



(Founded in 1878 by W. J. Herder.)

Evening Telegram

The Evening Telegram, Ltd., Proprietors.

All communications should be addressed to the Evening Telegram, Ltd., and not to individuals.

Tuesday, January 15, 1924.

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS.

In these days when strenuous demands are being made on time, thought, and space in the newspaper offices, it comes with as much relief as a breath from the briny, although it is on an old topic, to find in the Trade Review comments on the Fisheries that are in accord with ours of a recent date.

The Review says in part:

The Humber Deal has taken two to three thousand of our men away from the fisheries, and this has been one cause of the short catch during the past season. The shortage is being felt at last, and the demand has stimulated prices. The windup for fish exporters will be encouraging, and therefore there is every prospect of greater endeavours next season.

The main thing that we have done nothing during recent years to improve the cure of our fish, and as our competitors have been making special efforts in this direction we must do likewise or take a back seat every time. There are two ways that this can be done to advantage.

1st.—Arrange to improve the standard of curing under present methods, and that will enhance the value fifty per cent.

2nd.—Establish Fishery Schools to teach the younger generation new methods of putting up our fishery products, which will enhance the value two or three hundred per cent.

A fishery school is nothing else but technical education. Knowledge is power and it is within our means to have our boys taught many things that we cannot attempt to do at once, but with practical training in a fishery school it will be easy for them to make fortunes in this country in many ways that we little dream of to-day. We are tired of talking; let us get down to practical efforts and show faith in our country.

In the Fish Trades Gazette published in England, figures are quoted in order to compare our exports this year with those of last season. We are unable to ascertain to what extent they are accurate, and give them for what they are worth. The remark that Icelandic Fish are in greater demand than the Labrador article because of their superior appearance is worthy of note, and emphasizes the importance that must be placed on preparing for our customers an article second to none in every way.

The total exports from August 6 to November 23 amounted to 282,503 quintals, against 301,040 last year. The chief items were: Portugal, 10,096 quintals, against 7,536; Spain, 34,869, against 31,301; Italy, 64,143, against 54,203; West Indies, 65,013, against 73,523; United Kingdom, 10,725, against 26,006; Brazil, 16,232, against 5,165. All these were from St. John's. There is still a good deal of codfish to come from the north and west.

A fairly satisfactory report was received from Spain, where there was more enquiry for Labrador, and prices were firmly held. Supplies are moving from consumption, and only small stocks of suitable fish are in stock in Newfoundland. The Italian market has been disappointing for Labrador, the Icelandic style being clearer and whiter, and one shilling per quintal cheaper. The demand for shore fish is fairly good, and higher prices are being offered. Groceries have been over supplied, and prices are depressed owing to political disturbances. The Government purchased 4,000 quintals of French fish at one shilling less than Labrador; prospects for further shipments are not very good. The price at St. John's is still 6 cents per quintal. Lunenburg cures purchased two cargoes of bank fish at 6 3/4 cents per quintal.

The Loss of the Czarina

THRILLING RESCUE AT SEA.

