

1894

Police Investigation

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, SEPT. 23.

NOW FOR THE REVELATIONS

The Police Investigation Committee Organized.

COUNSEL TO BE PRESENT.

The Finance Committee Votes \$500 to the American Public Health Association—St. Lambert Hill Extension.

The civic committee appointed to investigate the administration of the police force commenced its labors yesterday forenoon. All the members were present except Ald. Rainville. There was quite a gathering of interested spectators, among them being the Mayor, Ald. Penny, Jacques and Renault, Mr. A. W. Atwater, Mr. J. H. Carson, Superintendent of Police Hughes and others.

When the members took their seats, Ald. McBride moved that Ald. Prefontaine take the chair.

"Only temporarily," said Ald. Prefontaine, as he seated himself in the big arm-chair, "as I expect another member will be chosen."

Ald. Brunet then moved that Ald. Rainville (who was absent) be appointed permanent chairman. This was agreed to.

Mr. David, city clerk, then read the extract of the City council authorizing the committee to conduct the investigation.

Ald. McBride said that he wanted it plainly understood that they were going to enquire into the administration of the police. "And now, Mr. Chairman, I want to know if citizens will be allowed representation by counsel?"

"I see no objection," replied Ald. Prefontaine.

"I want it entered in the minutes so as to save trouble later on," said Ald. McBride.

"I think it would be better to wait and see what charges are made before we bind ourselves, and then we will see how to conduct ourselves," said Ald. Prefontaine.

"Will they be allowed to have counsel?" again asked Ald. McBride.

"No doubt about it," answered the chairman.

"This committee has been accused already, and I feel it keenly. I want it to be known that we are in earnest," remarked Ald. McBride.

Ald. Farrell explained that, although his name had been used as seconder of the motion for the committee of investigation, he had nothing whatever to do with the formation of the committee.

"Another thing, Mr. Chairman," said Ald. McBride, "a statement has been made in the papers that we are going to meet in private. That is not true?"

"Well, whoever made that statement will see that it is wrong," replied Ald. Prefontaine.

Ald. Smith entered at this point, took his seat, and stated that he wanted the investigation conducted on as broad lines as possible. Also that citizens be allowed to attend and be represented by counsel. Let them investigate in a business and thorough manner. He also added that he had yielded to the pressure brought upon him and had consented to sit.

Ald. McBride then got it entered in the minute book that citizens wishing to appear could be represented by counsel.

The chairman then read the draft of the advertisement which is to be published in the newspapers. They were authorized first to look into the administration of the police force, and, secondly, to enquire into any accusations which might be made against any member of the force. So far as the administration of the force was concerned that was not an accusation. If any serious charge was brought against any officer the committee would decide whether there was reason for an investigation or not.

Mr. A. W. Atwater said that he appeared on behalf of a committee of citizens which was in process of formation. That committee wished to assist them in making a thorough investigation. The committee might so word their advertisement that they might take the form of asking for information as well as specific charges into the workings of the administration. Let it be broad and thorough if they were in earnest to reform the force, and to accomplish this let the fullest information be asked for.

Ald. Prefontaine said that it would be charges or information.

Ald. McBride stated that the original motion said "charges which have been made or may be laid before the committee."

The motion was changed accordingly, Ald. Prefontaine remarked that it was going further than the original motion.

Ald. McBride remarked that they would get all the funds necessary to carry on the investigation. This was a safe remark, seeing that there are four members of the finance committee on the investigating committee, and they were all favorable to granting the necessary funds.

It was then decided to apply to the Finance committee for \$2,000.

Mr. Atwater wanted to know if no complaints would be received after the eight days specified in the advertisement, to which Ald. Prefontaine replied in the negative.

Mr. Atwater further enquired if a charge was not made in writing, but if a person came to a meeting with facts which he was prepared to substantiate, would he be heard.

He was told yes.

It was then decided to meet on Tuesday, 2nd October, at four o'clock for the hearing of evidence.

Ald. Farrell spoke about having stenographers, but Ald. Prefontaine stated that they could do nothing until they got some money.

It was also resolved to have the City Attorney attend all sittings.

Any officer or man who has a charge preferred against him is also to have the privilege of being represented by counsel.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, OCT. 3.

THERE WAS ONE COMPLAINT

At the Opening of the Police Investigation.

A QUESTION OF POWER

Whether The Committee Can Force Witnesses To Answer—The City Attorney To Be Consulted.

It was evident that there was something going on in the City hall yesterday afternoon beyond the ordinary affairs of civic government. There was a subdued excitement and an air of expectancy. As men met and clasped each others' hands, the eyes would meet in such a manner as to ask, "What will it all amount to?"

The reason for this anxiety was the opening meeting of the investigating committee into the charges against the police force generally. The council ante-chamber was crowded with eager citizens, aldermen and officials. The room was formed like a court house. Inside the bar was a space set apart for the aldermen authorized to conduct the investigation and the other members of the council. Then there were places set apart for the lawyers engaged and for the members of the press.

Ald. Rainville occupied the chair and the other members of the committee present were Ald. Farrell, Smith, Prefontaine, Robert, McBride and Brunet. There were also present Mayor Villeneuve, Ald. Lyall, Dupre, Stevenson, Hurtubise, Nolan, Penny, Prenovau, Costigan, Savignac, Bonassolai, Renault and Grothe, Messrs. J. N. Greenhalgh, O. C. A. W. Atwater, R. C. Smith, Marchal, E. J. Bissell, H. Stanley Weir, R. B. Ames, J. Israel Tarte, M. P. J. H. Carson, J. R. Bourdoin, Wm. Cunningham, Jas. Cochrane, M. Nolan de Lisle, Superintendent of Police Hughes, Chief Detective Cullen and several other officers of the force.

The first question was that of appointing a secretary, and on the motion of Ald. Smith Mr. René Bauset was unanimously appointed.

The next business was that of appointing stenographers, and Mr. F. Gelinac was appointed for the French and Mr. H. S. Stafford for the English evidence.

Next came the reading of the following communication:—

MONTREAL, September 25, 1894.

To the Chairman and Members Police Investigating Committee, City of Montreal:

GENTLEMEN.—The necessity for security to life and property and a firm and just execution of the criminal laws in the interests of society, makes it imperative that the police organization of the city should command public confidence. To this end upon occasions like the present it becomes a matter of supreme importance that the working method employed in handling the force and the acts and modes of procedure of the members of the force should be of such a character as to bear the fullest scrutiny. In this connection we venture to express the hope that your committee will permit citizens and counsel at the forthcoming investigation to so enquire into all matters pertaining to the discipline and general conduct of all connected with the police organization of this city, that we, as taxpayers, may feel when the investigation is closed that your committee has permitted no obstacle to be placed in the way of a strict, unrestricted and thoroughly conclusive enquiry, to the end that abuses, if any, may be removed and public confidence restored.

Signed—Messrs. L. B. Morin, Lalang & Lallang, Duchesneau, Duchesneau & Co., N. Quintal et Fils, Hudon & Orsall, G. Boivin & Co., Z. Lapierre & Co., D. Masson & Co., Charles Laquille & Co., L. A. Boivin, P. P.

