



(Founded in 1879 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.

Wednesday, January 9, 1924.

The Fundamental Unity of the British People.

The advice of Rev. Canon E. A. Barnes, M.A., to his congregation in the venerable Abbey on Sunday evening, not to sell their British stock because of the present political situation, was timely, and because it was delivered from the pulpit instead of from a political platform, it will go far to restore confidence. The message has been repeated in every town and village of the Kingdom, and has even reached the furthestmost corners of the Empire. Why? Because it is recognized as a sincere conviction prompted by no political motive, but inspired by the firm belief that,

"Nought shall make us true, if England to itself do rest but true." Not for the first time in our history have influences of foreign origin attempted to undermine our established constitution and to foster discord and unrest within the state. Of recent years owing to the discontent in industrial circles, these apostles of anarchy have found more fruitful soil for the seed which they have freely sown, and encouraged by the reception they have been given by a comparatively few converts to their teachings, they have been led to believe that their cause is about to triumph.

The time seems all the more opportune for the carrying out of their plots because the country is divided into different political camps. They are, however, not taking into account "the fundamental unity of the British people" to which Canon Barnes refers, and which wrecked the well laid plans of the Spaniards in 1588, of Louis XIV in 1690, of Napoleon more than a hundred years later, and of the Kaiser in our own times. All that is required is for the Britisher to recognize his real enemy. He is slow to anger, but once fully aroused, he shows the same thoroughness in dealing with his opponent as he displays in the pursuit of his daily calling.

Recently in America information was obtained which proved that the agents of Moscow were sowing sedition in the Republic, and were even aiming at the overthrow of the Government. Previous to the war, London was the Temple of Refuge for the political scum of Europe, and even to-day she harbors a great many undesirable aliens. As in America, in return for the hospitality, they are unceasing in their efforts to create disturbances in the country, with ulterior objects in view which the ordinary Britisher has not yet fully grasped. Once it has been brought home to him that he has an enemy within his gates, he is alien or convert, it can be taken for granted that his methods of dealing with the evil will be drastic and effective.

The chief danger with which Britain is faced to-day is the imposition of the Capital Levy and other legislation of a similar nature, but the tendency of the British people to make haste slowly in all matters of a revolu-

tionary nature remains to-day as it did in the past, and not even the wild men of the Labour party are likely to stampede them, but rather to induce them to close their ranks and present a united front against a common enemy.

Supreme Court.

Yesterday forenoon the Grand Jury was present and addressed by his Lordship the Chief Justice on a bill of indictment charging John Crickard with perjury in connection with the trial of Arthur Desautel in the Magistrate's Court for a breach of the Prohibition Act. The Grand Jury brought in a true bill and the prisoner was arraigned this morning. Through his counsel Mr. T. P. Halley, he pleaded not guilty. Mr. Barron for the Crown asked for a day of trial. The date was set as January 28th before a special jury. Bail in the sum of \$5,000 was granted.

Portia Receives Damages

SHIP ENCOUNTERED HEAVY SEAS

Letters received from Capt. Connors of the S.S. Portia to the Shipping Department this morning give the information that the ship on her trip from Curling to Halifax with a cargo of herring met with the full force of the northwest gale on Wednesday last. The ship was enveloped by heavy seas for a period of twenty-four hours, several of which swept the decks, putting the lifeboats out of commission, while minor damage also done to the bulwarks and other apparatus about the deck. The captain and crew spent many anxious hours but by careful management made Halifax safely. The Portia left North Sydney on Monday night for Curling but no news of her arrival has been received. It is quite possible that the ship met with similar conditions, and ran into the storm which prevailed over the West Coast near Humbermouth yesterday.

Registering the Unemployed

Registry of the unemployed began to-day at the East and West End road sheds. Two hundred men from each city district will be maximum number employed. Only needy cases will be considered.

Damaged by Storm

A letter received in the city from a gentleman at Curling dated January 5th, states that a terrific storm raged on that part of the coast on Sunday last. Much damage was done to fishing gear, motor boats and other property. The inhabitants also suffered greatly.

Schr. Humorist Disabled

VESSEL MAKING FOR BARBADOS.

