledge.

COMMISSIONER—What is the meaning of the word personal there?

Q—I did not ask you about personal knowledge. Do you know a gentleman by the name of Goodland?

A—Yes.

Q—Did you ever see him in your office?

A—Yes, I think he is a printer by trade.

Q—Where was he a printer?

A—He had his own office for a while.

Q—What was he doing when he came into your office and what was his job then?

COMMISSIONER—Did he chance to have anything to do with the printing of the "Daily Star"?

A—Yes, I think he did.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—You only think now that he had something to do with the "Daily Star." Did you ever see a receipt signed by him?

A—I think I did pay him a bill once.

Q—What did you pay it to him for?

A—We had some advertising in the "Star" and we paid him and he receipted the bill.

Q—And now you are quite clear that Mr. Goodland had something to do with the "Star." Was that the only time you saw him in the office and was he a constant visitor there, chiefly on Saturdays and Fridays?

A—I do not remember the days he came in.

Q—And yet you do not know that money was paid to the "Daily Star" through your office or that the "Daily Star" was financed through your office?

A—I have no knowledge of it.

Q—You would not be surprised to know that they owed \$124,000?

A—It was a surprise.

Q—And all this amount accumulated and you never knew a word about it and you a partner in the firm?

A—I did not know.

Q—Do you subscribe to the statement that Miss Miller was negligent when she was in the office?

A—I never could get any account of her.

Q—Did you ever have any transactions with Mrs. Harsant?

A—Yes.

Q—To what extent?

A—I do not just know what you mean.

Q—Did you ever loan her any money?

A—If she asked me I did.

Q—Did she ask you?

A—I think on one occasion I loaned her \$100.

Q—Is that all?

A—That is all I can remember.

Q—Who registered the Deed in the Registry Office showing that you advanced her \$100?

A—There is no such deed.

Q—I asked you who registered the Deed?

A—You are confusing me with the Deed.

Q—I ask you again how much have you advanced to Mrs. Harsant?

A—Nothing.

Q—Earlier you said you advanced her \$100?

A—That was a personal loan and was paid back.

COMMISSIONER—You said a personal loan of \$100. That is true, is it?

A—Yes.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—Did you make any other loans to her personal or otherwise?

A—No.

Q—So that if there is a Deed registered in the Registrar of Deeds Office on October 5th it is not correct?

A—Oh, I beg your pardon it is Mr. Harsant.

Q—Did you advance any money to Mr. Harsant?

A—Yes.

Q—How much?

A—The amount now due is \$5,000.

Q—And Mr. Harsant owes you that \$5,000?

A—No, he owes a client of mine \$5,000.

Q—Is there any record of such deed or mortgage?

A—My client holds the mortgage.

Q—Then how is it in your name?

A—Because at the time it was negotiated I planned to do it personally and the amount got beyond me so I assigned the whole thing to my client.

COMMISSIONER—Have you any objection to stating your client is?

A—I have an objection.

COMMISSIONER—The answer is he has an objection and I am not surprised at it.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—Your client you say holds the mortgage. Is it an equitable mortgage?

A—Yes.

Q—It is not a regular mortgage but a document intended to create a mortgage?

A—Yes.

Q—What interest is Mr. Harsant paying?

A—Probably the usual rate of 8%.

Q—So that although Mrs. Harsant got \$22,885 from the Controller's Department she has to mortgage her house at 8%?

COMMISSIONER—That is not quite fair. This is in October, 1920 Mrs. Harsant was getting this money. You must remember that Miss Miller was not Mrs. Harsant in those days and for a long time after she was not. These events may have been entirely independent.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—That is quite right. That mortgage Mr. Curtis is still outstanding and Mr. Harsant is paying \$400 a year interest to your client.

MR. HOWLEY—With reference to this mortgage, Mr. Curtis, I just want to ask you a question or two but I do not want you to disclose the name of your client. Is your client Sir Richard Squires or any member of Sir Richard Squires' family?

A—No.

COMMISSIONER—Why worry about this? I am not going to worry about it. I am not going to assume that they have the slightest connection with one another. At that time Mr. Harsant was not married to Miss Miller or perhaps had never met her. At all events I do not know and do not want to know. It is an entirely independent transaction until somebody shows me different and I am taking it as such.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—Still the money is not paid and is still due.

COMMISSIONER—Mr. Harsant, is like some more husbands he has a mortgage to pay. It is not the first time I have heard of it. I think we had better get on with the next witness.

MR. HOWLEY—I would like to call Head Constable Byrne.

COMMISSIONER—What possible evidence can he give that will have the slightest bearing on this enquiry. The only way in which you have introduced him in any shape or form was with regard to a conversation he had with Mr. Meany about an alleged burglary. Will you explain to me how on earth his version of that incident can be admissible in any court.

