

Nathan Slavin, agreed to sell it to him at \$1,400. The truck-load was delivered at Slavin's place and upon the truck that delivered the liquor rode an agent of the department, and other officers followed in a motor. Slavin was charged with having liquor in an unlawful place. Mr. Dewart declared that subsequently an arrangement was made by Ayearst by which a fine of \$400 would be accepted. However, the Magistrate imposed a fine of \$1,000 and costs or six months in jail. Slavin went to jail but his friends got busy.

#### Why Was Fine Reduced?

It was not long before an order in Council was passed on the recommendation of the Attorney-General, remitting \$600, making the fine \$400, which was paid, and Slavin was released. "Why was the fine reduced?" asked Mr. Dewart. "Was it because the transaction turned out to be one in which an agent of the Government had been guilty of dishonorable conduct? Is it true that the man who made that sale to Slavin afterwards disgorged a portion of that \$1,400? Is it true that after a fortnight Slavin was employed by the Department to enforce the law? Is it true that both the vendor and the purchaser of the liquor were in the employ of the Government as agents of this department? Is it true that Slavin has been in the employ of the License Department jointly with men who made the sale to him during the very time that this House has been sitting, and at the very time when this discredited inspector had the audacity to sit upon the floor of the House with the Judges and clergy and dignitaries who graced the House upon its opening?"

He charged that there had been a flood of orders in Council passed by the Ontario Government, although he admitted there were instances where men should be pardoned because of technicalities under the terms of the O.T.A. During the year 1918 and up to March 6, 1919, thirty-eight orders in Council had been passed regarding the remission or reduction of fines in cases tried in the Toronto Police Court. Mr. Dewart frankly admitted that he had one of his clients pardoned because of a technicality. If they were instances of absolute remissions it would not be so bad, but twenty-seven cases were merely a reduction in fines. He contrasted what he claimed was the severity in the Homer case with others which were dealt with leniently, and wondered if the reduction of fines was part of the patronage machinery.

#### No Proper Audit.

Mr. Dewart said that there was no proper audit upon the expenditures made by the License Department. The Provincial Auditor called attention to the fact in the Public Accounts that the certificate of the Minister that any sum of money was required to be paid out shall be sufficient authority for the issue of a cheque, and that his approval was final.

#### Want of Confidence Motion.

Mr. Lucas said that he had not intended participating in the Budget debate, and that he was speaking without all the papers before him. However, he desired to reply to one or two things that affected his department.

"My honorable friend has made a motion asking for an investigation. He has made, as he always makes, a very plausible and very forcible argument, and always in courteous language. But my honorable friend surely does not expect to get away with that class of argument in this House. He is making not a motion for an investigation. My honorable friend has no desire whatever to have this motion carry. It is so evident that I only desire to mention it to point out how much sincerity there is in the remarks of my honorable friend. He would lead the members of the House to believe that he really wanted an investigation on this motion. He has waited for the opportunity when the Government moved that the Speaker should leave the chair to go into committee, to make this motion, when he, of all Parliamentarians, knows no amendment can be made, and that the Government must de-

feat it or retire. It is a want of confidence motion, which no one knows better than so able a Parliamentarian as the honorable member for Southwest Toronto." (Government applause.)

#### Probe Not Wanted.

"It is not an investigation he wants. It is something else he wants. The purpose is so obvious, even to the newest member of this House, and now that my honorable friend is out in the open, and the camouflage has been removed from his outer costume, we know where he is standing. He has thrown a lot of dust, and thrown many insinuations against the Government, the License Board, and Mr. Ayearst, and against anyone who had any connection with the Homer incident."

Certain people were suspected by the department of being guilty of selling liquor. Criminal lawyers always attacked private detectives in a case, and Mr. Dewart knew how to do that well. Mr. Lucas said that he would not discuss the Burns Agency at length or the employment of private detectives.

"We should not employ Burns," interrupted Mr. Allan Studholme, Labor member for East Hamilton.

#### A "Bogus" Motion.

Continuing, the Attorney-General said Mr. Dewart had asked for an investigation. Mr. Dewart had said the cheque for \$3,200 had been cashed, and further insinuations had been made as well. He referred to Mr. Dewart's motion as "bogus."

"I ask that the word be withdrawn," said Mr. Dewart, rising to a point of order.

"All right. I withdraw it and call it a sham." (Applause from the Government.)

"I object to the word 'sham'; no honorable member has a right to use it," again interrupted Mr. Dewart.

"I withdraw the words sham and bogus and call it a camouflage motion." (Applause.)

"I would not suggest that he was a sham or humbug, but when I give him this opportunity we will see which class he should be in. He says there is something crooked. He quotes a newspaper which says the same thing," continued the Attorney-General.

"My honorable friend is a member of responsibility in this House. He has made that statement. I say now to him that having had opportunity to deal with it, if my honorable friend will formulate any charge involving in any way any official, any member of the Government or anyone who is in any way connected with the Government or the License Board with anything irregular or improper I will ask the Premier to recommend to this House that a Commission of Inquiry be given him to substantiate any of these statements." (Applause from Government benches.)

#### Lucas Defends Ayearst.

"My honorable friend can either accept that position, stand up when we take this vote, and, on his responsibility as a member of this House, demonstrate to the House and to the people that he is not endeavoring to humbug, that he is not endeavoring to use this House to make slanderous statements involving members of the House, or the License Board, or the Provincial Inspector. If he will do that, the fullest kind of an inquiry will be made. He has made a most serious charge against a man whose name rings true in the Province of Ontario. I am not one to say that the Chief Inspector has never made a mistake. He may have made mistakes, as most men would have, for he occupied a difficult position; but I venture to say, in the judgment of this House, that no one has ever charged him with dishonesty until my honorable friend made the charge he has made in this House. At first he makes an insinuation, and then he gets braver and makes a charge. He says that an official of the department is a member of the Employers' Detective Agency, and so shares in the profits. I cannot answer that question, and I cannot believe it is true. If such a charge—if there is one scintilla of evidence to support that slanderous charge—if it is not true, that infamous charge—let him stand up now and say, 'I withdraw; I apologize,' or let him show his sense of responsi-