

# DEFAULTERS' GET-AWAY AIRED IN LEGISLATURE

## Attorney-General Criticized for Failing to Arrest J. W. Moyes and A. F. Lobb — Defence of Government

The cases of J. W. Moyes and A. F. Lobb were again brought to the attention of the Legislature yesterday, the discussion arising out of a motion by Mr. Proudfoot (Centre Huron) for copies of all correspondence, reports, and documents in any way relating to the attempted arrest of Moyes, who got control of a charter known as the Ontario West Shore Railway Company.

"The Hydro-electric Commission never, directly or indirectly, lodged a request for the extradition of A. F. Lobb," declared Hon. I. B. Lucas, Attorney-General, and member of the Hydro Commission, in reply to Mr. Sam Carter, who mentioned the Lobb affair.

### A Public Outrage.

Mr. Carter—I think it is an outrage. I have heard the Attorney-General say that Lobb got away with \$8,000 or \$10,000 from the Hydro. If they have not lodged a complaint, then it is a public outrage.

Hon. Mr. Lucas said the Crown, on its own initiative, when it knew some of the things, not only in connection with the Hydro, but also in regard to Mr. Lobb's estate down town, used every effort to secure Lobb. He would be glad to let Mr. Carter see the information of the department.

Mr. Carter—I will be glad to see it.

Hon. Mr. Lucas—What I do point out is that in all these cases the very mention of these things in the House defeats the very purpose the department has in view.

### A Startling Statement.

Mr. Carter—Your statement that the Hydro-electric Commission did not even refer this to you nor draw your notice to it is rather startling to me.

Hon. Mr. Lucas—The Commission never in any way asked for the extradition of Lobb.

Mr. Carter—Then they committed a blunder and no mistake about it.

### Get-away of J. W. Moyes.

With reference to J. W. Moyes, who got control of a charter known as the Ontario West Shore Railway Company, Mr. Proudfoot said, although the people might not consider they had much chance of getting their money back—they had been defrauded of at least \$126,000—a very vigorous effort should be made to arrest Moyes. It might be said that the people up there were the only ones interested in the prosecution. When a man like Moyes committed a fraud such as he committed and got away with it, then it was an encouragement to other people who were promoting schemes of this and other kinds. It should not, in cases of this type, be left entirely for the private individual to start a prosecution.

### Attorney-General's Defence.

Hon. Mr. Lucas said if there was brought down to the House the correspondence showing how the department had been trying to reach the man they were attempting to arrest, that would defeat the very purpose of the hon. member who raised the question. Moyes' last evidence was on April 21, and then he vanished into the northland, and nobody had seen him since. When the man had gone away, three years after the frauds had been committed and the money stolen, the department was asked to get him.

"The very municipalities, through their counsel, through their repre-

sentatives, having the details, having all the knowledge, knowing the frauds from 1911, knowing them as they were disclosed before the Railway Board, took no action, made no suggestion to the Attorney-General's Department," said Mr. Lucas, "and yet there were insinuations of blame of the Attorney-General's Department." An attempt was apparently being made to get political advantage.

### Reason for Delay.

Mr. Proudfoot said that, while it was true a great many statements had been made about the funds having been misappropriated and disposed of improperly, it was not known exactly how it would work out until the investigation took place before the Railway Board. It was only at that time they ascertained what had become of the money and how the money had been spent. Just as soon as the report was made by the board the proceedings were instituted. It was idle for the Attorney-General to say his department did not know what was going on, when the proceedings appeared in the press every day. Moyes could have been arrested long before he left. He denied that he had brought the matter up to gain political capital.

### Was an Issue in Huron.

Mr. A. H. Musgrove (North Huron) said the township of Ashfield was in his constituency, and at last election this Moyes affair was one of the most difficult points he had to meet. He, however, got a statement from Mr. Foy, and that proved satisfactory to the people.

Hon. Mr. Lucas said the first notification they had from Mr. Proudfoot was on May 3, 1914, while Moyes, it was stated, had left on May 1. The Attorney-General's Department was asked not to arrest Moyes until the Railway Board made their report, which report was issued on the 11th of May. Inspector Boyd was at once placed on the job, and Moyes having been supposed to have gone to Algonquin Park, the Inspector was told off to try and locate him there, while the Toronto police kept his house here under observation.

### Lawyers Differed.

Mr. Proudfoot stated that personally he wanted Moyes to be arrested at once, but there were three solicitors and they did not agree.

Hon. Mr. Lucas undertook that if there was any correspondence that could with advisability be brought down it would be brought down. However, if it were found that this should not be done it would not be brought down.

### Penalties for "Listeners."

Legislation was introduced by Hon. Mr. Lucas imposing a penalty of not more than \$25 on telephone listeners. This is intended to apply to rural telephones. "You can get the information, but you cannot pass it on; that is about the limit at present," said the Attorney-General with a smile. "This applies as well to operators, where it is more serious, and a penalty may be imposed upon anybody who repeats conversations that comes to him over the telephone and is not intended for him."

The Attorney-General said there was another clause which provided the necessary machinery in connection with legislation which it was expected would be adopted at Ottawa this session. That provided for joint meetings of the Ontario and Dominion Boards for the purpose of arranging terms for connections between Provincial and Dominion companies.