Amidst the passengers who arrived by the S.S. Sachem yesterday afternoon, were four members of the shipwrecked crew of the Czarina. The personnel of the crew who arrived were: Colin Taylor, Master, Wm. Snow, Bosun, Seamen John Kents and Edward Snow. The balance of the crew, after their arrival in Boston, joined steamers running out of an American port in the first trade, South, in an interview with a representative of the Telegram, Capt. Colin Taylor last night, stated that it was merely a kind act of Providence that the crew escaped a watery grave. He made particular mention of the heroism of the gallant men who went over the ship's side of the S.S. Cairnmona to their rescue. With the waves running mountains high, chief officer John T. Baker, with a crew of three able bodied seamen, manned a lifeboat and, after being tossed about for two hours, practically exhausted, they managed to reach the stricken vessel's side. They got as near to the schooner as possible and one by one the men jumped clear and into the boat. Capt. Taylor and his men were completely exhausted when the rescue party reached them. The most difficult and dangerous part of the rescue was the return trip. For four hours these brave men battled with the elements, and the Captain and entire crew feel very grateful to the gallant officer and crew in accomplishing such a miraculous rescue. A similar deed of praise is also due Captain John T. Berlin and crew for their many great kindnesses shown on the passage to Portland, Maine. The Captain of the Czarina tells a thrilling story. The Czarina left St. John's for Pernambuco, Wednesday morning, January 28th. Good progress was made until nightfall, when the glass took a sudden drop, and in a few hours the vessel was forcing her way against a strong southerly wind with a thick snow storm. On Thursday morning it started to blow a regular hurricane; the wind having shifted from South to North East, with continuous snow. The vessel was compelled to lay to at that day, only a reefed mainsail being used. Late in the day the wind increased in its violence, a mountainous sea was raging and it was realized that it was hardly possible for a vessel to live out in such a gale. Heavy seas swept the deck from stem to stern, and the entire crew were compelled to watch carefully the huge waves, because one never knew the minute the vessel would be engulfed. During all this time serious damage was being done to the vessel. Masts and rigging were damaged, the mainmast was torn to atoms, and the bulwarks were swept away. On nightfall coming on, the vessel became so badly strained that water began to rise rapidly in the hold. The crew were ordered to the pumps, but in spite of their efforts the water gained rapidly and the vessel began to settle down. The weather became very frosty, ice began to rapidly form, and with the blinding snow storm, they could hardly see a hand before them. Under these conditions the crew still stuck to their posts, although suffering untold hardships, and as darkness closed in the situation became very serious. The vessel was gradually sinking, and there was no means of escape because all the lifeboats had been smashed. The vessel's position was then 50 to 60 miles off Cape Race. However, about 9:30 that night the two most head lights of a steamer were seen in the distance. Capt. Taylor immediately set up flares and fired a rocket to attract attention. The signals for assistance were soon seen, and about an hour later the S.S. Cairnmona bore down at a safe distance from the doomed vessel. Suddenly there came a lull in the storm, a sign that the hurricane was about to change directions, and with the waves running mountains high the rescue crew arrived and took the shipwrecked men.

Capt. Taylor, upon presenting his report at Portland, Maine, stated that neither the crew of the schooner nor the rescue party could have hoped to survive the sudden renewal of the storm. Capt. Colin Taylor and crew saved very little of their belongings. After the crew arrived in Portland, Maine, they stayed at the Plymouth Hotel. Two days later they sailed on the Gower Bingley for Boston, and remained at the Marlboro' House until arrangements were made for their homcoming by the Sachem.

Rosalind at Halifax
SHIP WAS DELAYED SEVERAL HOURS.

S.S. Rosalind reached Halifax at 7 o'clock this morning, after a boisterous trip of sixty hours. After leaving port on Saturday night she met with the full force of Sunday's gale. A communication to that effect was picked up by the Sachem, 6 o'clock Sunday evening. The ship received a bad buffeting about throughout the entire run and harbored safely at Halifax without suffering any damage.

Kasy Felt Footwear for ladies and gentlemen at SMALL WOODS.

THE ENQUIRY

Proceedings Yesterday Afternoon and This Morning—Late Prime Minister on The Stand.

When the enquiry was resumed yesterday afternoon, Mr. Fraser, who had been on the witness stand during the morning session was recalled, and questioned by Mr. Howley about the several bank accounts which the firm carried as disclosed during the cross-examination. In reply the witness stated in March 1921, the account on which Miss Miller had authority to draw was closed and a new one opened on which Sir Richard Squires alone drew. Of the four accounts the witness said he had to do with those of Sir R. A. Squires in the Bank of Nova Scotia, and also the trust account.

Asked when he entered fully on his duties of cashier and accountant, the witness replied in June and that of earlier previously made he had no direct knowledge.

In replying to the Commissioner, witness stated that he would surely have asked Miss Miller the meaning of the initials J. T. on the stubs. To Mr. Howley, he said, she had referred him to Sir Richard's financial explanation. Asked when he saw Sir Richard, the witness replied he made four or five visits to the Colonial Secretary's Office to see him and only on one occasion did he see him at the law firm during these visits, the condition of the accounts were mentioned.

COMMISSIONER—The books obviously were badly kept by Miss Miller, but the reason has not yet been given to us, although it may have been hinted at. The books were in a bad state when he took them over and this naturally started him to seek an explanation.

Asked if he knew if Miss Miller furnished any money for liquidation purposes, the witness replied, yes, there were 4 or 5 cases in reference to fire losses during 1920.

