

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

(Continued from 7th Page.)

Q.—Did you have any idea at the time you made this refusal that you were not going to get back the money?

A.—No, I was hoping to get it back.

Q.—As time went on you did not get it back?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you at any time come to the realization of the fact that you were not going to get it at all?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you think now that you are not going to get it back?

A.—It is out of my hands now.

Q.—But it has never occurred to you that this money was not going to be refunded?

A.—No, I was responsible for it and I hoped that it would be repaid, and I was led to believe through Miss Miller that it would be repaid.

Q.—On certain dates all transactions between Miss Miller and yourself were represented by cheques?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you were prepared to cash these cheques signed R. A. Squires, per J. G. Miller?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Suddenly the system was changed and Miss Miller gave I.O.U.'s instead of cheques?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The total amount of the I.O.U.'s was \$22,885?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The I.O.U.'s are all signed by Miss Miller personally?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Sir R. A. Squires' name did not appear on them at all?

A.—No.

Q.—In taking these cheques and these I.O.U.'s you were actuated by a desire to have some evidence for your department of this indebtedness?

A.—Yes. That and for my own protection and to have a record of the amounts to be repaid.

Q.—And you looked to the credit of Sir Richard Squires for repayment of this money?

A.—I did.

Q.—For I.O.U.'s as well as for cheques?

A.—For all.

Q.—Then why if that was the position, did you accept a series of I.O.U.'s from Miss J. G. Miller for a sum of over \$20,000, and extended over a period of a year and a half?

A.—For the same reason, and the same purpose that I accepted the cheques.

Q.—But the cheques were signed "R. A. Squires, per J. G. Miller"?

A.—When Miss Miller came to me for the first time without a cheque, I asked her what about the cheque. She told me that the cheques had to be discontinued, on account of enquiries at Sir Richard Squires' office, and because of that I was to help her out.

Q.—Mr. Walker, Q.—You did not insist that the I.O.U.'s were to be signed in the same way?

A.—It never occurred to me to ask it.

Q.—The cheques were signed in the name of an alleged principal and the I.O.U.'s in the sole name of the agent?

A.—It really did not occur to me. I accepted the I.O.U.'s on the same conditions as I accepted the cheques.

Q.—Mr. Walker, Q.—Did she ever tell you that her authority to sign had been rescinded?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you know if it was ever rescinded?

A.—Not to this day.

Q.—And the question of her authority to sign cheques played no part in the change of policy to I.O.U.'s?

A.—No.

Q.—It never occurred to me, in the last transaction that took place between yourself and Miss Miller, you required a duplicate deposit slip?

A.—I was to supply \$2000.00 to cover an overdraft of Sir Richard Squires' account at the Canadian Bank of Commerce, and I required a deposit slip for the amount. I gave Miss Miller to understand that if she was going to deposit money to Sir Richard Squires' account at the Canadian Bank of Commerce, I said I was prepared to help her. She came to me and she wanted \$1000.00 at that time. I gave her \$500.00 and asked her to bring me a duplicate deposit slip. She took it to the Bank and deposited it. I said that if I gave her more it would be on the same conditions. Then I discontinued. I think at the time Sir Richard Squires was out of the country, or going to leave. I think he was leaving the country and left her these instructions. That is what she told me.

Q.—Are you sure that he was out of the country?

A.—I cannot say if he was in the country or not.

Q.—She came to get \$2000.00 and you had only \$500.00 to give her?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That was on the 27th July, 1922?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Walker then referred to a note which he had and continued: Sir Richard Squires would be out of the city at that time.

Mr. Howley, Q.—What is that you have got there?

A.—Notes from a personal book.

Mr. Walker, I think it would be better if you gave your evidence without reference to these notes. Can you recollect whether on July 27th, 1922, Sir Richard Squires was in the country or not?

A.—I do not recollect of my own knowledge.

Q.—Have you any document which you think will help you?

A.—I have a record of Sir Richard Squires' movements.

Q.—Was it made at that time?

A.—Not at that time, it was made up since.

Mr. Howley, Q.—When Miss Miller came for this last payment did she offer an I.O.U.?

A.—Not to my knowledge.

Q.—Was there any talk of an I.O.U. at the time?

A.—Not to my recollection.

Q.—Was there any talk over the change in the system that had prevailed?

A.—Not that I recollect.

Q.—When did you go out of office?

A.—On June 23rd, 1923.

Q.—I think a short time prior to that you laid a complaint with the police, did you not?

A.—What about.

Q.—Did you lay a complaint about anything?

A.—I may have laid a complaint about private affairs.

Mr. Walker—You went out of office on June 23rd, 1923. Did you say a short time before you went out of office lay any complaint with the police?