A marconigram received by Messrs. Monroe Export Co. yesterday afternoon from the S.S. Mont Carlo, states that she had been speaking to the schooner Humorist and found that she had her rudder post broken. The message reads as follows:—"Spoke to schooner Humorist, of St. John's, lat. 44.20 N., long. 45.18 W., bound to Barbados, with rudder post broken. No assistance required. Captain asked to be reported all well." The Humorist was bound to this port from Seville, having left there on December 2nd last.

G. W. V. A. Annual Meeting

The G.W.V.A. will hold its annual meeting on January 14th, in the C.C. Hall, when the nomination of officers to the Dominion Executive will take place. The proposed arrangements in connection with the unveiling of the National War Memorial, in July next will be made known. It is understood that the G.W.V.A. has been requested by the War Memorial Finalization Committee to undertake the arrangements contingent on the demonstration, etc., this the G.W.V.A. has assented to. The proposed programme is a rather ambitious one, but with the co-operation of all executive men should be possible of achievement. In having the G.W.V.A. organize the unveiling ceremonies, the executive men will be given a unique opportunity of taking the most prominent part in the ceremonies, which will mark the unveiling of Newfoundland's War Memorial. A large attendance is expected.

VESSEL ABANDONED; CREW SAFE.—Mr. J. J. Collins, Marconi Superintendent, received a marconigram via Cape Race this morning stating that the S.S. War reported the three-masted schooner J. W. Comeau, of Nova Scotia, drifting in latitude 39.56 north, longitude 62.03 west; crew saved.

THE ENQUIRY CONTINUED.

Mrs. Harsant (Miss J. Miller) Gives Evidence.

Upon the opening of the afternoon session yesterday, Howley K.C. requested a postponement for 48 hours at least of a further cross-examination of Mrs. Harsant, as he was not prepared to continue. The consent of the Commissioner was given to a postponement until Thursday morning. A brief adjournment was then taken until three o'clock, when Mrs. Harsant was placed on the stand and sworn by the Commissioner. Examined by Mr. C. E. Hunt, witness testified she had held the position of secretary and accountant to Squires and Winter since 1916, and that up to the time of her marriage in 1922 she was supposed to receive cheques from Sir R. A. Squires and to act for him personally. Several questions followed with reference to the duties of the witness in Sir R. A. Squire's office.

Q.—Do you remember having taken any business with Mr. J. T. Meaney at the Controller's Department?

A.—I obtained money from him for Sir Richard Squires.

Q.—Did you have any authority from Sir Richard or any Power of Attorney?

A.—I was given Power of Attorney by Sir Richard about a year after I went there, in the fall of 1917.

Commissioner.—Is that still in existence?

A.—No. It was cancelled in 1921. Mr. Hunt.—Have you the Power of Attorney?

A.—No. Q.—Did you have it?

A.—No. It was a letter sent to Mr. Glennie of the Bank of Nova Scotia and I signed it.

Commissioner.—It was a letter of authority?

A.—Yes. Mr. Hunt.—Did you see it?

A.—Yes. I signed it. Q.—Do you know what became of the document?

A.—No. Q.—You did not keep possession of it nor remember having a copy of it?

A.—No. Q.—Was it in your possession any time?

A.—I do not remember. At this point Mr. Howley requested that Mr. Meaney who he claimed was communicating with witness by signals should sit elsewhere, and the Commissioner, for the sake of harmony, indicated another seat for Mr. Meaney. Asked by the Commissioner what practice was followed because of the power of attorney, witness said she could issue and sign cheques, and in reply to Mr. Hunt stated that she signed cheques on behalf of Sir Richard Squires in the ordinary course of business as well as for the firm of Squires & Winter.

Commissioner.—Were there separate accounts for the firm and Sir Richard. You were not drawing cheques on two accounts.

A.—No. Mr. Hunt.—Then the Bank of Nova Scotia had an account for Squires & Winter and for Sir Richard Squires.

A.—Anything taken down in Sir Richard's name was taken care of by the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Q.—Did he have a separate account there?

A.—No, one account. Q.—In the books of the firm was there a separate account?

A.—It was all Sir Richard Squires. A copy of the power of attorney put in as evidence was admitted by Mr. Howley.