Martin, J. Groulx, H. Barbeau, J. C. Anger, J. Bouchard, J. O. Gravel, J. Barbeau, C. G. Bouchard, Gustave Gravel, F. Phaneuf, A. C. Thibault, S. A. de Lorimier, Arthur Prevost, A. Lavoie, J. B. A. Martin, J. A. Bouchard, J. H. Leclair, Edmond F. Daniel, C. N. Benoit, M. Harsoul, John J. McGill, W. J. Wital, M. Gaudet, Simpson, A. F. Gault, J. Johnston, Skelton Bros. & Co., James Gauthier, James Baylis & Son, Thomas May & Co., S. Greenshields, Son & Co., James Johnston & Co., J. Y. Gilmour & Co., and Lyman, Sons & Co.

The minutes of the council having been read, the chairman said that they were ready to go ahead. There was no far

ONLY ONE COMPLAINT RECEIVED.

Mr. J. N. Greenshields said that he was there with other counsel ready to assist the committee, but he desired to find out the mode of procedure to be adopted by the committee.

The chairman answered that the committee had not discussed that point yet, but they were ready to hear complaints. Mr. Greenshields replied that he understood that the committee was to hear complaints and grievances under oath, and if that were so he saw no reason why they should not proceed.

Ald. Prefontaine understood that they were to proceed on the complaints laid before them, whether written or otherwise. As to the verbal ones, the committee would decide whether they would be entertained or not.

Mr. Weir stated that he represented a number of citizens irrespective of the other counsel, and wished to see justice rendered to all. The mere question of hearing complaints did not fully imply all. As he understood the matter, it was to enquire into the workings of the force and institute

A GENERAL ENQUIRY

into the administration of the police. He asked for an indication of the course as to the line of procedure the committee intended to follow. They should make a general enquiry, as well as hearing complaints.

The chairman stated that their duty was to enquire into the personal accusations against the officers and men of the force, and those having complaints lodged against them should have a chance to be present, as it would not be well to accuse people in their absence. The citizens should lay their complaints before the committee and also state what branch of the force they accused.

Mr. Weir thought that they should first enquire into the general working of the department and then take up the formal complaints later.

Ald. Smith held that they were appointed to enquire into the workings of the force in the broadest sense of the word. They were not there to condemn or cut off the heads of any of the force without a fair trial. He was in favor of having those accused present, and being informed of the charges laid against them; it was due to all. They had nothing to hide, and everything should be above board. He denied that this was a question of persecution on the part of the English, as on the face of it he understood that the head of the police force was an Englishman. He hoped none would be so narrow-minded as to think that it was a race cry.

Ald. Prefontaine read the motion of the City Council, which was first to enquire into the

COMPLAINTS IN WRITING

or otherwise against officers or men on the force, and, secondly, on the complaints against the administration of the department and any remedies which may be suggested.

Mr. Smith was in favor of a general investigation first.

Mr. Bissailon represented the police force. He wanted the committee before investigating the charges that these be laid before them in writing, so that the police would know how to act in self-defense.

Mr. Greenshields wanted a general investigation into the department, and further into the management of the force. It was not so much a matter of what this or that man had done, but the question of a thorough investigation into the workings of the whole and not so much as personal charges. If any personal charges should be made afterwards then let that individual be notified. They insisted on hearing witnesses which may be produced. They would be ready at

the next meeting with witnesses to go on into the charges against the detective force. There were more important matters before them than petty charges. They were not present as public prosecutors against any one man, but on behalf of the citizens who desired an enquiry.

Ald. McBride moved to go on with the enquiry into the general administration of the force.

A QUESTION OF THEIR POWERS.

The chairman said that he would like to know from the City Attorney if they had power to examine witnesses under oath and commit the same for refusing to answer questions. If a witness refused to answer what was to be done?

Mr. Greenshields admitted that it was a serious matter, and he would like to have it settled to avoid any trouble in the future.

The chairman remarked that their powers were limited.

Mr. Greenshields stated plainly that they were empowered to enquire into charges against the force if they were made in writing, verbally, or by witnesses in the witness box.

Mr. Weir maintained that a general charge had been made, and it was now for them to enquire into any which may be laid before them. There was one of inefficiency against the force.

The Chairman—"But we have none." Mr. Weir—"I now make one of inefficiency, and having done so, you cannot stultify yourself in this way after inviting citizens to come with charges."

The Chairman—"If we have not the necessary power to force witnesses to answer I am willing to go back to the council and ask for such powers."

Mr. Weir—"I want a general investigation."

Ald. Robert—"Do you make that a charge?"

"I do," answered Mr. Weir, amid some laughter.

Mr. Bissailon claimed that they could not proceed on a general charge. They must be specified.

Mr. Atwater held that the committee had power to make a very full investigation into

THE WORKINGS OF THE FORCE.

The committee had not been appointed by the public, but by the council at the request of the police themselves, and they, on behalf of several citizens, were present to assist the committee in their labors. The minutes of the council authorized them to go into the charges which had been made or may be made. And was the committee going to report to council that no charges had been made? Why, charges had been in everybody's mouth for the past six months. Let them go into the administration of the whole force.

Mr. Smith, after reading the preamble of the resolution, said in the face of the demand of the citizens it would not, he said, tend to restore confidence in the committee was going to confine themselves to particular charges and restricting counsel to legal questions. Those they represented had large interests in the city and their desire was to clear the force of the insinuations made against it. Considering that the committee was composed of aldermen they should see that the enquiry was of the broadest character possible.

Mr. Bissailon again asked for specific charges to be made. The chairman had a perfect right to find out if he could commit witnesses for refusing to answer under oath.

COMPLAINTS WANTED.

The chairman stated that if no citizen appeared to lay a complaint then the matter ended so far as they were concerned. Then they could proceed to enquire into the administration of the force. He suggested an adjournment until the City Attorney's opinion could be had on the point he had raised.

Ald. McBride said that he understood the City Attorney was to be present at their meetings.

Ald. Prefontaine considered that most of the charges had been made more particularly against personal members rather than into the administration of the force. They ought to know if the character of the officers and men was to be impeached.

Ald. Smith understood that they were to go into the workings and charges against the department.

Mr. Greenshields held that if there was any doubt about the point raised by the chairman they had better consult the City Attorney, and if the motion was not sufficiently broad enough to condemn witnesses then they should get it. There was no use in wasting time.

Ald. Prefontaine held that they had power and a right to proceed into the charges against the officers and let them do so.

Both Ald. McBride and Mr. Greenshields wanted to have the powers properly fixed so that there would not be any misunderstanding.

Ald. Smith was of the opinion that they had the power according to the resolution.

Ald. Prefontaine said that there was nothing but insinuations.

What were the charges? Let them know what they were. He admitted that there was room for improvement in some branches. They wanted to know the reliability of the insinuations.

In answer to Ald. McBride, the chairman said that he had doubts in his mind if he could commit witnesses for refusing to answer.

Ald. McBride then moved to adjourn until Monday to receive the opinion of the City Council.

Ald. Prefontaine again said that they had power to enquire into the police force.

Mr. Smith said that it was not right to call upon people to make specific accusations.

The chairman wanted to know if there were any particular complaints.

The Mayor read the Chief of Police's letter asking for an investigation.

"We all want it," came from many throats.

Mr. Greenshields supposed that so long as the committee was in session that charges could be made.

All understood this, and Ald. Prefontaine wanted to go on with the charges. If they did not make a beginning it would be the same at all their meetings.

Ald. Smith wanted to know why they should not take up the

charges against the detective force, but Ald. Brunet thought all the charges should be laid before the committee first.

"There is nothing private in this," said one member.

Ald. Prefontaine then moved to take up first the verbal or other complaints against the force, and, secondly, to consider the complaints against the administration of the force.

Ald. Smith did not want any hard and fast lines laid down.

