

## APPENDIX No. 2

Q. Evidently for a year after that report was made Mr. Miller was still conducting affairs as agent?

A. Yes.

Q. And no notice was taken of his conduct? Is that a common thing?

A. I apparently made an error. That apparently was not drawn to my attention and I might have made an error.

Q. That is all right if it is an error. I don't see why that should not be reported to the Minister and action taken?

A. Well Mr. Miller has been dismissed.

Q. But that is not sufficient? Did you ever know of a thief caught in the act that would not give up the plunder?

A. If you write me a letter, Mr. Wilson, making complaint I will lay it before the Minister.

Q. It is a little amusing to me to have the Chief Officer of a Department when a matter such as this set forth in documents in his own office is brought to his attention refusing to take action until he is notified by a private citizen. Is that not a little too thin, Mr. Scott? I think it is. Why did you not do to Mr. Miller what you did with Mr. Waugh? You admitted in your testimony when you last appeared before us that you reported Mr. Waugh to the Minister and I think to the Justice Department. Now this is a similar case. It is true that Mr. Waugh took more money and had to refund it but his case is identical almost with that of Mr. Miller. Now what excuse do you give for the difference of action in these two cases?

A. I am not making any excuse at all.

Q. You ought to make some explanation?

A. I am not going to make any excuse.

Q. I am not asking you for an excuse, but an explanation?

A. The reason I do not make any excuse is that I do not think that Mr. Miller did anything intentionally wrong.

Q. You do not?

A. No, I do not think that he understood the regulations thoroughly.

Q. You do not think that he did anything intentionally wrong?

A. Also that the department did not lose anything.

Q. Although Mr. Miller reported to you that he had located the man and yet he did not have anything to do with locating him; although the men that Mr. Miller alleged he located Spinks with, denied Miller's story; although he says that he agreed with that man that Spinks should get \$25 a month, and all that is false, you do not think there is anything wrong about it?

A. I did not say that.

Q. Yes, you said it?

A. Intentionally wrong is what I said.

Q. Well you think he did not do anything intentionally wrong?

A. I think he did not understand the regulations.

Q. It is so plain that I think a fool could not err therein. It seems to me that it is just as plain as daylight. We have the documentary evidence, and the facts are given in the testimony taken at our last meeting, and yet you say that Mr. Miller did not intentionally do anything wrong. What do you call it if a man deliberately reports that he has located a certain man and has nothing of the kind? There is the evidence of two persons that Mr. Miller had nothing whatever to do with the location of this man. Then he says he located a man with Mr. Deschene, who is a section boss on the Grand Trunk Railway. This man never worked at farming, he worked on the railroad with Mr. Deschene. Still Mr. Miller reported that he had located this man with a farmer and was paid \$4 for doing it. He got \$18 for locating Mr. Spinks and his wife and seven children, and still you say he did not do anything wrong intentionally. There are several other cases. What about Mr.