

EIGHT

THE STAR, ST. JOHN N. B., THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 1907

# FOSTER DEFENDS HIMSELF; AYLESWORTH ATTACKS

## Insurance Commission Maliciously and Unfairly Operated as a Machine to Ruin Him, Says Mr. Foster.

## He Denounces the Report and Denies Many of Its Conclusions—Took No Commissions, He Says—Aylesworth Compares Foster with Bank Manager McGill, and Accuses Him and Others of Graft.

OTTAWA, Ont., April 10.—Hon. G. E. Foster today made his statement on the insurance commission's report. The minister of justice replied to him. The galleries and the house were crowded in anticipation, and Mr. Foster was closely listened to throughout the two and a quarter hours his speech lasted. Mr. Foster defended himself and attacked the insurance commission.

On motion to go into committee of supply, Hon. Mr. Plafin stated that the cost of the insurance inquiry had been \$105,000. The commissioners got \$30 a day each and travelling expenses. Mr. Shepley, the counsel, got \$100 a day and travelling expenses and expected in addition a general fee in proportion to his services. Mr. Tilley got \$50 a day and travelling expenses. Mr. Foster was cheered by the opposition when he arose to make his speech. He said he had no apology to make; that should come from others. The impression had been created that he had brought himself in the position to be censured by disavowal from the house. Thinking this had been the subject of inquiry he was prepared to state that no charge would be brought against him in the house. The insurance commission soon became regarded as a piece of machinery to break opponents to the government party. It had gone outside its powers and inquired into business and into the affairs of private parties in a way related to the insurance. His name had been brought in and he had been challenged to clear himself. He was here and appealed to the house and press to weigh his statement fairly and give the publicity to his defense that they had to the attacks upon him.

He made the statement to the house which he had made before the commission, but that body had overstepped its powers. It had deprived men appearing before it of the rights of a Canadian citizen; representation by counsel, the right of cross-examination, and knowledge of charge preferred. (Opposition cheers.) The Montreal Witness was not a paper which was published in Canada, but even it recently had commented upon the iniquitous character of the commission, raising the point to which he had referred. In other words, a most skillful and ingenious attempt had been made by means of that investigation, so far as it concerned the Independent Order of Foresters and the Union Trust Company, an attempt which to a certain extent had been successful, to shift the responsibility of the commission's actions upon those on whom it ought to rest. (Opposition cheers.)

**Charges Unfair, Says Foster**  
The result of the report of the commission had been to give rise to impressions which he had endeavored to change. The charge had practically been made that he had squandered and imperiled the funds of the order and the member for Carleton had said that as a Forester he had the right to inquire in the house as to what had become of the independent order. In 1901, when he took charge of the Union Trust Company, the Foresters had a surplus of \$5,250,000, and when he went out of the company in 1905 the surplus was \$10,000,000. The member for Carleton would naturally turn to the pages of the commission's report to find out what had happened to the surplus, but he would look in vain. (Opposition cheers.) That meant that a commission appointed specially to look after investments of insurance companies looked after investments of insurance companies quoted Hon. G. E. Foster, but was very careful not to go into a large proportion of surplus funds before Mr. Foster went into it. (Opposition cheers.) On the assumption that he was solely responsible for Foresters' investments, which was the assumption of his opponents, he quoted figures showing that in five years, from 1901 to 1906, that he acted as manager of the Union Trust Company he made a total profit of \$228,874 for the Foresters and for the Union Trust Company. He claimed that no other trust company in Canada could show in its first five years anything approaching to the profits he had quoted.

He also denied the statement that Mr. Foster was the company, for no considerable investment was made until it had been discussed by the board of directors, and he had combated the idea of a large board because thereby responsibility would be shifted to a committee, and practically throughout the board had been most assiduous in its attention to business.

**Not Alone Responsible**  
A director as well as a manager was governed by law, and it was unfair as well as untrue to make him absolutely responsible. He was not responsible for forming the Union Trust Company, and he had no part or lot in making the investments of trust funds of Foresters. The supreme court made the investments and after they had made the investments he was handling the Union Trust Co.'s funds under the laws of Ontario. It was absolute-

ly a misrepresentation to represent him as investing trust funds of Foresters quoted the amount of money they put into the stock of the Union Trust Company. Mr. Foster proceeded to quote from the evidence of Dr. Oronhyatekha and from the charter of the Union Trust Company to the share powers of investment by the Foresters. The capital they put into the Union Trust Company could be invested under the laws of the Trust and Loan Companies of the country for general investment and they could be invested on security of real or personal property and he challenged any man to point out any security or investment which contravened their powers.