Ald. Prefontaine wanted to establish whether there were any complaints or not. None of the members of the committee would dare to stand in the way of a thorough enquiry. Surely the citizens must know what they wanted. Was the force entitled to all the dirt which had been thrown at it?

Mr. Greenshields was willing to accept Ald. Prefontaine's motion provided it would stand good from day to day, but if it was not to be interpreted in that light then the time for

making personal charges would be closed. This would be manifestly unjust to the public.

Ald. Prefontaine stated that it was not his intention to put on a foreclosure; he did not want to bind themselves. Both Ald. Farrell and Smith asked that Ald. Prefontaine's motion stand good from day to day.

Mr. Bissailon said that if the charges were not ready they could go on for six months if necessary.

The chairman expressed his willingness to accept Ald. Prefontaine's proposition provided that citizens would not be debarred from making charges during their sittings. If any came up let them be heard. It would be a good thing for the credit of the city if no charges were made.

Ald. Prefontaine was altering his motion and remarked: "If this had been in the council I could have fixed it an hour ago, but there are too many lawyers watching me."

Cries of "Oh, oh, oh," and laughter.

Mr. Greenshields held that the upshot of the motion meant that if they concurred in it was that they would not take any further evidence, and Mr. Smith added that it was a question of a foreclosure.

"If so we are at the mercy of the committee," said Mr. Greenshields.

"Yes, you are at the mercy of the committee," replied Ald. Prefontaine, laughingly.

"We are sent here by the council to do our duty," remarked Ald. McBride.

"Yes, but we are not going to be dictated to," replied Ald. Prefontaine.

"We are not going to dictate to you, but only to assist you," answered Mr. Smith.

"There is quite a possibility that some citizens might make some charges against the Police committee," said Mr. Weir, to the surprise of many.

"What's that?" asked Ald. Robert.

"Well, we will insist on charges."

"If you go into the Police committee," added the chairman, "you may have to go into the City Council, as the Police committee is composed of members of that body."

"Are you trying to depart from the general resolution of the council by adopting the new one?" queried Mr. Greenshields.

"Even if you do it it cannot change the resolution or the instructions of the council, as that would not be allowed," answered Ald. Prefontaine.

Ald. Smith wanted to go on with the specific or personal charges and then go on with the general charges into the administration of the force and the efficiency of the department.

THE WANTED SYSTEM.

Ald. Prefontaine did not want to be called upon to listen to mixed charges. Let them adopt a system and go ahead, so long as there were charges.

The vote was called on Ald. Prefontaine's motion, with the following result: For—Ald. Brunet, Robert and Prefontaine—3.

Against—Ald. Farrell, Smith and McBride—3.

The chairman gave his casting vote in favor of the motion.

Then charges were called for, and the secretary read one from a man in Worcester, Mass., against a detective.

The accused was not present, and he is to be asked to come along with his accusations.

"Next," said Ald. McBride, "lay it on the table until he comes. That's the first blood." (Loud laughter.)

The committee then adjourned until the 10th instant at 4 o'clock, to enable the chairman to consult the City Attorney on his (the chairman's) power to commit a witness if he refuses to answer.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, THURSDAY, OCT. 11.

WITNESS FROM WORCESTER.

Mr. Brazeau Testifies at the Police Investigation.

A QUESTION OF POWER

Again Crops Up Over the Proposal to Examine Judge Dugas—Referred to the Council.

There was a flutter of excitement around the City hall yesterday afternoon which even the heavy rain pelting on the windows did not dampen. There was a large gathering of aldermen, lawyers, citizens and officials of the Police department. Counsel and citizen could be seen conversing, and counsel and aldermen all had their little say before the proceedings opened.

The surprise of the day was the appearance of Mr. Brazeau, of Worcester, Mass., who at the opening sitting sent in a written charge against some of the detectives. He was written to and asked to come along and back up his assertions under oath. No one at the City hall was aware of the fact that the man was in town until Mr. R. C. Smith informed the committee that he was.

"Ah," said Ald. Prefontaine, clapping his hands, "Now we will begin." And they did, with all eyes turned in the direction of Brazeau. It was precisely a quarter after four o'clock when the proceedings opened.

There were present Ald. Rainville, chairman; Ald. Prefontaine, Robert, Brunet, Farrell, McBride and Smith; Mayor Villeneuve, Judge Dugas, Ald. Lyall, Penny, Grothe, Jacques and Renaud; Messrs. J. N. Greenshields, Q.C.; R. C. Smith, A. W. Atwater, R. Stanley Weir, C. A. Geoffrion, Q.C.; F. J. Bissailon, Q.C.; L. J. Ethier, Q.C., joint city attorney; J. R. Duggan, J. E. Carson, H. B. Ames, Chief Hughes, Chief Detective Cullen and several other officers.

After the reading of the minutes of the last meeting the chairman said that they had written to Mr. E. L. Brazeau, of Worcester, Mass., who had made a specific charge against some members of the detective force, but no reply had been received from him.

WANTED TO CALL JUDGE DUGAS.

Mr. Greenshields asked, before going any further, permission to call Judge Dugas, who was present and was willing to give his opinion on the general efficiency of the detective force.

The chairman thought that they had better hear the opinion of the City Attorney, and he called upon Mr. Ethier to give that opinion.

Mr. Ethier said that in order to arrive at a practical conclusion, they had been guided by precedent in an investigation which took place some years ago, and was presided over by the late Hon. Sir John Abbott. They had had before them all the papers, and especially the minutes, connected with that investigation, and, although they had also consulted other proceedings, they had not found anything clearer than what appeared in the minutes of the investigation referred to.

After considering the wording of the resolution passed by the City Council in connection with the present enquiry, they (the City Attorneys) were of opinion that the powers conferred upon the committee were exclusively confined to

INVESTIGATING THE CHARGES

which have already been made, or which may be made in the future against any individual member of the force. If the committee wanted to go any further they would have to go back to the City Council and get the necessary authority. As to the method of procedure, what had been decided upon at the last meeting was perfectly regular, and it was exactly the kind of procedure they were called upon to follow. Dr. Bourinot was consulted at the time of the investigation presided over by the late Hon. Mr. Abbott, and his opinion agreed with that of Mr. Abbott. Consequently they (the city attorneys) thought they had good precedent for saying that an investigation carried out on these lines would be properly conducted. The charges must be specific.

Mr. Greenshields—in view of the opinion which the City Attorney has now given, are you prepared to hear witnesses on the general charge of incompetency, or only to investigate the police system and the detective force of the city?

The chairman said that, according to the opinion of the City Attorney, the charges must be specific. However, if it was the wish of the committee, he had no objection to the City Council being asked to grant them further powers.

Mr. Greenshields said that what the citizens were most concerned in was that the committee should conduct a general investigation into the

administration of the police force and the detective system. The question of the personal charges against any individual member became of secondary importance in face of the feeling there now was in the public mind.

In consequence of the burglaries and the thieving that had been going on, the citizens believed, rightly or wrongly, that the detective system was not properly administered, and that

it was bad. That was the point they wished to have investigated more particularly, and now, at the third meeting, they were told that the charges must be specific. The reason that the Chief of Police asked for the investigation was that charges were being made against him and his system. Now the committee said that they had no power to hear charges. He had asked Judge Dugas to be present that day, and His Honor was ready to express his opinion as to whether the police force, and the detective force in particular, was effective in protecting the lives and the property of citizens. Now, to the astonishment of everybody, they were told that the committee were unable to hear witnesses on that question. It was hoped at the last meeting that the committee would have got the power to do this, and would have been ready to proceed that day. They were there that day, and were unable to do a single thing, simply because the committee had not power to do the work that the citizens expected it to do, and for the performance of which it was created.

