

Saturday March 9th

Debt to Bootlegger.

When Mr. Finlayson resumed his cross-examination of Brien, he at once pressed—as he pressed on Wednesday last—for a definite answer as to how much the former Provincial officer owed Brown, the Kitchener bootlegger.

"What was the first note you gave Brown for?" he asked.

"Ninety dollars," was Brien's reply.

"Come on, you're only guessing again. It was \$97. How long was the note for?"

"Three months."

"You're wrong again; it was 60 days."

"Well, I don't know," said Brien.

"Don't you pay any attention to your debts at all?" asked Mr. Finlayson.

"Yes, when I can afford to pay them," was the reply.

Brien told the committee that Brown, the bootlegger, had "insisted" on paying the interest on the note when it had fallen due at the bank the first time. Later, when the bank had "kicked" for payment, he had paid another \$10 instalment. But Brown had not insisted on paying the interest this time.

"So, in any event," declared Mr. Finlayson, "we now have your admission that you still owe Brown \$80, when you swore before that it was only \$50. You know that you were wrong, now, when you said \$50."

"Yes," said Brien, "I may have been mistaken."

"It's not a question of mistake at all," said Mr. Finlayson. "You were wrong. I don't want to have to charge you with perjury."

When Bills Changed Hands.

Referring to the transaction which occurred between Brien and Brown, in front of the bank, when a roll of bills was passed to the former from the latter, Mr. Finlayson asked:

"Do you mean to say that a convicted bootlegger, as Brown was, was taking your note out of the bank without getting some consideration—some value—for it?"

"Absolutely," was the witness's reply. "I'm telling the truth."

Q.—Brown is a Jew—a pretty shrewd business man? A.—I don't know about that.

Q.—Do you want this committee to believe that with a conviction hanging over his head that might get him two months or six months you took \$80 from him without showing him any consideration? A.—Absolutely.

Q.—Do you still tell the committee that you don't know how much money Brown gave you? A.—Yes.

Q.—Now, Brien, when you deal with bootleggers in this way— A.—I don't deal with bootleggers.

Q.—Well, you took money from a bootlegger in this case.

Witness Brien explained that he had accepted the roll of bills only because Brown had told him that his Browns' credit would have been "injured" at the bank if he, Brown, had had to pay the note.

Q.—Was the money marked? A.—I heard so afterward.

Q.—Did Brown have the numbers? A.—I don't know.

Q.—Well, he had you foul. A.—He didn't have me foul.

Q.—Do you mean to say he didn't have you foul when you took money from him? A.—Absolutely.

No Connection.

Q.—The fact that you got the money and Brown got the minimum penalty had nothing to do with each other? A.—No, not a thing.

Q.—Now, Brien, do you think any Provincial officer should take money from a bootlegger? A.—I wouldn't say that.

Brien told the committee that on many occasions previous to the bank meeting Brown had asked his "help." He denied that he had discussed with the Magistrate the question of what was to be done with Brown.

Q.—Did you put in a good word from Brown? A.—No.

Q.—Why did you take Brown's money, then? A.—I didn't take his money for nothing.

Q.—I quite believe that you didn't take his money for nothing.

Describing Brown's visit to his house the night following the bank meeting, witness said that he, Brown, had "brought up a bunch of notes for the \$80."

"Do you remember him telling you," asked Mr. Finlayson, "that you hadn't played fair with him—that you had reported him to Toronto?"

"I never told him any such thing," was witness's reply.

Q.—Did you ever have any of your other creditors give you a roll of bills to pay off your indebtedness? A.—No.

Saturday March 9th

NEWSPAPER CHARGES REGARDING DISMISSAL DISAVOWED BY BRIEN

Published Interview "All Mixed Up," He Says—"Confidence Abused"

NEVER MET K. K. HOMUTH

Believes His Discharge Warranted by Dealings With Bootlegger

Public Accounts Committee's investigation of R. B. Brien's newspaper charges that he was dismissed from the Provincial Police force last summer through political interference with his duties and because of his zeal in enforcing the Liquor Control Act took an abrupt turn at yesterday's continuation of the Legislature inquiry.

Under a stiff examination from Hon. William Finlayson, Government representative on the committee, Brien admitted that in taking a roll of bills from Brown, a Kitchener bootlegger, to pay a note in the latter's favor, he had done enough to warrant his dismissal; that he had no complaint to make about the official disposal of the Conestoga road-opening incident except that he had been "censured" from Toronto headquarters; that the Toronto Star reporter who quoted him, in an interview, as saying the beer seized at the Blair Street dance belonged to a Conservative member of Parliament had got "all mixed up" and had "abused his confidence"—and that at no time during his Waterloo County work had he ever conversed with Karl K. Homuth, M.P.P.

Ample Warnings Given.

From Inspector Edward Rae, officer in charge of the Kitchener post, the committee had evidence of the ample warnings Brien had been given to pay his debts; of the incident in Commissioner Williams's office when Brien was allowed to resign, rather than be dismissed, in order that he might more easily secure new employment; and of intercession on his part that saved the man from being "fired" months earlier than he actually was struck off the force.

Rae swore that there was no political interference behind his return of the Schneider liquor permit in the Conestoga affair; that the case was so purely "local" that he never even reported it to Toronto; that Brien, by his failure to act as the law provides, lost any chance he may have had to secure evidence for a prosecution in the Blair incident; and that at the time he did not even know Mr. Homuth or W. C. Welchel, M.P.P., whose names, it is

alleged, have been bandied about the country as "pulling him off the case."

Evidence on the Exchange Hotel incident, at Wellesley, was also furnished by the Inspector, and took a similar trend.

Flare-ups between examiners, which characterized the opening of the inquiry last Wednesday, were conspicuously absent yesterday. The committee will sit again next Tuesday morning. Brien was permitted to go to his home, subject to recall for the purpose of re-examination by Liberal Leader Sinclair if the occasion arises.