

### In Hurry for Whiskey.

"This prescription," said the Attorney-General, referring to the whiskey order, "was taken by one Arnold, a chauffeur of Col. Lennox's, to the Government dispensary. There was some delay, and Mr. Lennox himself came into the dispensary and told the clerk they should have a better system there, and said that he was in a hurry, because he had to go to Sutton. Dr. Preston was campaigning with Mr. Lennox at that time in North York.

"Mr. Lennox," he continued, "might, perhaps, explain to this committee why he a King's Counsel, and a supporter of the Government which in 1916 passed this temperance law, has broken it, and has laid himself open to penalties if he were prosecuted."

The matter came up following the Attorney-General's mention and complete denial of the inferred charge that the liquor found in the Mansion House raid at Sutton was placed there with the knowledge of the Attorney-General. Mr. Nickle asked if the committee was to infer that Mr. Lennox took the liquor to Sutton.

The Attorney-General replied: "It is, to my mind, a sufficient answer to Mr. Lennox's charge that the liquor was taken to Sutton by the officers."

Another matter of importance dealt with by the Attorney-General and the committee was that of the liquor seizure at Fort Frances, in which the charge was that the department had offered to release the liquor to its owners for shipment to some legal place, British Columbia being named. The recent controversy was partly over the application or the use of the words, "to debauch the citizens of British Columbia." Mr. Raney said yesterday, as Mr. J. P. Haverson, K.C., previously testified, that neither he nor Commissioner Hales had used the expression, although, he said, he had some knowledge of the efforts of the company to secure possession of its liquor and smuggle it into the U.S.

The committee's view, after hearing the evidence, was that there was a complete misunderstanding; that Mr. Lennox had himself used the term "debauch" and had been taken up as attributing it to somebody else.

### Lennox Tenders Thanks.

Notable in connection with the committee proceedings was the Attorney-General's comment upon the refusal of Col. Lennox to take the stand at yesterday's hearing. He would have thought, said Mr. Raney, that the member for North York would have been only too glad to avail himself promptly of the opportunity of refuting the personal matters concerning himself which he had brought out. Mr. Lennox, however, smilingly thanked him for his solicitude.

The committee heaved an audible sigh of relief when, toward the close of the sitting, Mr. Lennox said he thought that he could get through all his evidence by Friday.

Beside the Attorney-General, the committee yesterday heard J. D. Flavelle, former Chairman of the Ontario License Board, who testified that no crooks or criminals were ever knowingly kept on the departmental payroll. Occasionally, he admitted, an undesirable slipped through, and, when unmasked, was dismissed. But the Attorney-General's orders and regulations, he thought, were too strict. Mr. Raney had ordered that a man who drank or who smelled of liquor should not be employed.

Mr. Flavelle gave a complete certificate of character to Chief Inspector Ayearst, who, he maintained, had not a blemish against his record, so far as he knew. The ex-Chairman told the committee that law enforcement officers were always having charges laid against them by persons who felt the effects of their operations.

Inspector Beckett, Grey county; Dr. Lavelle, Chief Parole Officer, and Inspector Charlton also testified.

R. M. Warren, North Renfrew, made a forceful protest at the commencement of the meeting against the "insult" which he said Mr. Lennox had on Friday last offered to himself and the electors of North Renfrew. He did not purpose, he said, to suffer the "yappings of any Toronto lawyer" in that respect to pass without protest.

## Commissioner Believes Telegrams in Huston Inquiry Are Relevant

### STATED CASE NOT GIVEN

D. L. McCarthy, K. C., counsel for The Toronto Evening Telegram, when Commissioner MacIntosh yesterday at Osgoode Hall resumed his inquiry into the death of Captain Orville Huston, alleged that Gordon Waldron, K.C., counsel for the Ontario Government, was conducting the proceedings in a manner which constituted an attempt to procure evidence which would possibly help E. W. Backus in his libel action against the newspaper in question. This was repudiated by Mr. Waldron as an "unfounded assertion," and he suggested that Mr. McCarthy had formed his opinions on "slanderous articles," which had appeared in The Telegram concerning him (Mr. Waldron).

### Telegrams Produced.

The whole session was devoted to arguments in connection with the production of certain telegrams which had passed between The Telegram and its representatives at Fort Frances and Winnipeg. The production of these telegrams in evidence was objected to by J. D. Spence, appearing for the Canadian Pacific Telegraph Company. Mr. Spence asked Commissioner MacIntosh for a stated case, asking, among other things, whether the commission was legally issued under the Public Inquiries Act or not; whether the Governor-in-Council had power to authorize the commission to inquire into the matters set forth in the commission; whether the subpoena summoning the witness from the C. P. R. Telegraph Company for the production of the documents was in order; and whether the documents to be produced were relevant to the enquiry.

Mr. McCarthy, on behalf of The Toronto Evening Telegram, objected to the admission of the telegrams until their relevancy or admissibility had been determined. He, too, applied for a stated case.

Commissioner MacIntosh, in summing up, stated that he had taken particular care not to bring anything into the investigation which would help Mr. Backus or The Telegram. There was nothing of a political nature. He, too, emphasized the importance of the Porter report on which Major Lewis had based his charges. He was unable to recall whether that report was among the documents which had been turned over to him, although he was under the impression that it was. He concluded by saying that he considered the 17 documents which had been handed over were relevant to the inquiry. He, therefore, rejected the application for the stated case.

Mr. Spence announced that he would make the necessary application to the Appellate Division for a ruling whether the documents should be produced.

The commission had intended to proceed with the examination of Irving E. Robertson of The Toronto Evening Telegram, but on being informed that he was not well, and accordingly unable to attend, the inquiry adjourned until Thursday morning.