WANTED FURTHER POWERS.

The chairman said that if anybody wished to make a specific charge, it would be his duty to swear him, but he could not go beyond the power delegated to him by the council. In view of the opinion of the City Attorney, he did not see that they could do anything else than go back to the council and ask for further powers.

Ald. Prefontaine—"Let us put the matter in such a shape that there will be no difficulty later on."

Mr. R. C. Smith wished to know if the City Attorney's opinion was that the committee had full power to investigate any charges made in the newspapers.

Mr. Ethier—"No, no."

Ald. Prefontaine—"The papers change their opinions every day."

Mr. R. C. Smith thought that, while it was of the utmost importance to have the powers of the committee fully defined, if it refused to hear the evidence of such a person as Judge Dugas, the impression made upon the public mind would not be a favorable one. The judge should be heard upon the general charge of incompetency of the police and detective forces.

The Chairman—"I am willing to hear him, if the committee desire; but I won't swear him, as I have no power to do so."

Mr. Weir said there could only be a feeling of regret that the committee had not the power which had been hoped for. It was better, however, to make a right beginning, and after the opinion of the City Attorney, the only course for the committee was to go back to the council and get further powers. In asking for such powers, he hoped that they would not confound themselves to the general administration of the Police department, but would also ask for power to determine in what respects the department could be improved. It would be of little avail if they were to discover that Augean stables existed, and they had not the power to cleanse them. He strongly urged that the power asked for by the committee should be broad enough to enable them to hear suggestions for

REMOVING ANY DEFECTS

which might be found to exist in either the police or the detective force.

Ald. Robert—"Broad enough to suit you alone."

Ald. Smith thought that as Judge Dugas had been good enough to be present, there could be no possible objections to hearing what he had to say. The committee had better make a beginning. If the judge was not going to make any specific charges, where was the necessity of his giving his testimony under oath?

It was thought better, however, in view of the City Attorney's opinion, not to hear the judge.

Ald. McBride asked the chairman if he had received any specific charges.

The chairman said that one had been received at the last meeting from Mr. Brazeau, of Worcester, Mass. That gentleman had since been written to, but no reply had been received.

Mr. R. C. Smith—"Well, he is here."

MR. BRAZEAU'S ALLEGATIONS.

Some of the members rubbed their hands, remarking, "Ah! now we will begin," and everybody got on the tip-toe of expectation as Mr. Brazeau took the

stand. He gave his evidence in French, testifying to the effect that whilst he was on a visit to Montreal he was robbed, on the 9th of June last, of \$350. He was drunk at the time, and was in the company of two men named Dunham and Malone. When he discovered his loss he told Detective Trempe about it, and on the following Monday, when he was again at the detective's office, he was introduced to Detective Arcand, to whom he also told his story. Arcand told him to go back on the following day, as he was then too busy to attend to the matter, having a robbery case on in the Police court. Witness went to the detective's office next day, and Arcand turned up under the influence of liquor. Arcand addressed himself to the secretary, Mr. Lamouche, and said that there was nothing to do. Witness then saw Mr. Dorion, advocate, who went with him to the detective's office. On the 20th June he obtained warrants for the arrest of Dunham and Malone, who were in the city for, at least, a week longer.

Mr. Bisillon then commenced to cross-examine the witness, and soon began to question him as to his conduct during the three or four days previous to the robbery, with a view to showing that he had been drinking heavily. When, however, he asked the witness where he had slept on the night immediately preceding the robbery, and whether he had passed a restless or a sleepless night, Mr. R. C. Smith objected on the ground that the question was

NOT PERTINENT TO THE MATTER under consideration. Mr. Greenshields also objected, but the question was repeated, witness replying that he passed a restless night.

Ald. Smith wished it to be understood that witnesses must not be subjected to any "bulldozing." If the committee was going to allow any lawyer to go there and bark the enquiry by going back into a man's character for years past, people would not come forward to give evidence. They ought to be obliged to Mr. Brazeau for coming forward, and they should protect him. He strongly protested against the manner in which the witness was being handled.

Ald. McBride thought witnesses should understand that any question not bearing on the case need not be answered.

Mr. Geoffrion objected to the remark about "bulldozing," and said that the advocates in the case had a duty to perform. Two detectives, who were citizens, had been accused, and he would like to know if any member of that committee, under similar circumstances, would very much object to the person who accused them being cross-examined.

Ald. McBride said that persons in the witness box should be protected.

Ald. Prefontaine said that witnesses would be protected, but they had got to stand cross-examination.

Mr. Bisillon then resumed his cross-examination of the witness, who said he did not tell the Chief of Police that Arcand was drunk. He did not know where he was robbed; in fact, he was too drunk at the time to know that he was robbed, and it was only after awaking from a sleep on Victoria square that he found out his loss. When he told Detective Trempe of the robbery he was just getting over his drink. He did not give Trempe the names of the persons with whom he had been, as he did not remember them. Before he was robbed he drank liquor at two places where it was

SOLD WITHOUT A LICENSE, and he thought that the last glass he had was dugged. He had the liquor at the house of a man named Pelletier, on St. Paul street, and at Dunham's place. Dunham was subsequently arrested on a warrant; but when this happened Malone had left the city. Arcand went with him to see Mr. Dorion. Arcand told witness that if he liked to lay a charge against Pelletier and Dunham for selling liquor without a license, he could do so.

By Ald. Prefontaine—He had no complaint to make against the detectives before he did not think that they were active enough in securing the arrest of criminals.

This concluded the witness' evidence, and Ald. Rainville moved a resolution to the effect that, by reason of the power conferred upon them by the City Council, the committee had invited citizens to lay charges against the police; that one charge was made, upon which the committee would report later; that certain citizens had expressed to the committee

a desire to have a general investigation into the administration of the Police department, and particularly in connection with the detective force, in order to discover any defects that might exist and to receive suggestions as to desirable improvements; therefore the committee suggested that their powers, which were now restricted to the examination of specific charges by the resolution of the council, by virtue of which the committee was constituted, be extended so as to allow them to enquire into the general administration of police affairs.

Ald. Smith moved: That the City Attorney be instructed to prepare the necessary resolution to be passed by the City Council sufficient to confer powers on this committee to hold a thorough investigation into the general working or administration of the police and detective forces, in addition to the powers already conferred upon it.

Ald. Rainville's motion was adopted and the committee adjourned until Tuesday afternoon at 4 o'clock.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, OCT. 17

THERE'S A LACK OF SYSTEM.

Judge Dugas Says This of the Detective Department.

ARE PETTY JEALOUSIES,

Which Interfere With the Working of the Force—No Means of Identification—No Specimens of Their Difficulties.

The Police Investigation committee again met for a couple of hours yesterday afternoon, when Judge Dugas gave his opinion on the administration and efficiency of the detective force. The chairman of the committee, Ald. Rainville, presided, and the other members in attendance were Ald. Farrell, Prefontaine, Robert, McBride and Smith. The counsel present were Messrs. J. N. Greenshields, Q.C.; A. W. Atwater, L. T. Marchal, R. C. Smith and R. Stanley Weir, representing citizens, and Donald Macmaster, Q.C.; C. A. Geoffrion, Q.C., and F. J. Bisillon, Q.C., who were present on behalf of the police and the detectives.