**The Montague Land Deal**  
Proceeding to take up the question of the Montague land deal, Mr. Foster said the whole gist of the report was the charge which had been made boldly not to say boldly formulated against himself by Mr. Bourassa. He did not accuse the member for Labelle of prejudice because he had naturally gone for his authority to the report of the government commission, but he took the liberty of calling his attention to the fact that the report was a misrepresentation of facts. It was a pretty rough charge to throw at a man across the floor of the house of commons and rougher still when a man could sit back on a government commission's report and put the responsibility of making that charge upon it.

He had been accused by the commission of forming that syndicate in order to loan the Trust Company's funds to himself, and second he was charged with receiving a commission from other party who gave the money or from the syndicate of which he was a member. In other words he was accused of putting the Trust Company's money into his own pocket. In March 1902, Dr. Oronhyatekha and Mr. McGillivray who were custodians of Foresters' trust funds and Dr. Montague, deputy chief ranger of the order, arranged to lend \$100,000 out of the Foresters' funds to themselves for the purchase of certain lands, and they invited him to go into the syndicate. He would like his own syndicate, but before Dr. he would not take another man's if it was to his trust. He was not a member of the order's supreme court or of the order, and had nothing to do with their money or its investment. He was simply invited to join a syndicate of four to borrow \$100,000, which was loaned on security of the mortgage on land and as an interested party so far as the order's money was concerned he had a perfect right to borrow that money.

From March, 1902, to May, 1903, that business was an entirely outside of the Union Trust Company. The Union Trust Company had no right to buy or sell land. They had nothing to do except simply to take the place of Dr. Montague, hold titles of land and convey them to persons who bought them according to the directions of the syndicate. The syndicate managed later negotiations through himself, they being in contact with one another and looking over lands and deciding upon what terms should be. Some 44,000 acres were bought before Union Trust Company even in that capacity had anything to do with it. Some 60,000 or 70,000 acres were bought after that. The Union Trust Company became a holding trust in place of Dr. Montague for 44,000 acres.

That syndicate he maintained had a right to carry in its business as it pleased.

**Those Commissions**  
On the first transaction there was an agent's commission. The agent offered half of it. We took \$5,000. The commission was taken by the syndicate managing its own affairs, a syndicate composed of Dr. Oronhyatekha, Mr. McGillivray, Dr. Montague and himself. Lenders and borrowers both agreed to the taking of half of the commission from the agent. They might call it prospective profits, but it was the whole transaction. He did not get that commission; it was distributed. The second transaction was on exactly the same basis, but throughout the whole record of the evidence they would not find that the virtuous Mr. Shepley and the highly honorable commission made a single inquiry into the purchase of these 44,000 acres. Did the first transaction go by the board because Mr. Foster was not in it, and was the second investigated because Mr. Foster was in it? He asked Judge MacTavish to answer that like a man. Mr. Foster then dealt with the charge that he had accepted a bribe in the shape of a commission in the Kam-

**DRY CORSETS**  
They are the smartest models known to the Corset Manufacturer's art, science and sense having achieved a wonderful triumph.  
Price range from \$10.00 to \$26.00.  
Will Improve Your Figure.

loops transaction. The commission had ruthlessly swindled Mr. Foster's business before the public in his absence, had obtained his bank books and found a check for \$2,500 to them. (Mr. Foster) and one for \$100 in favor of the leader of the Opposition. He was stripped absolutely bare by Mr. Shepley as to his financial standing in the country," said Mr. Foster. "I have stolen nothing; I have not and my opponent has not. My opponent today I stand before parliament of this country under bare poles, and I am not ashamed to say so, but God forbid that I should be appointed in the King's name should make me a financial object before the country. It has been said that my voice grew hoarse in approaching this subject. No wonder! For all I have is the ability that God gave me—my power to work my character, my reputation, and I will fight to the last ditch before I let anybody rob me of them. (Opposition cheers.)

"I told Judge MacTavish that I would spread the whole thing before the commission if they wished, but he said that it would be quite satisfactory. No other witness was called. They had my denial, but yet in the report it is stated that of this money at least \$2,500, probably \$1,000, was paid to me. If members of parliament have not then what will a man in London, who has known me as a private minister, who had not the opportunity of seeing this evidence, think? The evidence might as well be hid in Hades, and that is the statement of your learned friend. (Opposition cheers.) That is the maliciousness of the judgment by which I am condemned before the country and the attitude of the existing circumstances including my denial on oath, are hid in some slanders will arise in this house and point to the report. I will not be near to meet my traducer, but through ringing years of my life I dare put such a malicious finding on record. (Opposition cheers.)