A.—Yes, I did.

Mr. Howley—Did you lay a complaint to the effect that your office had been broken into and records stolen?

A.—I laid a complaint that my office had been broken into but I did not

say anything about anything being stolen.

Q.—Did you confer with head constable Byrne officially on the subject?

A.—Yes.

Mr. Walker—What is that name, please?

Mr. Howley—Head Constable Byrne.

Q.—Do you remember the date?

A.—I do not recollect the date but it was within two or three days after the occurrence.

Q.—Why did you delay two or three days?

A.—I think it was on a Saturday night that the occurrence took place, and it was a Monday that I brought it to the attention of the police.

Q.—Did you bring it to the attention of anyone else before you brought it to the attention of the authorities?

A.—Not officially to anyone else. I might have spoken of it.

Q.—Did you bring anyone down to the office to see what had happened?

A.—Not that I recollect.

Q.—Did you bring any member of the House of Assembly down there to see what had happened before you told the police?

A.—Not to my recollection. There was no member brought down by me to see anything of the kind.

Q.—Are you quite positive of that?

A.—Quite positive.

Q.—Was any member of the House of Assembly present in your office when the condition you complained of existed, and before you told the police?

A.—No.

Q.—Then you told the police on Monday?

A.—That is my recollection. I spoke to Superintendent O'Neill over the phone and said that someone had entered the office and asked him to send one of his officers to investigate.

Q.—He sent Head Constable Byrne to you, and you made a statement to him?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Would you look at that? (Hands Witness a paper.)

A.—Yes. (Looks at paper.)

Q.—That is Head Constable Byrne's report of what took place.

Mr. Howley (Addressing Commissioner)—I ask if you would consider accepting that in evidence.

Mr. Walker—That is Head Constable Byrne's report to the Inspector General of what took place.

Mr. Walker—How can this Witness say that in evidence. If this Witness says that it is true and you all desire that I should see it I could accept it. But I do not think that you have laid the proper foundation for putting it in.

Mr. Howley—Is that a correct account?

A.—That is not a correct account of what transpired between Head Constable Byrne and myself.

Q.—Is it incorrect in whole or in part?

A.—It is all incorrect.

Q.—It is generally mixed up so that it does not convey what I said.

Q.—Can you tell what parts are correct and what parts are incorrect?

A.—The part of the entry into my office is correct. The opening of the box that is correct. That is the fact of the opening is correct. When he says that I said "I believe the Prime Minister is at the back of this," that is not true. That is his own inference.

Q.—Are you positively prepared to say that you did not say it?

A.—Not to my recollection.

Q.—Are you not prepared to swear that you did not say it?

A.—I did not say that to Head Constable Byrne.

Q.—And until then nobody had known anything about that only yourself, Miss Miller and her brother. Is that correct?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You spoke a while ago about Mr. Miller and his sister because of your close association with them?

A.—What do you mean?

Q.—I am speaking of the close association between Mr. Miller and yourself and of the close association between his sister and Sir Richard Squires. And there was an understanding between you and the Millers in which you were united in obtaining funds for Sir Richard Squires?

A.—I did not say that.

Q.—The Commissioner—What is Mr. Miller's occupation?

A.—He is a general coal merchant in St. John's.

Q.—But did not Miss Miller and Mr. Miller co-operate in obtaining money from your Department?

A.—No, I said Mr. Miller had a knowledge of his sister obtaining money for Sir Richard Squires.

The Commissioner—He had a general knowledge that this thing was done?

Mr. Howley, Q.—Is Miss Miller a close personal friend of yours?

A.—Yes.

A.—Has there at any time been any business connection between yourself and Mr. Miller?

A.—I won't answer that question.

Q.—Were you close personal friends?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were you friendly in each others company?

A.—Decidedly yes.

Q.—Have you at any time since your suspension from office discussed the matter of this enquiry with Mr. Miller?

A.—Yes, very often.

Q.—Have you at any time since your suspension from office travelled and been in company with him out of this Colony. And do you remember being in Halifax with Mr. Miller any time last October?

A.—Yes.

Q.—During your association with Mr. Miller in Halifax did you discuss this matter of enquiry with him at all?

A.—No.

Q.—Did you discuss any matters with him in connection with the liquor control department or its funds or the connection of Sir Richard Squires with it at any time?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you remember what days you were in Halifax with Mr. Miller?

A.—I don't.

Q.—Do you remember what day you left St. John's?

A.—On a Saturday, I think I left on a Red Cross Boat on her regular sailing day.

Q.—Did Miller go on the same boat?

A.—No.

Q.—Was he there when you got there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You spent how many days there?

A.—Two days perhaps, I am not sure.