Mr. Bisillon asked permission to call witnesses to contradict the statement made by the witness Brazeau at the last sitting of the committee, about Detective Arcand being drunk.

Mr. Greenshields asked that Judge Dugas, who was present, be sworn.

Mr. Stanley Weir asked leave to examine the Superintendent of Police at an early date. If there were to be a departmental investigation, all the departmental officers should be examined, and he knew of no one with whom a better beginning could be made than with Superintendent Hughes. He, therefore, desired to have an opportunity at either that session or the next of examining him.

The Chairman—Oh, certainly. Ald. Prefontaine—We will take upon ourselves to examine him, sure.

Judge Dugas was then sworn, and was examined by Mr. Greenshields. He said that he had been Judge of Sessions for the past sixteen years, and in that capacity he had come a great deal in contact with the detective force of the city. He had formed an opinion as to its efficiency and whether it was properly managed and officered.

Mr. Greenshields—Well, now, would you give us your opinion of the detective system as it exists here in the city of Montreal, based upon your experience?

The witness replied in substance as follows:—I wish it to be understood that whatever I say is only a matter of opinion based on experience, and is subject to modification. As I have to begin with something, I will mention that the first fault which I find is with the rules

which are given to the detectives; they are

NOT SUFFICIENTLY CLEAR, not sufficiently private. All classes of society may have complaints to make to the detectives; not only gentlemen, but ladies of the highest rank, and in the way matters stand now there is no doubt there is, and always will be, a great hesitation on the part of those who have complaints to make, and of ladies more particularly, to approach such a local. As to the detective force or the detectives themselves, I think I can safely say that there is a complete lack of system. Some of them have been there for a long time—good men, perhaps, but keeping too much to the old system, forgetting that the district of Montreal has been enlarging to a very great extent, and more particularly the city of Montreal. This is the centre of the Dominion, where a great number of travellers pass through, and where a great number of criminals belonging to other countries gather. What was good twenty-five or thirty years ago is no more good now; it cannot meet the needs of the situation. One of the faults which I have found with detectives generally is that

SECURITY IS NOT KEPT WELL.

enough; there seems to be too much anxiety to let the press and public know of their doings. The same reproach could be made regarding those who have complaints to make, and more particularly could it be made regarding the press, which never misses an opportunity whenever it can to let criminals see that their arrest is contemplated and know of the doings of the police to effect their arrest. There should be a book, kept strictly private, and to which the detectives and the police authorities only should have access, in which all complaints made at the office, with details and information, should be entered. If one or more detectives are charged specially with a case, a written report of their doings should be made at least every day, and should be continued until an order is given from the proper authorities to abandon any more active service. Active pursuit of criminals who escape for a certain time is too quickly abandoned. Sometimes three or four parties may be suspected of a crime, and if one or two of them are arrested, a lookout for the others is maintained for a certain length of time, and then they seemed to be entirely forgotten; so that after, say, six or twelve months, they can return safely enough—I won't say always—into our midst without being arrested. It should be an imperative duty for each detective to hold to the search and arrest all criminals, even when not in charge of the case. They should work in a common interest, and

ALL SPIRIT OF JEALOUSY should be excluded. All indiscretions committed should be severely punished.

There has been too much of this jealousy, and I think there are instances where a detective would permit a criminal to escape rather than help a colleague specially charged with the case by giving him information which would lead to the arrest. It happens too often that the detectives don't work in harmony; at all events it is the experience that when somebody is in charge of a case the others will remain in the background, instead of giving any information they may possess. Disguises are completely ignored in the force. Each detective should be enabled to disguise himself, and the Government or the city should pay the expenses incurred for that purpose. We should do like is done in all well regulated detective forces in Europe and the United States. It can easily be understood that disguises are a great thing. Detectives in a great city like ours, who have been on the force a few years, are known by all the thieves, and I might say by everybody. There are cases of daily occurrence in which detectives should be disguised. When arrests are made on sight for any breach of the peace, in which several persons are concerned, it happens too often that

THE REALLY GUILTY PARTIES ESCAPE.

Take a fight, for instance, in which two or three are engaged. Passers-by will approach to see what is going on, and whilst they are doing so a constable approaches, whereupon those who were fighting will fly as quickly as possible, and those who were passing by and remained there are arrested. The same thing happens when a thief gets a man

to go and sell stolen goods for him. He pauses on the street and meets a fool, and gets him to go into a bric-a-brac shop, whilst he remains outside looking for the detective. Suddenly he sees a constable coming, and flies, whilst the other person remains in the shop and, being in possession of the stolen goods, he is arrested and goes for trial. These are very great difficulties for the detectives.

I mention the matter as it happens very often. The detectives know it themselves. It will be for somebody else to find which is the best way of preventing these things. As to arresting on sight, I may say that there are more irregularities or illegalities committed by the detectives than anyone else. It is due to the detectives to say that they expose themselves a great deal, and not one of them lacks courage or will hesitate to expose himself to an action for damages or dismissal for a false arrest. I have told them myself very often. "You should not do that; let the parties interested come and lodge their information in a regular way. Be armed with your warrant that you may act." But in their zeal they do make arrests which, being made without a warrant, are illegal. When the party is brought before the judge the thing is legalized, because some information is given. The position of a constable or a detective is very difficult when an arrest without a warrant has to be made. Very often if he does not act he is blamed, whilst if he does act he is very often exposed to severe criticism, and if the law is not very clear, possibly he has the alternative of being sued, and soiling the courts, after great hesitation, deliberation and study, declared his action illegal, the poor constable has to act spontaneously, without either having time to reflect or to take advice. Great difficulty arises as to what they have to do when a fight or the like takes place in a house. They have been blamed for not acting; but in this I think

THEY ACT PRUDENTLY, as is shown by a judgment in the Superior court. Printed instructions should be furnished to the detectives and the constables.

The system of identification of criminals which exists here, but only on a very small scale, is insufficient. Montreal is in this matter in the very backward ground and in a very backward state, compared with places of less importance in the Dominion. The identification of persons is of great importance, not only in protecting the public against professional criminals who periodically appear in our midst, but also for the good administration of justice and for the information of the courts, which, when passing sentence, must take into consideration the past conduct of the culprits. It is sometimes important to the criminals themselves that identification should be perfectly established. I could cite instances where the courts have been wrongly informed, and heavier sentences have, in consequence, been passed than if the information given to the court had been correct. I have a report about one Kearns, who was said to have been either sent to the jail or the penitentiary no fewer than five times.

A GOOD CASE IN POINT.

In the report of the jailer, which was before the court at the time Kearns was last sentenced, appeared the name of a man named Kearns, who had the same baptismal name as the prisoner, and who was said to have been either imprisoned or sent to the penitentiary five times. He had committed a burglary in company with another person; but as the latter had only been convicted once before, I committed him for three years to the penitentiary and Kearns for five. Kearns has since protested very strongly, and I find that he had not been sentenced before. If I had known the real facts, I, perhaps, should only have sent him to jail.

Mr. Macmaster—You will recommend him to mercy.

Witness—I have written a letter. Ald. Prefontaine—Lucky you didn't hang him.

