

Tuesday, Feb. 26th

PREMIER MAY PLUG INFORMATION LEAKS

Progressive Members Pro-
test About Published News
of Alleged Defalcations

\$100,000 SUM MISSING?

Alluding to a published report in a Toronto evening paper of alleged defalcations in several branches of the Government administration, Hon. Manning W. Doherty, Farmer Leader, and Hon. W. E. Raney (U.F.O., East Wellington) protested yesterday in the Legislature against such articles going first to the press before the information was supplied to the House. Mr. Raney said that from Government officials had gone out information the whole tenor of which had been to cast discredit on the former Government.

Premier Ferguson said the former Government had got into the habit of permitting officials to make announcements of policy. The present Government proposed to decide for itself and give out declarations of policy through Ministers and not through officials. Proceeding, he said that only a short time ago, in the Attorney-General's Department, there had been arranged a round-up of the bootleggers of the Province, but there was a leak somewhere in the service, information went to the newspapers and an article appeared in a morning paper and the quarry disappeared. He intimated that the Government was trying to find out who was supplying unauthorized information.

The Premier said that unfortunately there had been definite disclosures of this type—as reported in the article Mr. Doherty referred to—where there were defalcations, but adjustments were being made in most cases, often by members of the families. The defendant was not available in some cases, he said.

The story referred to states that defalcations totalling \$100,000 are expected to be revealed. It is said the defalcations have been revealed in the Northern Developments Branch of sums up to \$5,000. The Lands and Forests Department also is said to be included in the discoveries. It is said that several motor-marker agents have not yet made complete returns of moneys collected by them a year ago.

BARRACKS ASSAULT SUBJECT OF DEBATE

Attorney-General Will Dis-
courage Promiscuous
Use of Lash

CURRIE REVIEWS CASE

"So far and so long as I am the Attorney-General of this Province I shall endeavor to the utmost of my ability to discourage the promiscuous use of the lash," said Hon. W. F. Nickle, in the Legislature yesterday, in speaking in reply to John A. Currie (Conservative, Southwest Toronto), who protested against the civil authorities interfering in the Stanley Barracks alleged assault case in the way they did.

Thinks Lash Archaic.

Mr. Nickle said that, to his mind, the lash was archaic; it smacked of the Middle Ages, and was not beneficial. When the law endeavored to punish an imprisoned man merely for the purpose of creating pain, then the punishment, instead of being reformatory, became an act of vengeance, said the Attorney-General, and made the individual, when he returned to society, more unsocial than when originally deprived of his liberty.

Mr. Currie, in reviewing the Stanley Barracks case, said that such matters were covered by the Army Act, and that it was unprecedented in British procedure for the civil authorities to step in in a barrack-room case—unless in case of murder—and, moreover, that the procedure followed had been wrong, and that the men were not properly before the Toronto Police Court.

Not Beyond Civil Law.

The Attorney-General said he did not accept that interpretation of the law, and declared that he was not prepared to admit the doctrine that a crime committed in barracks was beyond the purview of the civil law. He regretted that Judge Denton's question to one of the prisoners as to how he would like to receive lashes as it was alleged he had inflicted them was interpreted as meaning that the Judge intended to punish by the lash.

RANEY IS INTERESTED IN HOME BANK AFFAIR

Places Nine Questions
on Order Paper of
Legislature

Hon. W. E. Raney (U.F.O., East Wellington) has placed the following questions on the order paper of the Legislature:

"(1) Has the Attorney-General given instructions for an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the cases of the Home Bank directors? (2) What are the points involved in the appeal? (3) Is the Attorney-General objecting to the trial of the cases in question by a Judge? (4) If so, why? (5) If an appeal is being taken, when does the Attorney-General anticipate it will be heard? (6) Has the Attorney-General given consideration to the importance, from the point of view of the administration of justice, of an early trial of these cases? (7) Has the Attorney-General given consideration to the desirability of a trial of these cases before a tribunal as free as possible from prepossessions and prejudices? (8) Has the Attorney-General given consideration to the provisions of Section 1025 of the Criminal Code of Canada forbidding appeals in criminal cases from any judgment or order of any court in Canada to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council? (9) Is it the opinion of the Attorney-General that the defendants are less likely to get a fair trial before a Judge than before a Judge and jury?"