Witness stated that this authority was rescinded in 1921 and that from August 1920 she did all the financing of the firm on behalf of Sir Richard Squires and during his absence, she said in August 1920 when Sir Richard left for his first trip across, our bank account was overdrawn and he had notes falling due for about \$20,000. I understood that Sir Richard was going to see Mr. Glennie and make arrangements before he left. Mr. Glennie sent for me and was quite indignant that Sir Richard had left without coming to see him and he told me that unless I deposited \$20,000 immediately, he would send for Sir Richard and bring him back.

Q.—And what happened then?

A.—Some arrangements had been made with my brother, Mr. J. L. Miller, who was working at Bell Island with the Dominion Iron and Steel Co. to finance Sir Richard's account during his absence. It all went through the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Q.—Did it pass through your hands or come under your personal notice as book keeper?

A.—I am not quite sure about the correct amount, I think there was a note I signed the note and my brother endorsed it. It was for about \$20,000. Q.—That was in 1920. Well then, what happened after that?

A.—It was a continual overdraft until Sir Richard came back. Mr. Howley suggested that there was no connection between this evidence and the matter under discussion, but the Commissioner consid-

ered the question relevant. Asked by Mr. Hunt what happened upon Sir Richard's return, witness stated that he did not go into the matter of the overdrawn accounts with her, and that previous to his next trip he asked if witness could raise another sum for him. Questioned as to which trip was referred to, witness answered "All those trips after the first in Aug. 1920."

Commissioner.—It went on in the same happy way. How long did that go on after his return in Dec. 1920?

A.—Until I left the office in 1922. Commissioner.—During that time did you see Mr. Meaney?

A.—I saw him on many occasions. Commissioner.—When did you first see him?

A.—I am not sure but I think it was after the first trip.

Commissioner.—What took place?

A.—I brought him one of the firm's cheques and asked him to cash it.

Asked by Mr. Hunt why she went to Mr. Meaney, witness stated that his name was suggested by Sir R. A. Squires as a party from whom accommodation might be obtained. Asked what took place when cheque was taken to Mr. Meaney, witness said Mr. Meaney expressed surprise but gave me the money and took the cheque. The transaction took place at the Controller's office and he did not say where the money came from. A short while after witness stated she gave Mr. Meaney \$4,000 in bills given her by Sir Richard and received in return the value in the cheques. Asked if Mr. Meaney had asked for payment, witness said "yes." Questioned as to the first cheque for \$500, witness stated that she accounted for it to Sir Richard. With reference to other amounts received, two fifty dollar amounts and three one hundred dollar amounts were retained by witness for expenses. Asked if Sir Richard knew the actual amount retained, witness said "No," that it was used for expenses incurred in the transaction.

Q.—Will you swear that \$22,485 went to Sir Richard Squires.

A.—Yes. Q.—Was there any collusion between you and Meaney in connection with this matter?

A.—Nothing more than I went for the money. I would phone him first and see if he were in his office.

Q.—What I mean to ask is this. Was there any attempt by Mr. Meaney and yourself to retain any of this money?

A.—None whatever. Q.—And you say every time you went to him you told him it was for Sir Richard?

Q.—Did Meaney make any efforts to collect this amount back from you?

A.—He was continually asking for it and told me it was a very serious matter.

The Commissioner enquired if the requests were made known to Sir Richard. Witness said that they were and that he (Sir Richard) had requested a list of the amounts, but that Mr. Meaney would not give it in writing.

Witness said she did not keep a note of the I.O.U.'s, nor could she remember any talk about an I.O.U. for \$20,000 having been lost. Asked as to why the cheque system was changed to that of the I.O.U. system witness explained that at the time Mr. Curtis came into the office and insisted upon opening a separate office account.

Mr. Hunt.—You could no longer draw on the Bank account, is that why you changed from Cheques to I.O.U.'s?

Witness.—Yes. Mr. Hunt.—Just to sum up I want to make absolutely sure of this. You say then you did receive the full amount of cheques and I.O.U.'s represented that we have seen here today amounting to \$22,485. You say out of that amount \$400 was taken by you in payment of expenses to Bell Island and other places in connection with finances, and you say the balance \$22,485 went to Sir Richard Squires?