Witness, continuing, said: For my part, I think that courts of justice generally do not punish ardent criminals, professional thieves, with sufficient severity. Whatever may be done for them they will always be ready to plunder as soon as they are set at liberty. I have noticed on the part of constables generally much willingness to help, as far as

the magistrates are concerned. Still it has happened that sergeants and other officers in charge of stations have refused to obey the orders given by judges, alleging as their reason that, being municipal officers, they have to receive their orders from either the Chief of Police or the Mayor only, and this even concerning persons falling immediately within our jurisdiction. The reason is, as far as I am able to judge, that

A CERTAIN ANTAGONISM

seems to have existed between the municipal officers and the Government officers directly in regard to our criminals. It is in view of this, to a certain extent, that I have always urged a change of system, as far as the detectives are concerned, as since they work exclusively on cases which come before the criminal courts—Court of Queen's Bench, Sessions, Police court—they should be controlled by these courts. I have made frequent representations to the various governments that we had no detectives at our disposal, and that there should be some understanding between the Government and the municipal authorities whereby the detectives could be put under our control. Whenever a detective has to be sent outside the city limits a great deal of red tape is necessarily involved. The appointment of Mr. Carpenter is due to such representation; but he cannot alone look after such a large district as is assigned him. I will cite a case which struck me very much at the time, and was the cause of my making strong representations, with my colleague, to the Government. A man was supposed to have been murdered at Sault-au-Recollet who had left Montreal on an excursion. The fact was well known, and I ordered the detectives to go there and enquire; but they refused, and the case was brought before me. They refused on the ground that they could not go unless they had an order from the Mayor. Whenever they think that they can go out or town without being blamed, I may say that they do it. They are very nice, and they seem to be generally and always at our disposal, provided there is nothing in the way to oppose them. I am entirely

OPPOSED TO ANY PRIVATE AGENCIES

of detectives which are not controlled, and I think the sooner we get rid of those which do exist the better. There are cases, if I am well informed, of such private agencies having been retained by ecclesiastical parties of working in their interests.

Something should also be done towards controlling all petty constables, who have been nominated by the numerous justices of the peace in the district. All the detectives ought to possess a certain amount of education, and they should be able to speak both languages. The fact of not speaking both languages causes great inconvenience. I have often called attention to the great evil of second-hand furniture shops. There are some which are honest; but there are some which are receivers of stolen goods. A more effective system should be devised to supervise them, for the more supervision the less crime you would see. There is nothing so difficult as to have receivers of stolen property convicted; the grand jury is generally too easily approached. A list of persons liberated from both penitentiaries should be regularly furnished to the detectives. I could go further; I would have an exchange of photographs and every means of identifying criminals exchanged, not only in Canada, but with towns in the United States, where our criminals are known generally to go. I suppose that it is within the scope of your enquiry to

ENQUIRE INTO THE IMMIGRATION

to this country; if so, I would say that in the course of the last few years we have had immigrants who are the cause of many criminals being brought before us. Again, laborers' tools should not be permitted to be bought by second-hand dealers. Look at the windows in certain streets, and you will become convinced that the majority of the tools exposed for sale there have found their way there through thieves.

A great difficulty with us is as to dealing with children. The spirit of the law is to protect them as much as possible from incarceration and even punishment when under fourteen years of age. It seems that this is well known among a certain class of children, and I am asking myself whether it is not due to this fact that more children are now brought before our courts than ever before. If

houses of prostitution are to be tolerated, and I am one of those who firmly believe that they should for the better protection of morals, they should be regulated so as to be entirely under the thumb of the police authorities. Whatever may be said to the contrary, I don't know why we should not do like the rest of the world and use them for the detection of criminals. It is a well known fact that all habitual criminals frequent these places, and I would ask that they be put in a position, in case of emergency, to call a constable without being noticed. Alcohol and the drinking of liquors is the cause of 90 per cent. of the crimes committed by grown-up persons, not professional thieves. The majority of crimes committed at night are committed in lanes that are dark as possible. I think that electric lights should be put in these places, which should be well lighted. Hotels should be compelled to keep regular books of travellers, and report whenever they are suspicious of any person. The definition of the duties of detectives should be made clear. Beereries and like small shops should be looked into.

In reply to Mr. Greenshields, the witness said that there were some persons on the detective force who ought not to be there. There were three of the detectives who did not speak French, and probably there were some who did not speak English; but, at all events, those who did not speak both languages should not be there. Apart from this, he thought there were

ONE OR TWO NOT UP TO THE MARK

as far as ability was concerned. The force was not handled and officered with any administrative ability. The lack of this would to a certain extent account for the defective condition of the force; but to his mind matters had been very much exaggerated in the public press. So far as he could judge there was no check upon how the detectives worked. There was no system; it was a lack of system. Everyone seemed to be left to his own accord. From this lack of system he believed that criminals escaped, and that the perpetrators of crimes committed here were not discovered. He did not know that the detectives had been in the habit of charging for their services other than the fees they got from the city. During sixteen years it had reached his ears, perhaps two or three times, that \$5 had been given, but not in such a way that he could do anything. The money in the cases referred to was given, not extorted. He would be opposed to a detective

RECEIVING MONEY FROM COMPLAINANTS

who had laid a charge at the office, or from any outside person whatever. If people who had been rendered a service wished to give any money, let them give it to all the men, as was done in the case of the firemen, and not behind the door. He was strongly opposed to detectives being paid by corporations or individuals for particular cases they were working upon, believing that such a system, if habitually indulged in, would detract very much from the efficiency of the force, as the tendency would be for a liberal scramble where the most money was, and the poor man would not be in a position to get justice from a force, where this system prevailed. Some people would offer money in such a way as to leave a detective in such a position that he did not know whether to accept or not. They would give it to him in the way of carter's expenses, etc. Unless this kind of thing were usual, he would not find much fault with it, as he knew how such things could be done.

By Mr. Weir—Witness did not consider the present number of detectives sufficient for the needs of the city. He did not know how they were appointed, and he did not know if they were controlled at all, beyond that Detective O'Brien was the chief.

By Mr. Geoffrion—It went without saying that if the detective force was not sufficiently manned the needs of the public could not be properly attended to.

By Mr. Atwater—During the last two or three months witness had had before him cases connected with the

LAW RELATING TO GAMBLING, and there had been two or three convictions. In some cases the proceedings were taken by the High Constable and in others by the detectives. The first cases against gamblers were taken some

Two or three years ago, and it might be that the proceedings were taken at the request of the Attorney-General.

Mr. R. C. Smith—Do you think it would be possible to obtain the services of a man sufficiently capable to act as chief of the detective force for a salary of \$800 a year?

Witness—I have seen very many intelligent men who got a less salary than that. (Laughter.) I am in favor of high salaries. (Renewed laughter.)

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, THURSDAY, OCT. 18.

CHIEF CULLEN ON THE STAND

He is Examined in Regard to His Department.

THE COMPLAINT BOOK

And How it is Kept—What Work the Detectives do—The Committee to Meet in the Evenings.

The interest in the Police investigation is still being kept up, as was evinced by the numbers who were present at the meeting yesterday afternoon.

Ald. Rainville occupied the chair. A letter was read from Mr. H. de Gallier de St. Laurent protesting against being accused as working for the Citizens' league. It was laid on the table.

Judge Dugas was on hand to undergo cross-examination, but neither Mr. Greenshields nor Mr. Bisson had any questions to ask, so His Honor took his departure.

Mr. Greenshields then asked that Chief Detective Cullen be called.

Ald. Prefontaine asked that the report of the Police committee on their enquiry into the workings of the detective force be filed. This was done by Superintendent Hughes.

Then there was some talk among the members of the committee on the advisability of holding evening sessions.

"How long will it last?" asked the chairman.

"A long time yet," replied Mr. Greenshields.

Ald. Smith was of the opinion that evening sessions would be favorable to the majority.

CHIEF DETECTIVE CULLEN EXAMINED.