COMMISSIONER—After adjustment, is there difficulty in getting settlement from the company?

A—No.
COMMISSIONER—In Brown's case there was delay.

A—Yes.
MR. HOWLEY—Did Miss Miller tell you she furnished the money to pay fire insurance?

A—I don't think so.
Asked if there were entries in the book to show the money were paid out of office cash, witness replied that there were none.

COMMISSIONER—Then of these premature payments did any pass through your hands?

A—No.
The witness then mentioned the three claims on which advances had been made explaining that Miss Miller told him when the cheques arrived from the head office not to notify claimants as she had in one instance advanced \$1185 on Goddard's claim and \$2000 on an attachment, and she had received reimbursement by cheque which Sir R. A. Squires signed.

The Commissioner observed that Brown was peculiarly and particularly careful.

The Attorney General, having previously obtained permission to cross-examine on any new evidence, asked, did Miss Miller obtain reimbursement from an unknown account and did he (witness) keep a fire loss account. The witness replied he was compelled to keep a fire loss account but he did not ask Miss Miller why she paid the fire losses in advance. Asked if he knew of a reason, the witness replied that it was because she was negligent in forwarding her accounts. To this answer the Commissioner put the question, was it easier to go out and raise the money or post the particulars of the claim?

Asked if it was because the agency was in arrears in forwarding the premiums that Miss Miller did not get the cheque from the head office, the witness replied that it possibly was.

COMMISSIONER—You took up your position in April and up to July you had nothing to do with the cash. Miss Miller then might be introducing money for Sir Richard, and it was being kept secret from everyone?

A—I would not know.

COMMISSIONER—If Miss Miller was having financial transaction outside after July did they go through the office?

A—No, with the exception she received outport agency commissions from the office.

A number of loose leaf sheets of the Daily Star account were then handed the witness who stated that the major portion was not in his handwriting. Asked by the Commissioner if they contained any reference to wages the witness replied he did not know. Further he said he did remember Miss Miller had said she found the money for the Star account. The Commissioner then asked if there was anything on the ledger to confirm or refute Miss Miller's statements. The witness replying there were items on Star account but not specifically for wages.

The Commissioner remarked that a little more candor in reference to the account would be better.

The Attorney General asked that he be shown the ledger leaves, but after an explanation that they contained business that did not concern the public, he withdrew his request and instead asked if the Star account was in debt or credit. To this the witness replied that from 1917 up to 1921, the debt was \$124,000.

Asked if the account was made up by memos furnished by Sir Richard, the witness said it was not entirely made up from them, the books prior to June were merely a matter of record.

Mr. Leslie Curtis was then recalled. Questioned by the Attorney General, Mr. Curtis said he telegraphed for Mr. Fraser after becoming a partner because Miss Miller was never at her work.

COMMISSIONER—When was it that Miss Miller was never there?

A—Early in 1921. To the question did he ever hear that Miss Miller was away on Sir Richard's financial affairs the witness said he did not hear. He knew she was away and did not ask her why. In reply to the Attorney General the witness said that the books were properly kept now. Asked about the period that Miss Miller was under pay the witness said he signed her last cheque in July, 1921. Asked why it was that he wanted to have the separate accounts, the witness explained that because Sir Richard had notes and other outstanding accounts. As a partner in the law firm he did not want to be personally responsible for them, further explaining that he wanted Mr. Fraser to keep them so that at the end of the year they (the partners) would know how they stood. Pressed further the witness said he never looked through Sir Richard's or the firm's account, and that though he had not seen the Star account he had heard of it. He knew there might be a Star account, but it did not cause him any anxiety.

ATTORNEY GEN'L—Can you swear that you did not know that the Star was being financed by Sir Richard or the firm, the witness replied that he had no personal knowledge. Asked if he knew of any other person who visited to the firm's office, the witness remembered that he had something to do with the Daily Star and he paid him for some advertising. To a question as to the nature of any financial transactions he had with Mr. Harsant the witness said he thought he had loaned her \$100.00.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—Who registered the deed showing that you had loaned her \$3000? Receiving no reply the Attorney General perceived that the document was in the name of Mr. Harsant. Asked what amount was due him, the witness replied that the amount was \$5000 and was due to a client who was receiving \$400 per year interest covering a mortgage. The witness did not give the client's name but stated that it was not that of Sir Richard Squires.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—So although Mrs. Harsant got \$22,800 from the Controller's Department she had to mortgage her house.