MR. HOWLEY—His evidence touches the credibility of Mr. Meany's evidence.

COMMISSIONER—According to the common law of England and surely it must be the law of this land that to call a witness for the purpose of contradicting somebody who said something that goes so little to his credit.

MR. HOWLEY—Mr. Meany was not my witness.

COMMISSIONER—At any rate it is genuine to the issue in this enquiry and I shall disallow it.

MR. HOWLEY—I agree in so far as it is applicable to certain facts here, but then there is the further consideration that the transaction to which I want to refer now is material to this enquiry, material in this way that this enquiry is authorized to enquire into and investigate certain alleged payments of money belonging to the controller's department to certain individuals. In pursuance of that enquiry evidence was brought here to

show that payments have been made to Miss Miller and to connect up Miss Miller and the payments with Sir Richard Squires. Then at or about the date when the confusion that led to this enquiry took place the Controller who is the principal witness in the enquiry reports to the police that his office has been burglarized and according to police records makes a statement that involves the Prime Minister.

COMMISSIONER—I am not going to enquire into that. I have no authority or right to enquire into it. If there was a burglary of who instigated it or who was the burglar is no concern of mine. It does not come within the scope of the enquiry.

MR. HOWLEY—But might I submit that it would come within the scope of the Commission to enquire whether there was a burglary at all or whether the whole thing was faked.

COMMISSIONER—I shall not enquire. I see no justification for it. It is outside my province. And whether the burglary was real or faked my decision would not count and would be of no use to anybody.

MR. HOWLEY—That is all the evidence I have to submit, sir, with the exception of the evidence of Sir Richard Squires himself. In so far as there is another matter of enquiry in which Sir Richard Squires is expressly named as a party who has been guilty of wrong doing I would like to put before you sir, for consideration the question of whether or not you would ask me to put Sir Richard Squires in the witness box now for the purpose of giving his testimony, or whether it would not be more desirable in the interests of the enquiry to have his testimony taken in the immediate future so that Sir Richard Squires' evidence could be taken all together.

COMMISSIONER—I see no good and valid reason why Sir Richard Squires cannot give his evidence now with regard to the charge we are now investigating. Last week I allowed you a postponement after very considerable demur and I see at present no reason why Sir Richard Squires cannot go into the box and tell his story.

MR. HOWLEY—I am quite prepared to go on.

COMMISSIONER—Thank you. Sir Richard Squires examined by Mr. Howley, K.C.

Q—You have been engaged in the practice of the law in St. John's for a number of years have you not?

A—Yes.

Q—I think you started into practice in the year 1905?

A—Yes.

Q—And carried on business as a practising Barrister and Solicitor down to the year 1919 when you became Prime Minister?

A—Yes.

Q—You continued as Prime Minister from 1919 down to sometime in July 1923 when you resigned?

A—Yes.

Q—Up to the time of your assumption of the office of Prime Minister in 1919 I think you gave your daily continual personal attention to your law office?

A—Yes, up to the time of my political organization which started early in the year 1919.

COMMISSIONER—Which culminated in your becoming Prime Minister in 1919, is that right?

A—Yes.

Q—When did Mr. Winter join you?

A—Yes, I think he did.

MR. HOWLEY—During the period of your practice I think Mr. Winter was associated with you?

A—He was associated with me for several years.

COMMISSIONER—He became your partner when?

A—In 1916, and partnership, and relations were severed in the summer of 1920.

MR. HOWLEY—There are two gentlemen by the name of Winter practising Barristers and Solicitors are they not?

A—Yes, I am referring to Mr. Alex Winter.

COMMISSIONER—Then after he left in 1920 you carried on the practice single-handed?

A—What actually happened in the summer of 1920 was that Mr. Winter intimated to me that he had an opportunity with Messrs. Blackwood and Emerson, one of the leading law firms in St. John's and he would like to avail of that opportunity. I consequently arranged for the severance of our relations. That was shortly before I left for England in 1920, I then asked Mr. Curtis if he would look after some legal matters for me until I returned. Mr. Curtis was not a Barrister at the time, but rather a solicitor.

COMMISSIONER—When did Mr. Curtis come into the office as a partner?

A—In January, 1921. There was nobody there as a partner in between.

MR. HOWLEY—Sometime in 1916 I think Miss Jean Miller entered your employ?

A—Yes, I think it was in 1916.

Q—In what capacity did she enter your employ?

A—Up to 1916 I had been looking after my own business affairs but after that date my business had grown to such magnitude and as I was also undertaking some Fire Insurance connections I needed an experienced

## Now Playing--At The NICKEL--Now Playing

HAZEL DRURY

Soprano

INEZ HARRISON

Contralto

in refined programmes of Songs and Duets.

