

Employs Criminals?

"With full responsibility as a member of this House," he said, "I shall show that not only does the Attorney-General give employment to thugs and criminals, but I say further, with all the emphasis that I can command, that these men were kept, and are being kept today, by the Attorney-General, assisting him in the enforcement of the Ontario Temperance Act. I can quite understand the administrator of a department being deceived by his officials or his servants. That is inevitable; but I cannot conceive, nor will the public condone, any Minister keeping in his employ men that have been convicted and have, to his knowledge, served terms, in the enforcement of the Ontario Temperance Act. Now that is a pretty strong statement to make."

Mr. Lennox cited the case of a man who was arrested in Toronto for aiding and abetting the delinquency of a child fourteen years of age. The man who bailed him out was the Provincial Inspector, Mr. Ayearst, he said. The charge against the man was dismissed, so that it might be said that he was proved not guilty.

Arrested in Guelph.

In the following January the man went to Guelph and was arrested on a charge of criminal assault, said Mr. Lennox, and they had the spectacle, not only of the Government paying the Crown Attorney to prosecute the man, but the Government also paying the lawyer who defended him. There were two Crown officials, one trying to bring punishment to the man, and the other to defend him. The result of the trial was a conviction of this "stool pigeon" for common assault, because there was only the evidence of the girl against him.

"One would have thought," said Mr. Lennox, "that this was at least an occasion when the Attorney-General, as the representative of justice, would at once have interfered and said, 'No longer will I associate myself with this man.' Did he? No. This man goes back to Toronto, as usual representing this department, drawing pay at the rate of \$125 a month—a man entrusted to represent the Attorney-General."

Witness Spirited Away.

Discussing the case of three men, who faced a conspiracy charge last fall for getting a witness out of the country, Mr. Lennox said that Mr. Hammond, one of the officials of the police, gave testimony that he had employed one of these men though knowing the charge against him. He had been instructed to employ him, he said, by orders. His orders came from the Commissioner of Police for Ontario, Major-General Elliott. This same man who had been employed was now in Toronto Jail for operating an illicit still, said Mr. Lennox.

This man, proceeded the speaker, left the department last April, was away three months, and, though charged with conspiracy and waiting trial, was not only taken back on the department during June, to continue "his nefarious work as a spotter, but he was actually paid out of the Treasury of this Province for the time he was out of employment."

Spotters Behind Bars.

Mr. Lennox then recounted the history of several cases in Police Courts in different parts of the Province in which he claimed officials employed by the Government had taken part. One man went to Cobourg for the department—and "today if you want to see him you've got to go to Portsmouth, Kingston." Another man, a spotter in the employ of the Ontario Government, Mr. Lennox said, was employed at Fort Frances. "If my honorable friend the Attorney-General wants him he has got to go to Stony Mountain."

He then referred to three operators of the department who, he said, went to Hamilton, and he read an affidavit from a man they arrested that they had been, when they made the arrest, so intoxicated they could scarcely talk. One of these men later went to Hamilton, Mr. Lennox said, and got a prescription, and was found drunk on the streets. Another employee brandished a revolver when intoxicated in a Grand Trunk coach, and, said Mr. Lennox, he was the only man of all the spotters in the employ of the Government of whom information was asked that was discharged from the department. This man, said Mr. Len-

nox, was arrested and fined on the charge, and yet for nearly two months afterward he drew pay.

Ignores Man's Record?

Mr. Lennox also mentioned the case of a man who, he said, stole a \$100 Victory bond, and who spent 30 days in jail for the deed, and who, he claimed, was still retained in the employ of the department. Mr. Lennox complained that when a question was put on the order paper concerning this man no reference was made in the Attorney-General's reply to the man's record. Mr. Lennox asked if that was fair to the House.

The Attorney-General pointed out that answers to questions of this kind were made by officials of the department, and there would be no record at the disposal of men temporarily employed.

"Is that all the value that is to be attached to answers to questions?" asked Hon. Howard Ferguson.

The Attorney-General replied that Ministers could not be expected to know all about all men employed.

Left to Avoid Trial.

Mr. Lennox went on to say that the man to whom he was referring was given \$600 to clear out of Kitchener and go to Regina before a certain trial under the liquor law came on at the former place. The Government had declared to the public they would not tolerate the employment of men who had unclean or unsavory records, and yet in the past three or four months this man, guilty of the despicable offense of selling his soul to avoid giving evidence against men he was sent to catch, returned last July and was taken back to represent the Department of Justice.

Mr. Lennox also mentioned one man who had been tried for murder, who, he said, was employed by the department, and also cited the case of the Hallam brothers.

Mr. Lennox mentioned a case which, he said, happened at Guelph, in which three spotters were sent up to obtain evidence. He alleged that one of the men was drunk while the other two were gathering evidence. The spotters sent notes to the man whom Mr. Lennox alleged was drunk, and this man later in court, according to the member for North York, gave evidence which was based on the contents of the notes received from the other two men.

Accused of Perjury.

That had been brought to the notice of the Attorney-General, and there was today on the files of the department a statement made by the other two spotters that the man had perjured himself by basing his evidence on the notes of the two men. Notwithstanding that, the Attorney-General continued to employ this man, and it did not seem to make a bit of difference whether the Attorney-General knew or did not know.

The Attorney-General asked whether Mr. Lennox said the letter was in the department notifying him of the facts.

Mr. Lennox said the statement he was making was that this evidence was sent in. General Elliott had been appointed to represent the Attorney-General in the enforcement of the Temperance Act, and if it had not been brought to Mr. Raney's attention that was "up to" him. No head of a department could avoid responsibility as the Attorney-General was attempting to do in this case.

Not Seeking to Evade.

The Attorney-General said he was not attempting to avoid responsibility. If any of his officers made a mistake he was responsible. That was a different matter from the suggestion of Mr. Lennox that he (Mr. Raney) had personal knowledge of the matter.

Mr. Lennox said he had always understood that notice to the Attorney-General's Department was notice to the Attorney-General.

The Attorney-General—In an official way it is—yes.

Mr. Lennox also cited a case in which he alleged that an operator had struck a Crown Attorney in court and had been fined \$400. He asked whether the man paid the