COMMISSIONER—That is not quite fair. This is Oct. 20, Mrs. Harsant is getting the money. They might be quite independent. She was not Mrs. Harsant then.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—I quite agree.

THE COMMISSIONER asked that a new witness be called.

Head Constable Byrne being called by Mr. Howley it was not shown that his evidence was material and the oath was not administered.

MR. HOWLEY then intimated that the only other witness was Sir Richard Squires. As he was not quite prepared to proceed he asked for an adjournment.

THE COMMISSIONER would not agree.

SIR RICHARD SQUIRES TAKES THE STAND.

COMMISSIONER—Did Mr. Curtis come into the office since 1920.

A—About the first part of 1921. Witness stated that Miss Miller had entered his employ in 1916, as accountant and clerk. Asked when she had ceased to act in that capacity, witness replied at some length, where upon he was asked by the COMMISSIONER to give his reply as briefly as possible. Witness replied "I don't know." Asked when she was married, witness said he did not know what date. She ceased the regular business in July, 1921 and afterwards did insurance work only, for which she was specifically paid. Miss Miller was given power of attorney, he thought, in 1917 and was entrusted with the responsibility of attorney for him at the Bank of Nova Scotia. She was supervised by witness up to the summer of autumn of 1918 and the checking of the books terminated before 1912. Asked what led to the termination of checking, witness said that it was because her work was very reliable and

very neat. Prior to the 1919 campaign he was daily in his law office in connection with political affairs, but after the election, very little. Miss Miller continued to look after the accounts and bank accounts. On or about August 3, 1920 witness left for England and returned on or about December 6. Asked if he had discussed financial affairs of his law office with Miss Miller before his departure, witness replied that he told her that the accounts would get along satisfactorily and that he would leave some signed notes for the Bank of Nova Scotia in case accommodation was required or for outstanding accounts. Witness thought two large accounts were outstanding, one for \$14,000, the Daily Star, the other for \$6000, a political organization and witness recollected writing her a letter at the time.

Q—Do you know what became of the notes?

A—No.
Q—Did you ever make enquiries?

A—None whatever.

The COMMISSIONER expressed surprise that witness had made no enquiries regarding the notes since his return, to which witness replied that the notes were left in blank. "That," said the Commissioner, "makes it worse." The Commissioner further said that he was unable to understand why Mr. Howley had not been instructed regarding these notes at the time that Mrs. Harsant was giving her evidence.

MR. HOWLEY asked witness if he had any conversation with Miss Miller regarding other demands, and how he was to meet them. Witness said no, that he had left a number of blank notes on which she could get the accommodation required. The copy of a memorandum dated August 3, 1920, giving Miss Miller instructions was produced, but unless and until the original was produced, the COMMISSIONER would not permit it to be read. Asked by the COMMISSIONER how the letter was forwarded to Miss Miller or whether it was placed where she could receive it, witness replied that he did not know.

MR. HOWLEY asked if witness had any conversation with Miss Miller regarding financial affairs after his return. Witness said yes, that she said she had obtained from Mr. Meaney during his absence accommodation for \$4000. Witness said he was surprised and resentful, and gave her the amount with instructions to take it to Mr. Meaney with despatch.

Q—Did she tell you how she had got it?

A—No, she said she had got it.

Q—Do you remember the date of giving Miss Miller the money?

A—No.

COMMISSIONER—What form did the payment take?

A—A bank note. It was very soon after my return in December.

Various questions were asked regarding Mr. Meaney's associations with witness's party, his appointment to the position of Acting Controller and that it was probably due to the fact that Mr. Meaney was not given full control in the Department that a misunderstanding between him and witness originated.

An adjournment was taken at 5:10 p.m. until eleven this morning.

Q—Did you get a receipt from Mr. Meaney?

A—No.
Witness explained that he could not give attention to his office work owing to the many duties of an official nature that he was performing at that time. The power of attorney to Miss Miller, said witness, was cancelled because of dissatisfaction of the office staff with her work and because of complaints of the janitor in connection with office affairs. Asked if he received any money from J. T. Meaney during the period following his return and the cancellation of power of attorney, witness replied, not to his knowledge.

COMMISSIONER—Do you swear you did not?