A.—Yes. Mr. Hunt.—And out of that you did not receive a cent.

A.—Not a cent.

MR. HOWLEY BEGINS CROSS-EXAMINATION OF MRS. HARSANT.

Questioned as to the first transaction with Mr. Meaney, witness stated it was on Dec. 11, 1920 for \$500, but could not remember when she paid him the \$4,000, but it was before the Power of Attorney was cancelled. Questioned as to the signatures of the cheques witness stated that none of them were signed by Sir Richard Squires himself, so far as she knew. Asked whether there were I.O.U.'s in Mr. Meaney's possession before her authority to sign cheques was cancelled, witness could not remember. The reason why the I.O.U.'s were substituted for cheques was repeated and the witness further stated that the

change was not discussed with Sir Richard Squires, and that Mr. Meaney asked about it. Witness could not remember the reason given to Mr. Meaney for the change. Asked if Sir Richard, while Prime Minister and Colonial Secretary, resumed business in his private office witness said "No." She had to do with the financial end of it entirely. Asked by the Commissioner if she ever got the money first and gave the cheque after, witness replied that she did not think so. Asked by Mr. Howley to recall the facts concerning a cheque for \$1,100, witness said "I was a small amount." I financed Sir Richard Squires up to \$100,000. It meant a small amount to me in that connection.

All witness could remember was that upon receiving the money from Mr. Meaney, she gave receipts. Pressed by Mr. Howley to ascertain if any money represented by the cheques were drawn, witness said: There may be one case, which I will tell you of. We had no money in the Bank, there was a fire insurance claim due and the party was taking me away him the \$1,000 due. I do not know whether I telephoned or sent up to ask Mr. Meaney for the money. That was after Mr. Curtis became partner.

Q.—And after your Power of Attorney had been cancelled?

A.—Yes. Questioned as to stubs produced, witness claimed it was not fair, but the Commissioner said it was quite fair and might prove illuminating in direction not yet suspected. Witness said that Sir Richard knew she financed him and that was enough for him to know. At that juncture the Commissioner said he would like to see all the stubs as he was not clear as to what Mr. Howley was trying to decide. A copy of the letter to the Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, rescinding the power of Attorney of J. A. Winter, L. R. Curtis and J. Miller, was put in and recognized by witness. Referring again to the issue of the first cheques, the Commissioner asked to look back over the book of stubs. In Nov. 1920 he found one for \$1,000 marked "J. T." another, numbered 1121, Nov. 27th, for \$1,000. He returned the book to Mr. Howley and requested him to further peruse the book, when he found cheque 1215, of Dec. 4th, for \$1,055, 1218 of Dec. 4th, for \$900. At this stage an adjournment was made until this morning at eleven o'clock.

THIS MORNING'S PROCEEDINGS.

The enquiry opened at 11 a.m. when Mrs. Harsant was recalled and cross-examined regarding portions of her evidence yesterday by Howley, K.C. Asked regarding the date on which Sir Richard left for England in the year 1920 the witness replied that it was in August, 1920, but she was not sure of the date and to a further question she replied that she had full charge of the cash in his office. She then reiterated her statement of yesterday that he was abroad in 1921 and 1922.

Q.—During all this period you were his accountant and cashier?

A.—Yes. Q.—Is it correct that you first saw Mr. Meaney after Sir Richard came back after his first trip?

A.—Before Sir Richard went he suggested for me to go first to my brother and then to Mr. Meaney.

Commissioner.—When was it that you first had recourse to Mr. Meaney?

A.—It must have been before Sir Richard returned. The witness added that she must have been confused in regard to this matter in her evidence given previously.

Mr. Howley.—Were you under the impression yesterday that the cheque of Dec. 11 was the first one?

A.—I understood that it was but I

did not think anything about the date when it was shown me.

Q.—Yesterday, Mrs. Harsant, you discovered that there was a cheque dated Nov. 19th, now you correct this. Is there any other portion of your evidence of yesterday that you require to correct.

A.—There is the case of this cheque.

Commissioner.—Did you yesterday give your evidence to the best of your ability.

A.—Yes, and I would be willing to correct any other mistakes if they were pointed out to me.