It was, however, agreed to go on, and Chief Detective Cullen was sworn. He deposed that he had been chief of the detective force for about fifteen years. He had seven men under him, so that with himself there were eight detectives. His jurisdiction extended over the city. The detectives never went outside the city limits unless under an order from the Mayor or the Chief of Police, except sometimes when the interests of justice demanded it. When men went outside the city certain expenses were incurred, and the city objected to pay such expenses for the business of the province; it did not think it had a right to do so. As far as the detectives are concerned they were under his control, subject to the authority of the Chief of Police. If a serious case was reported the Chief of Police was consulted about it, and instructions were taken from him. The Chief of Police was witness' superior officer and had a right to give instructions to the detectives as well as witness. He was responsible to the Chief of Police.

Mr. Greenshields—And I suppose the Superintendent's authority extends to the formation or construction of the system on which your work is carried on?

Witness—Yes; we take all our orders and instructions from him.

Well, now, as to the detective system as it exists in Montreal to-day, is that the product of your work, or is it the joint effort of yourself and the Chief?

"The system, I claim, is nothing to be ashamed of."

"I am not asking you that at all; I am asking if this system you are not ashamed of is the work of yourself and Superintendent?"

"It is my work especially."

HE EXPLAINS THE SYSTEM.

"Now, Mr. Cullen, when a report or complaint comes in of the commission of a crime, what is done in the first place?"

"That report is taken down in a book for the purpose."

"You have a book for that purpose. Will you let me see that book? Bring in the books; bring them all."

This was done after a short delay.

Ald. Prefontaine desired to know what Mr. Greenshields wanted out of the books, general information or what, as they did not wish the contents of the book to be made public.

Mr. Greenshields did not want any information contained in the books to be given to the public.

Mr. Geoffrion objected to the books being opened and made public. His learned friend had only asked to see the books and he now saw one of them.

The Chairman—There is nothing asked about it.

"Don't get excited," said Mr. Greenshields. "We don't want the details at all; simply want to see what sort of a system of bookkeeping you have."

Witness then produced the "Report book," and, in reply to Mr. Greenshields, said that the interior was perfectly plain; there was no particular form of report. The two pages opened before him contained reports of fourteen different cases, most of them relating to small matters. The entries were made by the secretary, Mr. Lamouche, who received verbal reports from complainants and entered them in the book. When a detective was engaged upon a case he made his own report from day to day in a diary provided for the purpose. If he wanted to find out what a particular detective had done on a particular case, he would have to go through the diary to find out what his report stated, but that would not be a matter of any great length of time, as there was an index which enabled him to turn up to any page. In the "Daily roll book" each detective entered the hour at which he arrived at the office, and also the hour at which he went out on a case. In another book were entered the names of the

DETECTIVES ABSENT FROM DUTY.

the number of days they were absent and the cause of the absence. The work done by a particular detective in a particular case might be summarized under a particular number, if witness had the means of doing it. If he wanted to know what had been done in a case five years ago, and the detective had since died, so that he could not consult him, he would look through the old diary. If a man had been working for a year on a case, witness would have to go through the diary from day to day to find out what had been done in that case.

Mr. Greenshields—Now, Mr. Cullen, will you tell me to show how quickly you can get information from the books where Detective Trompe was on the 19th March.

Witness (after searching the books for a few seconds)—He was engaged on a case at Longueuil.

"Is there any record of what Trompe was doing at Longueuil?"

"He was on duty there for the Richelieu company, looking for stolen property."

"So far as your books are concerned, there is no record of what he was out for."

"There is."

"I say from your books, as you keep them, and this man made his reports, it does not appear what his duty was at Longueuil."

Witness (after looking at the book)—It does. The book says he was there with the coroner in connection with a fire at the Richelieu company's place.

"You told us a few moments ago it was in connection with a robbery, it was not a robbery."

"There was a robbery besides."

"Does he report anything of what he did there?"

"He reports he was there with the coroner; but if he did arrest a party he would have reported it."

"The books show that he was there TEN DAYS ON A CASE, but they don't show what he did."

"If he had arrested anyone, it would have been reported."

"Then there is no report. Unless he arrests somebody he does not give any information, except to merely say he was at Longueuil."

"At Longueuil on such a case."

"Is that the general system you have allowed your men to go on when they went out for ten days on any particular case?"

"If they find anything they report."

"So that in your books, unless they find something or arrest some one, there is nothing to show the particular work they did, except they were in Longueuil or on Notre Dame street or somewhere else."

"I don't see what else could be put there."

"Under whose instructions, or in what way, does a detective once charged with a case drop it?"

"He never drops it."

"They must have an awful lot on their hands now?"

"We never give them up. A case was opened fifteen years ago, and I am after it yet."

"You are liable to get it." (Laughter.)

"When a detective is once charged with a case he is always charged with it."

"Yes. I would say that the complaint book is strictly private, and neither the press nor the public has access to it, though I see that one witness has stated to the contrary."

"If a detective wanted to be off on a little holiday, he could enter that he was on such and such a case."

"Well, he could."

A CASE IN POINT.

Witness then opened the Report book indiscriminately and struck a report of a case where a lady from St. Hubert had her pocket picked. The entry simply gave the name and address of the lady, a description of the property lost—a pocket-book—and stated the amount of money it contained. There was nothing in the entry to show what was done in this particular case; but the detectives had arrested many persons for pocket-picking. No detective was put in charge of the case. In another case of pocket-picking entered in the book no detective was put in charge of it, as it would be a loss of time for a detective to go and look for a stolen purse or pocket-book.

"Well, Mr. Cullen, do I understand that when a complaint is made somebody decides whether it is worth while to try to get justice for that person or not."

"We always decide."

"So that some people may come and make a complaint, and if you don't think it worth while to look after it, they don't get justice."

"You have no right to make such an assertion."

"I understood you to say there was no attempt to recover the property, and nothing was done about it."

"I said it would be a loss of time for a detective, unless further information could be given than is given here, to look for the property. The lady could only say that her pocket book was stolen, containing so much money. There are many pickpockets about the railway stations, markets, etc., that all we could do is, if we catch one of them, to send for this lady and ascertain if she has seen him standing about at the time she lost her pocket-book."

"The case of the larceny of a banjo was then taken up, and the witness said that Detective O'Keefe was put in charge of the matter, but he

DID NOT FIND ANYTHING OUT. The book did not show particularly what he did in connection with the case. A woman living on St. Maurice street had two pillows, two quilts and two boxes containing dishes stolen. Detective Barrett investigated the case, but he did not find anything out. The book showed that at that time Barrett went to certain second-hand shops to enquire about stolen goods.

"Now, to get right down to business, you have no report whatever of what that man did in that case."

"If he had got it it would be shown."

"Had he any other larceny cases in hand at that time?"

"Oh, my, yes."

"So that report might refer to any of them?"

"Yes."

By the Chairman—The detectives did not report verbally to witness each day, apart from the report contained in the diary, what they had done in any particular case, unless it was something special. They did not tell him that they had done so and so regarding a small matter, but if there was anything serious they would.

The committee then adjourned until Tuesday night at 8 o'clock.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, OCT. 24.

RESULTS WERE NEGATIVE

In a Series of Selected Burglary Cases.

CULLEN AGAIN EXAMINED

By Mr. Greenshields—Detectives Do Not Report Recovery of Property—The Examination a Matter of Book-Keeping.

The committee appointed to enquire into the administration and efficiency of the police and detective forces resumed its duties last evening, all the members being present.