Q.—During the time you were there did you have any discussion with Mr. Miller about this matter?

A.—In my recollection this matter was not mentioned.

Q.—Did Mr. Miller remain in Halifax after you?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you remember what day you got home?

A.—I think it was on a Thursday, the regular schedule day for the arrival of the Red Cross Boat. I do not remember the date of the month.

Q.—Was it on the 1st of November?

A.—It may be.

Q.—While you were in Halifax with Mr. Miller did you, or did you know if Mr. Miller addressed any communication to Sir Richard Squires with regard to this matter?

A.—I did not know. I did not see anything.

Q.—Did you discuss with Mr. Miller at all the question of communicating any proposition of any kind to Sir Richard Squires then? And do you know if Mr. Miller communicated and used your name and did he do it without your authority?

A.—Yes, I know that Mr. Miller communicated but I have no recollection whatever myself of discussing this matter with Mr. Miller.

Q.—I wish to come back to this question of the credits given for supplies from your department. Now you have not got any records of the outstanding credits at the time you left the office you told us. Do you know whether or not these credits have been liquidated?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You spoke a while ago about Mr. Miller and his sister because of your close association with them?

A.—What do you mean?

Q.—I am speaking of the close association between Mr. Miller and yourself and of the close association between his sister and Sir Richard Squires. And there was an understanding between you and the Millers in which you were united in obtaining funds for Sir Richard Squires?

A.—I did not say that.

Q.—The Commissioner—What is Mr. Miller's occupation?

A Wonderful Big High Class Programme at THE NICKEL To-day

Direct from New York and The Strand Circuit of Million Dollar Theatres.

HAZEL DRURY, Soprano **INEZ HARRISON, Contralto**
in refined programmes of Songs and Duets.

EVERY AFTERNOON AT ABOUT 4

EVERY EVENING AT ABOUT 9.

Pola Negri in 'MAD LOVE'

A DARING DRAMA OF A FASCINATING FLIRT.

THURSDAY, FRIDAY and SATURDAY—Daniel Carson Goodman's "WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE WOMEN?" A terrific drama of the money-mad, luxury-loving age of society gone wild.

France's Triumph

HOW HER POLICY IS TO BE APPLIED—REGROUPING OF THE FRANCO-BELGIAN FORCES.

The German industrialists having surrendered, the Franco-Belgian authorities are prepared to introduce into the occupation of the Ruhr important modifications. A pardon is to be extended to certain persons who had fallen foul of the occupation of the Ruhr, but there is for the present to be no general amnesty. A number of deported persons will also be allowed to return gradually. The troops are to be regrouped so as to bring about something akin to an "invisible" occupation. This, however, will be a very cautious process. Its rate of progress will depend upon the spirit shown by the industrialists and the masses of the population. The local success which France has obtained tends to complicate in certain important respects Anglo-French relations. These complications have for the moment been shelved by the agreement reached on the French proposal for the appointment of committees of experts to

conduct inquiries into German State finance and the export of German capital, with a view to its recovery. The work of the experts may enable the diplomatists to get round the larger and delicate problems which for the present are being ignored.

The British Government takes the view, and is prepared to insist upon it, that any partial settlement of the Reparations problem—such as the French have entered into with the German industrialists—is inimical to the final solution and to the restoration of peace in Europe.

Even if the pact arrived at between the French and the industrialists could be carried out—which at the best is very doubtful—the immediate revenue to be derived therefrom would not compensate for the grave injury done to German credit and to the wealth-producing potentiality of the German people. The new agreement arrived at between the French and the German industrialists would, if carried out, give France a complete economic hegemony of Europe, because it would give her full control of the coal, iron and steel production of Europe. Britain is not prepared to approve of this agreement, and has issued instructions to her representative on the Reparations Commission, Sir John Bradbury, to oppose any partial settlement of the Reparations problem. The issue raised by M. Poincaré's speech at Neuilly is even more serious.

The French Premier has declared that France will not evacuate any portion of the territory she now occupies until each and every provision of the Treaty has been fulfilled. It is now generally recognized that the literal fulfilment of the Treaty is a sheer impossibility, and M. Poincaré's contention, therefore, amounts to a declaration that France will remain on the Rhine permanently. The British Government will insist that Great Britain has equal rights with France in every part of the territory now occupied by the Allies under the Treaty. In Part XIV of the Treaty dealing with guarantees, Section 1, Article 428, it is laid down that "As a guarantee for the execution of the present Treaty by Germany, the German territory situated to the west of the Rhine, together with the bridgeheads, will be occupied by Allied and Associated troops for a period of 15 years, from the coming into force of the present Treaty."

