

"The first item given by you in support of this charge had to do with a man named McCutcheon, whom you called as your principal witness before the committee. McCutcheon had been in the employ of the department, under Mr. Ayearst, off and on for several years, when in January, 1921, he was sent to Guelph. There he was arrested for an alleged assault on a waitress in a restaurant, and was convicted of common assault. Mr. Flavelle and Mr. Ayearst looked into the matter, and were satisfied that the charge of assault had been 'framed.'

#### McCutcheon Was Dismissed.

"Nevertheless he was dismissed. Afterward he was employed by Inspector Hammond here in Toronto, but was never again permitted to go into court as a witness. Later in the year he was again convicted of participation in the bribery of a Crown witness, and was then finally dismissed, and afterward he was convicted, and is now serving a term for keeping a still.

"McCutcheon was your principal informant in respect of the charges brought against my department and your chief witness before this committee. The McCutcheon case does not support your charge that I or my department employed, and is now employing, thugs and criminals in the enforcement of the law."

Mr. Raney then quoted Mr. Lennox's charge: "Did I lie when I said that two of the Government spotters at Hamilton, under oath, admitted that they had been in jail for burning a barn and committing burglary?"

#### Lickers Concealed Facts.

His answer to this charge was: "The facts in this regard were that a man named Lickers secured employment from Mr. Sturdy, the then License Inspector at Hamilton, on the approval of Mr. Flavelle, who was then Chairman of the Board of License Commissioners. Afterward it transpired that Lickers had been convicted of burning a barn and highway robbery, and he was immediately dismissed. He had concealed the facts from Mr. Flavelle and Mr. Sturdy, both competent officers and both appointees of the late Conservative Government. This item does not support your charge."

He then read Mr. Lennox's next question: "Did I, to the public, say what was true when I charged a stool pigeon by the name of McCoy with being drunk on the train, brandishing a revolver, and driving the passengers from the car at Hamilton, and who was afterward convicted?"

#### Gross Exaggeration.

This he answered by saying: "The statement, as you made it, is a gross exaggeration, in fact is almost altogether falsehood. McCoy, a returned soldier (I do not know why you call him a stool pigeon, unless it is because, in your view, every law enforcement officer is a stool pigeon), was convicted by the Police Magistrate in Hamilton of carrying a revolver. The facts were reported to the department, which, on investigation, came to the conclusion that McCoy's conduct had been improper, and he was dismissed. It transpired that the revolver was a German souvenir that was out of commission and the Magistrate directed that the penalty should not be enforced. McCoy did not brandish a revolver and did not drive passengers from a car at Hamilton. This item does not support your charge."

The next question was: "Am I right when I allege that a spotter by the name of Foster accepted, or tried to accept, \$150 from a man who was charged with selling liquor?"

#### "No! You Are Not Right!"

To this Mr. Raney's answer was: "No! you are not right. No one of the name Foster has been employed as an officer to enforce the Ontario Temperance Act, as far as I can discover."

To Mr. Lennox's question: "Will you stand up in your place in the House and deny that two of your spotters got a 15-year-old boy to buy two bottles of whiskey and then made this 15-year-old boy taste whiskey for the first time in his life at Collingwood?" Mr. Raney answered: "On the evidence before the committee of Officer Fielding, one of the 'spotters' referred to, who is a returned man with an excellent record with the department, this charge is false. The young man in question was acting as a runner for a bootlegger. He refused to disclose the name of the bootlegger and was fined \$20 by the Magistrate for being drunk."

The Attorney-General next quoted Mr. Lennox as asking: "Will you, to the people of this Province, say that Police Magistrate Fraser lied when he announced at Niagara Falls a short time ago that the witnesses provided by you were jailbirds, one having been tried for murder and having served a term in jail?"

#### Record Not Investigated.

The answer to this question was: "The man referred to in this charge was employed by License Inspector Ferris of Niagara Falls without having taken sufficient precaution to ascertain his previous record. As soon as the facts were known the man was dismissed, and subsequently Ferris himself, who was an appointee of the late Conservative Government, was dismissed for offensive partisanship and other irregularities. This item does not support your charge."

The next question was: "Will you deny that Stanley and William Hallam not only assaulted and burglarized one of Windsor's citizens on September 14, 1920, and stole eighty cases of liquor, and one of them was retained by you as a trusted servant?"

To this Mr. Raney replied: "The charge against the department in this case is contained in the last two lines. The charge is false. It is true that these men were convicted of having stolen a quantity of liquor on the date stated. Their guilt was, however, not discovered until some months after the termination of their employment with the department, which, was, in the case of one of them, in September, 1920, and, in the case of the other, October, 1920. They were convicted in June, 1921. This item does not support your charge."

#### "Miserable Creation of Life."

Mr. Lennox's next charge was: "Will you deny that one of the most miserable creations of life was in your employ at Cochrane, and criminally assaulted two young girls?"

The answer to this was: "A man named Stagg, a returned soldier, was employed for a short time by Inspector Blackwell for special work, without the knowledge of the department. Inspector Blackwell of Cochrane and Inspector Moore of Haileybury, both of whom know Stagg, were witnesses before the committee, and gave Stagg a good character. They believe the charge against him was a 'frame-up' by the bootleggers."

Mr. Lennox's next question was: "Will you deny that in your service was a man by the name of Lloyd Gordon, who accepted \$600 from hotel-keepers or others engaged in selling liquor, and that after he was sent to jail for theft, was re-engaged by your Department?"

#### False in Implication.

To this Mr. Raney replied: "In its implication this charge is false. Gordon was employed by the Department and did not appear as a witness when the case with which he was concerned was called. It is, as you say, that he was bribed by the bootleggers. Later, Gordon turned up in Toronto and procured employment from Inspector Hammond, to get information for him concerning Officer Courkin, whom Hammond suspected of being in league with the bootleggers. It is true Gordon served a month in jail for theft and, that afterwards Mr. Hammond took him back for a week or so.