A—Miss Miller gave me no money. MR. HOWLEY—Was any money obtained by Miss Miller spent in connection with the office?

A—I have no recollection. Witness stated he had no knowledge of five cheques (handed to him), dated from Dec. 11th, 1920 to March 19th, 1921, and that he was not in a position to say if any Controller's money had been spent on his account by Miss Miller.

Questioned on money obtained by Miss Miller from outside sources, witness could not state where they came from or how they were expended. Asked about the \$500 deposited to his account in the Bank of Commerce, witness stated he had no knowledge of it beyond the receipt produced. Witness was questioned about another sum of \$3000 deposited by Miss Miller. Witness said he thought it was on Dec. 21.

COMMISSIONER—What did she tell you about that?

A—I did not remember it until the enquiry. It is quite likely that she told me about it, but owing to the many financial affairs that I had on hand, it might have escaped my attention.

COMMISSIONER—I should have expected you to make enquiries.

Asked as to the \$46,000 previously stated to have been received from Jas. Squires, the witness said he had no recollection to show that he had furnished it. Witness stated he could neither confirm or deny Miss Miller's statement regarding his expenditure, and that it was not correct that she had asked for a settlement with Mr. Meaney, nor did Mr. Meaney himself suggest it.

Q—Did she tell you how she had got it?

A—No, she said she had got it.

Q—Do you remember the date of giving Miss Miller the money?

A—No.

COMMISSIONER—What form did the payment take?

A—A bank note. It was very soon after my return in December.

Various questions were asked regarding Mr. Meaney's associations with witness's party, his appointment to the position of Acting Controller and that it was probably due to the fact that Mr. Meaney was not given full control in the Department that a misunderstanding between him and witness originated.

An adjournment was taken at 5:10 p.m. until eleven this morning.

Q—Did you get a receipt from Mr. Meaney?

A—No.
Witness explained that he could not give attention to his office work owing to the many duties of an official nature that he was performing at that time. The power of attorney to Miss Miller, said witness, was cancelled because of dissatisfaction of the office staff with her work and because of complaints of the janitor in connection with office affairs. Asked if he received any money from J. T. Meaney during the period following his return and the cancellation of power of attorney, witness replied, not to his knowledge.

COMMISSIONER—Do you swear you did not?

A—Miss Miller gave me no money. MR. HOWLEY—Was any money obtained by Miss Miller spent in connection with the office?

A—I have no recollection. Witness stated he had no knowledge of five cheques (handed to him), dated from Dec. 11th, 1920 to March 19th, 1921, and that he was not in a position to say if any Controller's money had been spent on his account by Miss Miller.

Questioned on money obtained by Miss Miller from outside sources, witness could not state where they came from or how they were expended. Asked about the \$500 deposited to his account in the Bank of Commerce, witness stated he had no knowledge of it beyond the receipt produced. Witness was questioned about another sum of \$3000 deposited by Miss Miller. Witness said he thought it was on Dec. 21.

COMMISSIONER—What did she tell you about that?

A—I did not remember it until the enquiry. It is quite likely that she told me about it, but owing to the many financial affairs that I had on hand, it might have escaped my attention.

COMMISSIONER—I should have expected you to make enquiries.

Asked as to the \$46,000 previously stated to have been received from Jas. Squires, the witness said he had no recollection to show that he had furnished it. Witness stated he could neither confirm or deny Miss Miller's statement regarding his expenditure, and that it was not correct that she had asked for a settlement with Mr. Meaney, nor did Mr. Meaney himself suggest it.

Q—Did she tell you how she had got it?

A—No, she said she had got it.

Q—Do you remember the date of giving Miss Miller the money?

A—No.

COMMISSIONER—What form did the payment take?

A—A bank note. It was very soon after my return in December.

Various questions were asked regarding Mr. Meaney's associations with witness's party, his appointment to the position of Acting Controller and that it was probably due to the fact that Mr. Meaney was not given full control in the Department that a misunderstanding between him and witness originated.

An adjournment was taken at 5:10 p.m. until eleven this morning.

Q—Did you get a receipt from Mr. Meaney?