—NIGHTS AT 9.

Rupert Hughes' Sensational Story

## "SOULS FOR SALE"

with Barbara LaMarr, Eleanor Boardman, Mae Busch, Lew Cody, Frank Mayo, Richard Dix. Production in 9 big reels.  
THURSDAY—"GLASS HOUSES," starring VIOLA DANA.

## LOOK!--At the Crescent To-Night--LOOK!

Big Newfoundland Vaudeville Show--5--Classy Up-to-the-Minute Acts--5

SNOW, BINDLE AND SNOW

Musical Trio.

JOE WHEELER

Ventriloquist, with his boy Jerry.

DAINTY DOLLY and DAN DELMAR

in Up and Down Town.

DANIEL H. MCCARTHY

Scotch Piano Accordion Soloist.

CHARLES BERNSTEIN

American Character Songs.

NO EXTRA CHARGE--THE USUAL CRESCENT ADMISSION--ALSO FEATURE PICTURES.

A—It meant a practical abandonment of it.

Q—During the latter part of 1919 and during the year 1920 are you able to give us any idea as to the amount of care or attention you gave to your law offices?

A—During 1919, before the actual election campaign came on, I would be in daily attendance at my office in connection with political affairs. After that I would be rarely at my office in connection with political affairs. After that I would be rarely at my office except more for meetings or conferences. After my election in 1919 it would be only a very rare circumstance that would bring me to the office at all.

(To be continued.)

## Stock Market News

TO-DAY'S OPENING.

Am. Can.	106 1/2
Am. Smelters	88 1/2
Bethlehem	64 1/2
Leather Pld.	41
Kennecott	34 1/2
Mack Trucks	36
Pacific Oil	49 1/2
Pan-Amer.	58 1/2
Sinclair	26 1/2
Studebaker	103 1/2
Sub. Boat	11 1/2
U. S. Steel	92 1/2

B. E. S. 2nd	15 1/2
B. E. S. 1st	55 1/2
Brompton	40 1/2
Brazilian	45
S. R. Com.	101
U. S. Pld.	108

Jan.	33 3/8
------	--------

NEW HAVEN.

Vice-President Buckland Predicts a Surplus Exceeding \$5,000,000 in 1924.

(Boston News Bureau, Jan. 10.)

Boston—"With continuance of normal business and present rates, prospects are encouraging for a surplus of from \$5,000,000 to \$6,000,000 in 1924," said E. G. Buckland, vice-president and general counsel of the New Haven.

"Although we had a deficit in 1923 it will be something under \$3,000,000 and less than was expected early in the year. We are going into the winter in the best physical condition in many years. It is true that we still have a large number of bad-order cars, but with increased efficiency in operation these cars are not necessary and if in repair would not be needed for the business of the company."

STREET TALKING 8 P.M. DIVIDEND SHAWINIGAN.

(Financial Times, Jan. 12.)

As a result of the further rise in Shawinigan Water &amp; Power to a new high level, discussion has developed regarding the future of the stock.

The present 7 per cent. dividend has been maintained for a number of years. It is now argued that an increase of 1 per cent. in the rate is in prospect. The annual meeting has been called for a nearby date. It will be interesting to hear what J. E. Aldred, the president, will have to say regarding the company. It is understood that good progress has been made with expansion in earnings.

MANITOBA POWER NEW STOCK OFFERED AT \$20.

(Montreal Star, Jan. 10.)

Shareholders of Manitoba Power are being offered an opportunity to subscribe for 24,000 shares of treasury stock at \$20 per share. The ratio of one new for three old now held, subscriptions being received up to January 22. The cost of the plant has exceeded by \$65,000 the original estimate owing to changes in the plans by the company's engineers.

In November last two units of 23,000 horsepower each, of ultimate 168,000 horsepower development, had been completed and turned over for operation. It was further stated that the company is now delivering under contract thirty-five thousand

horsepower. The sale of additional power is said to be progressing satisfactorily.

CUT IN SUGAR PRICES.

A further reduction of 16 cents per 100 pounds on all grades of refined sugar was announced yesterday afternoon, making a total reduction of twenty-five cents per hundred pounds this week. These cuts followed the continued downward tendency which the New York market has shown for some days, both for raw and refined sugar. No. 1 granulated sugar is now selling at \$9.35 per 100 pounds, with No. 1 yellow at \$4.95 per 100 pounds.

ADVANCE FLOUR PRICES.

Flour prices were advanced this morning by the Ogilvie Flour Mills by 10 cents on all grades, making the price of first patents \$6.20 per barrel, and second patents \$5.70 per barrel. Bran and shorts were also advanced \$1 per ton, making the price of the former \$28