Continuing to reply to Mr. Howley's questions, witness stated that the date of the first cheque would be the date of her first visit to Mr. Meaney.

Q.—Had Sir Richard returned when you gave the first cheque.

A.—Evidently he had not.

Commissioner.—I agree with you. Mr. Howley.—Can you remember if he gave you any other instructions before he left.

A.—Not with regard to Mr. Meaney. I took it that previous to Sir Richard's departure I had authority to go to Mr. Meaney and get money.

Q.—By whom was it understood?

A.—Between Sir Richard and myself, because of many conversations, she explained that she was to exhaust her brother's resources before going to Mr. Meaney. The demands that turned up after Sir Richard went were appalling, she said.

Commissioner.—When Sir Richard went were demands likely to increase. Did either of you know how much he would require.

A.—No. Commissioner.—Then you were to go to Mr. Meaney if your brother would not do it all, but at that time neither you nor Sir Richard knew how much money was required.

A.—Yes. Mr. Howley then asked some questions in reference to the Daily Star and its maintenance to which Mrs. Harsant replied that the financing was done from Sir Richard's office. Referring to the first time she went to Mr. Meaney for money, Mrs. Harsant said there was no indication that there was an understanding between Sir Richard and Mr. Meaney. He was surprised and was always surprised when I went, she said.

Mr. Howley then produced a number of stubs whereupon the Attorney-General asked that all the stubs in the possession of Mr. Howley be put in evidence. The Commissioner said he did not think at the present stage that it was material. Stubs of 5 cheques the first dated Nov. 19th, were then put in evidence.

Mr. Howley.—This cheque, Nov. 19th for the \$1,000. What does the "J. T." represent?

A.—That represents Mr. Meaney; these were his Christian name initials.

Mr. Howley.—This is the cheque that you cashed for \$1,000 from Mr. Meaney.

A.—Yes. Q.—Why did you adopt this method of initials?

A.—I think I adopted it myself first and told him (Sir Richard) about it afterwards. I think I told him "cash" and I think I told him "J. T."

Q.—Can you tell us positively if you said anything to Sir Richard about the marking of the cheques.

A.—I remember distinctly telling him "Cash" and I may or may not have told him "J. T."

Commissioner.—Was the cheque book under your control, and did any one besides yourself draw the cheques?

A.—Yes, Sir Richard.

Mrs. Harsant was then shown a book of stubs to find out if Sir Richard had filled in any of the stubs. After a scrutiny, she said that there were no stubs in Sir Richard's writing. She further stated in reply to the Commissioner that Sir Richard could have seen the stubs, but as far

as she knew he may never have seen them.

Mr. Howley next took up the cross examination in regard to the payment of the \$4,000. In this, the witness corroborated her evidence of yesterday. Mr. Howley then suggested that during the time Sir Richard was away there were social gatherings at the office to which the witness replied that her brother had permission to visit one of the offices that is now occupied by Mr. Curtis. She said he came occasionally with the Steel Company's officials and that he was there after closing hours. She was not so sure.

Q.—Did Mr. Meaney ever call there and visit the room?

A.—No, I do not think Mr. Meaney knew of the room. I do not remember Mr. Meaney and my brother being present.

In answer to Mr. Howley, witness stated that she remembered one or two occasions upon which liquid refreshments had been used by her brother and his friends in the office. This was done by Sir Richard's permission. Mr. Meaney was not present on these occasions. She admitted having seen champagne in one of Sir Richard's cabinets. Pressed by counsel, she admitted having seen champagne there that did not belong to Squires. She presumed the liquor she had seen consumed in the office had come from the Department of the Controller. Under further questioning, she admitted having sent the office boy to the Controller for parcels of liquor, but had given him no receipts. This liquor was not for her own use. A script was unnecessary as an understanding existed between Meaney, her brother and his friends. She had no knowledge of how the parcels thus obtained had been paid for, nor could she recollect if any of the contents of these parcels had been consumed in the office.

The Commissioner at this juncture asked if such evidence was necessary as it did not seem to him to have any bearing upon the allegations made in the first paragraph of his Commission.