This Article plainly shows that the occupation is a joint occupation, and in the Rhineland agreement entered into between the Allies and Germany this feature of the occupation is emphasized.

Great Britain has as much right as France in Mayence or Coblenz, as much right as Belgium in Aix-la-Chapelle, and the division of the occupied area into military zones was a purely inter-Allied arrangement for the convenience of the military commanders, and in no way affected the political principle of a joint occupation.

Price of the War

Eighty-one Million Pounds in Pensions.

From the date of the Armistice to March 31 last, rather more than a million men in Great Britain were granted pension, allowance, or gratuity. Approximately 42 per cent. of the total pensions awarded were for wounds or injuries. Statistics issued by the Ministry of Pensions, in their annual report covering the ear ended March 31 last, include the following figures:—

£81,500,000 expended, compared with £26,500,000 in 1921-2, and £100,000 in 1920-21.

2,500,000 beneficiaries with 2,500,000 and 2,500,000 (at highest point).

18,876 new pensions; compared with 39,337 and 128,328.

The total beneficiaries include 326,000 wives and 885,000 children, the total expenditure of the Ministry of Pensions to date, amounting to £460,000,000, all of which has been paid directly to the benefit of the pensioner.

Including allowances and gratuities for minor disablement, the aggregate total of the pension list is presented, if the whole of the awards had been in payment at one time, the number of 4,500,000.

Evidence that the condition of the disabled was in many cases improving was to be found this year, statistics, not only in the reduced average age of the pensioners, but in the number of pensioners, but in the reduced average age of the pensioners. In 1918-19 it was 42 years, after re-boarding, that this figure was falling from 7 to 8 years, indicating that in many cases the rate of recovery was fairly rapid. The fall had continued, but, on the whole, was slower. In many cases the disability was becoming stable, and therefore ripe for consideration with a view to assessment on a permanent basis.

Week of Prayer

PROGRAMME FOR THE WEEK

Wednesday, January 9th—Why we made them believe in the Holy Spirit. The industry has Hammond Johnson; The Kirk's 8 p.m.

Thursday, January 10th—Why we made them believe in the Church—Rev. C. H. Johnson; Queens Road Congregational Church, 8 p.m.

Friday, January 11th—Why I think of the D. lieve in Immortality—Rev. R. W. Fairbairn, Cochrane Street, 8 p.m.

Saturday, January 12th—Why we made them believe in the Church—Rev. Dr. Darby, Wesley Church, 8 p.m.

"K." Boots, Brogues, Pumps at SMALLWOOD'S. dec24,tf

St. JOHN'S Grocery Stores

Beef, Choice Boneless, lb.
Pork, Ham Butt, small lb.
Cabbage, small green, lb.
Turnips, local, lb.
Potatoes, local, gallon
Onions, lb.
Flour, best grade, stone
Butter, best local, lb.
Pilot Biscuits, lb.
Soda Biscuits, lb.
No. 1 Bread, lb.
Butter Bread, lb.
Sweet Bread, lb.
Pet Milk, tin
Beans, Armour's, tin
Chow Chow, staple strong bottle
Extra Fresh Eggs, doz.
Kero Oil, high test, gallon

J. J. ST. JOHN.
Duckworth St. & LeMarchant Road.

"LILY OF THE VALLEY" PRODUCTS

in Tin and Glass.

Winters & Prophet—Packers.

CHERRIES, in Phoenix Cap Glass Jars.
PEARS, in Phoenix Cap Glass Jars.
STRAWBERRIES, in Phoenix Cap Glass Jars.
JUNE PEAS, in Phoenix Cap Glass Jars.
SWEET PEAS, in Phoenix Cap Glass Jars.
SPINACH, in Phoenix Cap Glass Jars.
LIMED BEETS, in Phoenix Cap Glass Jars.
LIMA BEANS, in Phoenix Cap Glass Jars.
WAX BEANS, in Phoenix Cap Glass Jars.
RASPBERRIES, in Phoenix Cap Glass Jars.
TOMATOES, in Phoenix Cap Glass Jars.
AYLMER CANADIAN BANTAM CORN ON THE COB—40c. Can.

SPECIAL!
SWEET PICKLED FANCY CALIFORNIA
WHOLE PEACHES—Large Cans.

C. P. Egan,
TWO STORES:
Duckworth Street & Queen's Road.

How to Purify the Blood

"Fifteen to thirty drops of Extract of Root, commonly called Mother Seigel's Curative Syrup, may be taken in water with meals and at bedtime, for indigestion, constipation and bad blood. Persistence in this treatment will give permanent relief in nearly every case." Get the genuine at druggists, 50c. and \$1.00 bottles.

BILLY'S UNCLE



Dogs Will Be Dogs.

BY BEN BATSFORD