Proceeding, Mr. Foster combated the charge that the Union Trust Company was speculative. Investments in lands, business and lumber were commonly carried on by such companies and banks.

**The Fowler Land Deals**  
In regard to the land deal in which he engaged with Messrs. Wilson and McGillivray in respect of the Great West Land Company he had denied that he had had any connection with Popple and Fowler, and he said that when the land was sold at an advance of 50 cents an acre to the Great West Land Company they had received twenty-five years' interest.

They needed the money, and he took the matter to the Union Trust Company, and they talked it over, and he said that he was not a party to it. They agreed to advance the money. Mr. Wilson, Col. McGillivray and himself were to receive 25 per cent. of the money. He sent the money to mortgage all his assets as a security and to give the company a bonus of 27 1/2 shares of stock. He had already given a mortgage on the land, and he denied it again. The very first document relating to the transaction gave the Union Trust Company a lien over every acre of those lands. Turning to the finding that he did not disclose the transaction to the directors of the Union Trust Company, he said that a document signed by the parties to the transaction and claimed that no document could have been given in explicit regard to the suggestion that there was a risk in the transaction he held that the lands, situated as they were, afforded a prime security for his loan that was placed upon it, and from the start there was not a shadow of doubt of there being any risk. In all that time he had never heard of the Union Trust Company went to himself or to McGillivray or Wilson. There was no law which made it illegal for directors to sit on two boards.

That he thought finished the charges against him, giving him satisfaction, he true had he not a right to say to the house that it was an outrage that such a report should be put on the permanent records of parliament. (Opposition cheers.) "Had he not a right to ask the house in common honesty to him if his statements were true that they order that report back to the commission for amendment; for erasures where erasures were necessary; for statements which were full where full plain statements one way or another, instead of insinuation? If a commission were to be allowed to travel all over the country and inquire into private affairs what security had any party in a minority? A damnably wrong had been done to him, and so long as he had breath he should protest against it.

**Mr. Mr. Aylesworth's Response**  
Mr. Aylesworth said Mr. Foster had made repeated reflections regarding the intentions of the insurance commission and especially of the chairman of the commission and the gentleman who conducted the inquiry. Mr. Foster had taken exception to an investigation into what he termed private matters and private affairs, which only he and his associates were concerned.

Mr. Foster had sought to convey the impression that the commission, from the moment of its organization, or at all events from the moment it took upon the investigation of the affairs of the insurance body with which Mr. Foster was more or less identified, was animated by the sole desire to secure political advantage and was conducted in a manner different from that it had previously followed. The gentlemen who composed this commission were men of prominence, standing and reputation in the country. He thought that the people of Canada would credit the commission with the honest intention to do its duty without fear, favor, partiality or affection. The commission occupied literally a position not differing in principle from that of a coroner

and a coroner's jury engaged in an investigation into the possibility of some happening which might necessarily be brought afterwards before the courts of the land.

"Upon any such investigation there was in no sense a prosecution and there was none in the present case. There was an investigation; that was the nature of the inquiry; the nature of witnesses; that was a necessity. Mr. Foster complained that no charges against him were formulated. No charges were formulated in any instance, and for the very good reason that this was not the office or purpose of the commission.

**Foster Contradicted Himself**  
Mr. Aylesworth, quoting from the evidence, gave the language of Mr. Foster at the time of his evidence before the commission when he was asked whether there was in existence and in his possession anything throwing light upon the matters upon which he had been examined. Mr. Foster replied: "No, you have searched me right through, and you have not found anything." Then, in arguing his case before the commission, Mr. Foster concluded with these words, which Mr. Aylesworth read in view of what they had heard that day: "I thank you, your honor, for allowing me to make this statement. I do not think that I shall leave this box without acknowledging your unvarying courtesy to me. Though I have sometimes had the audacity to question your ruling it has been on a question of principle and nothing personal, of course. I do not think either ought to leave the room without acknowledging that so far as Mr. Shepley is concerned he has treated me with unvarying courtesy, and all who have been associated with him, the witnesses and others, have been more than kind."

Mr. Aylesworth said that under the circumstances, in view of the magnitude of the country, it was not the day to make the argument before the house or country that any special degree of harshness or of cruelty was exhibited by the commission with regard to the Order of Foresters, or to the Union Trust Company, its creatures and its allies, or with regard to the conduct of the manager of the

Union Trust Co., Mr. Foster. Mr. Foster had presented his case before the house upon the footing that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which that company was brought into existence, they found that the Union Trust Co. was a different entity from that of the I. O. F. That was in no sense accountable to the Order of Foresters as being in their employment or handling their money. But if he had looked at the article of incorporation and at the circumstances under which