Mr. Howley.—I think I can show close personal intimacy and understanding between the parties who have alleged that monies were given Sir Richard Squires, and can link that intimacy up with a story which will show Sir Richard is not guilty of the allegations.

It was decided by the Commissioner, however, that this evidence was not necessary.

Mr. Howley then questioned witness concerning a letter written to her by Sir Richard Squires cancelling the power of attorney and making an appointment for the purpose of going into matters with her.

Witness said she had no knowledge of the matters which Squires wished to discuss with her, and when he did come to the office, she saw very little of him. She may have come to the office very late, but that would be after her work had been taken over by Mr. Fraser. He had taken over all her work except the financing of Squires. She had been called upon to raise money for Squires after Fraser had come into the office. He had taken over the books, insurance companies and the bank account. The books, said witness, were in a bad state when Fraser took over. This she thought was because of Squires' absence and the fact that she had been waiting for him to call them over. She had two assistants with the books, who had knowledge of the overdraft accounts and difficulty in raising funds. Squires, she said, had not spent much time in Law Office since he entered politics, and when he did come, it was mostly after tea. He left everything in her hands, and had implicit confidence in her.

Questioned concerning the money kept for her expenses, she said she had receipts and vouchers to cover some of it. She kept no statement of the disposal of the money obtained from Meaney. The only records of the obtaining and the disposal of this money were the cheques and I.O.U.'s, plus the verbal statements of those who could explain. She again asserted that she could not recall the date on which she paid over the \$4,000 to Meaney.

Asked by the Commissioner if he wished to further cross-examine the witness, Mr. Howley said that he was waiting for some bank statements, in connection with which he would possibly want to ask some question. As the Commissioner ordered the re-examination of Mrs. Harsant for this afternoon, and informed Mr. Howley that he could have her recalled at a later date, if necessary.

This morning's session then adjourned.

Ankle Supports only 70c. a pair at SMALLWOOD'S.

NEARBY LINTHORN FOR HARRIED.

A Splendid Program at The Crescent To-Night

Goldwyn Presents
HELENE CHADWICK and JAMES RENNIE
in Basil King's great story
"THE DUST FLOWER"
A Story of a Modern Cinderella.

WATCH FOR FRIDAY NIGHT'S BIG BUMPER AMATEUR CONTEST.

SNUB POLLARD

in a Screaming Two-Act Comedy, also
The ever popular

"PATHE REVIEW."

Coastal Boats.

Argyle.—No report since leaving Argentina yesterday morning.

Kyle left North Sydney at 9 a.m. for Port aux Basques.

Margie left Rose Blanche at 2 p.m. yesterday, coming east.

Sagons leaving Humbermouth today for North Sydney.

Blair left Seldom at 2 a.m., going south; due in port to-morrow night.

Prospero left Springdale 6.40 a.m. going south.

Shipping.

Schr. Nellie T. Walters is loading dry fish at Gaultois for Oporto from Thos. Garland, Tilbury.

S.S. West Chawar, reported to be Furness Withy Co. yesterday evening, that she was making this port for Lunenburg, coal. The ship is bound for Lunenburg and New York and is supposed to be in ballast. She did not report at 1 p.m. to-day, but is expected to reach here early this evening.

Here and There.

Junker is delicious and different when flavoured with chocolate or cream.

15th WEDDING ANNIVERSARY.—Mr. and Mrs. T. A. MacNab celebrated the twelfth anniversary of their marriage to-day. The ceremony was performed at St. Columba Church, Lunenburg, Eng., by the Rev. Dr. Fleming.

For Coughs and Colds STAFFORD'S Phoratorine, 35c. bottle.

CREW RETURNING.—The ship wrecked crew of the bark, Charlie, picked up by the steamer Cairn Mac in mid-ocean, about a week ago, are taken to Portland, Maine, are returning home by the Sachem from Boston for this port on Tuesday next.

Ladies' Black Hockey Boots \$6.00 at SMALLWOOD'S.

THE TRAINS.—Yesterday's westbound express arrived at Bishop Falls 4.50 a.m. to-day; owing to the lateness of the Kyle arriving at Port aux Basques, the incoming express not expected to leave the western terminus until late to-night. The Carbonian train arrived at