A—No.
Witness explained that he could not give attention to his office work owing to the many duties of an official nature that he was performing at that time. The power of attorney to Miss Miller, said witness, was cancelled because of dissatisfaction of the office staff with her work and because of complaints of the janitor in connection with office affairs. Asked if he received any money from J. T. Meaney during the period following his return and the cancellation of power of attorney, witness replied, not to his knowledge.

COMMISSIONER—Do you swear you did not?

A—Miss Miller gave me no money. MR. HOWLEY—Was any money obtained by Miss Miller spent in connection with the office?

A—I have no recollection. Witness stated he had no knowledge of five cheques (handed to him), dated from Dec. 11th, 1920 to March 19th, 1921, and that he was not in a position to say if any Controller's money had been spent on his account by Miss Miller.

Questioned on money obtained by Miss Miller from outside sources, witness could not state where they came from or how they were expended. Asked about the \$500 deposited to his account in the Bank of Commerce, witness stated he had no knowledge of it beyond the receipt produced. Witness was questioned about another sum of \$3000 deposited by Miss Miller. Witness said he thought it was on Dec. 21.

COMMISSIONER—What did she tell you about that?

A—I did not remember it until the enquiry. It is quite likely that she told me about it, but owing to the many financial affairs that I had on hand, it might have escaped my attention.

COMMISSIONER—I should have expected you to make enquiries.

Asked as to the \$46,000 previously stated to have been received from Jas. Squires, the witness said he had no recollection to show that he had furnished it. Witness stated he could neither confirm or deny Miss Miller's statement regarding his expenditure, and that it was not correct that she had asked for a settlement with Mr. Meaney, nor did Mr. Meaney himself suggest it.

Q—Did she tell you how she had got it?

A—No, she said she had got it.

Q—Do you remember the date of giving Miss Miller the money?

A—No.

COMMISSIONER—What form did the payment take?

A—A bank note. It was very soon after my return in December.

Various questions were asked regarding Mr. Meaney's associations with witness's party, his appointment to the position of Acting Controller and that it was probably due to the fact that Mr. Meaney was not given full control in the Department that a misunderstanding between him and witness originated.

An adjournment was taken at 5:10 p.m. until eleven this morning.

Q—Did you get a receipt from Mr. Meaney?

A—No.
Witness explained that he could not give attention to his office work owing to the many duties of an official nature that he was performing at that time. The power of attorney to Miss Miller, said witness, was cancelled because of dissatisfaction of the office staff with her work and because of complaints of the janitor in connection with office affairs. Asked if he received any money from J. T. Meaney during the period following his return and the cancellation of power of attorney, witness replied, not to his knowledge.

COMMISSIONER—Do you swear you did not?

A—Miss Miller gave me no money. MR. HOWLEY—Was any money obtained by Miss Miller spent in connection with the office?

A—I have no recollection. Witness stated he had no knowledge of five cheques (handed to him), dated from Dec. 11th, 1920 to March 19th, 1921, and that he was not in a position to say if any Controller's money had been spent on his account by Miss Miller.

Questioned on money obtained by Miss Miller from outside sources, witness could not state where they came from or how they were expended. Asked about the \$500 deposited to his account in the Bank of Commerce, witness stated he had no knowledge of it beyond the receipt produced. Witness was questioned about another sum of \$3000 deposited by Miss Miller. Witness said he thought it was on Dec. 21.

COMMISSIONER—What did she tell you about that?

A—I did not remember it until the enquiry. It is quite likely that she told me about it, but owing to the many financial affairs that I had on hand, it might have escaped my attention.

COMMISSIONER—I should have expected you to make enquiries.

Asked as to the \$46,000 previously stated to have been received from Jas. Squires, the witness said he had no recollection to show that he had furnished it. Witness stated he could neither confirm or deny Miss Miller's statement regarding his expenditure, and that it was not correct that she had asked for a settlement with Mr. Meaney, nor did Mr. Meaney himself suggest it.

Q—Did she tell you how she had got it?

A—No, she said she had got it.

Q—Do you remember the date of giving Miss Miller the money?

A—No.

COMMISSIONER—What form did the payment take?

A—A bank note. It was very soon after my return in December.

Various questions were asked regarding Mr. Meaney's associations with witness's party, his appointment to the position of Acting Controller and that it was probably due to the fact that Mr. Meaney was not given full control in the Department that a misunderstanding between him and witness originated.

An adjournment was taken at 5:10 p.m. until eleven this morning.