Chief Detective Cullen, who was recalled, continued his evidence, being examined by Mr. Greenshields. He deposed that since he had been chief of the detective department he had only on one occasion sent in an annual report to Superintendent Hughes, and that was about the first year that the Superintendent was put in charge. So far as he knew, that was the only report ever made. The making of that report was an idea of witness; no one suggested it to him. A record of the property recovered was not always made, because they did not always have time to do so. As chief of the detective department he had no fault to find with the personnel of the men who composed the force. When a detective recovered stolen property it was not entered in detail in any book.

Mr. Greenshields—Of course, they are all honest men, and we trust them absolutely; but it does seem to me it might be just as well to have a little check on them.

Witness was then examined regarding a certain book produced by him, the making of entries in which was said to have commenced last February.

Mr. Greenshields—Has not that book been written up since your last examination?

Witness—It has not.

"Since what time has it been written up?"

"The secretary will tell you."

"So you don't know anything about how that book was written up?"

"I know it was written up as it states."

"Do you ever have occasion to refer to that book previous to the last ten days?"

"No."

"Now, Mr. Cullen, did you ever see that book written up ten days ago?"

"I did not; that is to say, I have seen the secretary writing in it within the last ten days."

"Did you ever see the book previous to ten days ago?"

"I did."

"With writing in it?"

"Why, certainly. Why, man—"

The remainder of the sentence was lost in an outburst of laughter.

TOO MUCH HILARITY.

Mr. R. Stanley Welch objected to so much hilarity. If disconcerted a witness, and the matter under consideration was too serious for laughter.

Ald. McBride—Well, Mr. Chairman, if I cannot laugh I am going home. I am not here for pay.

Mr. Welch—This is a serious business, and there is just a little too much hilarity.

Ald. McBride—It is not serious for me; that is to say, it is not serious enough to prevent me laughing.

Witness, continuing, said that in the entry of a robbery in the book before him, and which took place on January 26, a description of the property was not given in detail; to enter details of property in every robbery would take too much space.

Mr. Greenshields—Now, Mr. Cullen, can you tell us how many burglaries have been reported in your office within the last year?

Witness—I could not. I can tell you the number of cases altogether. I should have to pick out the burglaries.

"Can you tell us in how many burglaries you have arrested the perpetrator?"

"We have arrested about 1,100 persons."

"I want to know from you how many burglaries you have arrested."

"I could not tell you without looking over the books."

"Can you tell us in how many cases of reported burglaries you found the stolen property?"

"I could not."

Mr. Bisson objected, contending that questions relating to the books should be asked of the secretary.

Mr. Macmaster—We all know that Detective Cullen is not a book-keeper; he is chief of his department.

Mr. R. C. Smith—If the chief does not know about his department, who does?

Mr. Greenshields (to witness)—Well, now, did you hear about a burglary that took place at Cochenbaler's?

Witness—I did.

"Got any entry of it?"

"Yes."

"Turn to the entry in the book."

"The case was given to Trompe, and it is marked 'attended to; no result,' and I believe him."

"Now, Mr. Cullen, as chief of your force, you know there was a large robbery there, some \$3,000 worth of jewelry being stolen?"

"So they said."

"Do you doubt it?"

"Well, I may give evidence in that case and I don't want to say anything here."

IT WAS "ATTENDED TO."

"Have you any report in your books to show what was done by your men in that case?"

"This book says he attended to it."

"How did he attend to it? What did he do; where did he go?"

"He will tell you himself."

"You don't know anything about it?"

"He looked for it."

"Now, Mr. Cullen, the only report you have regarding the Cochenbaler robbery is 'attended to; no result.'"

"Yes; that is the only report so far as these books are concerned. I have seen other reports in other places."

Witness was then examined regarding a robbery at P. Wright & Co.'s, 1325 Notre Dame street, on January 11, about which he said no complaint had been received, but he had heard of it from an outside source. He was asked if he took any steps to discover the perpetrator; but Mr. Bisson objected. The objection was overruled, and witness replied to the question, "I cannot say, for I don't see a report." There was no report in the books about an attempt to steal furniture in broad daylight from Hon. G. A. Drummond's on August 8. Witness saw an item in the newspapers that such an attempt had been made.

Mr. Greenshields asked witness if he took any steps to find out if such a robbery had been committed, whereupon Ald. Robert objected. Mr. Greenshields said he did not think that Ald. Robert had a right to object to the question. The investigation they were conducting had been commenced at the demand of the citizens, and the committee was there for the purpose of investigating. The witness said he knew of the robbery, which was a matter of public notoriety, and yet one of the members of the committee did not want to investigate what steps had been taken to discover the perpetrators of the robbery, because no complaint had been made. Surely the citizens were not going to stand quietly back because, forsooth, a complaint was not made.

Mr. Greenshields (to witness)—We

want to know if you investigated the matter at all.

Witness—We got no report of it.

THE RESULTS WERE NEGATIVE.

Witness, continuing, said that a robbery was reported as having taken place at W. J. Delaney & Co.'s, 2567 St. Catherine street. Detective O'Keefe had charge of the case, but he did not find anything. Two men, however, were arrested on suspicion by Detectives Campau and Arcand. A few days later witness heard of a robbery at P. Grace & Co.'s, 1350 Notre Dame street. Trompe had charge of the case, and it was attended to, but without result. There was a report in the book of a robbery at D. Beattie's, 137 St. Peter street; but the entry did not specify what was stolen. The case was given to Detective Lafontaine.

Mr. Greenshields—What became of the stuff?

Witness—He has made no report.

"So that so far as the robbery is concerned you don't know what he has done about it?"

"No."

"Did you ever ask him anything about that case?"

"I don't know."

In reply to further questions, witness said that a case of robbery at L. Villeneuve's, 1741 St. Lawrence street, on February 9, was attended to by Lafontaine, but without result. A robbery was reported to have taken place on February 22nd at A. Mongeau's, 43 St. Lawrence street. O'Keefe had charge of the case, but there was no result.

Replying to the chairman, Ald. Rainville, as to the reason of such questions being asked, Mr. Greenshields said that robberies and burglaries were committed, and there was no system whatever to detect the perpetrators. Complaints were entered in a book, and a man's name was entered opposite to them, but there was nothing to show what a single man on the force did; he simply put "attended to; no result." There seemed to be no attempt whatever to discover the perpetrators of the crimes.

Witness knew nothing of a robbery at T. G. Lajoie's, 1401 St. Catherine street, on February 23; no complaint had been made about it.

Ald. Prefontaine objected to cases being enquired into which had not been reported to the detectives.

Mr. Bisson objected to their going on with cases in this way. No cases had been lodged.

Mr. Marchand was of the opinion that, as Mr. Greenshields had given names, days, dates and robberies, he had a right to put these questions. The books simply showed that the detectives' names were entered against a case.

Ald. Smith—Is it possible that a complaint may be laid and not entered?

Mr. Greenshields then took the witness in hand. He asked—"What about Robert Greig's robbery at 15 Tower avenue?"

"Nothing entered," said Mr. Cullen.

"Now," said Mr. Greenshields, "we will take the case of Mr. J. Rivet, 1345 Ontario street. That was on the 7th March. What was done with it?"

Mr. Cullen—"Barrett went around and found nothing."

Mr. Greenshields—No results.

Witness—"None."

The robberies in the premises of Mr. Rewes, 22 Lincoln Avenue; Mr. R. J. Inglis, Beaver Hall hill, and others were discussed, and the enquiry adjourned until Friday evening at 8 p.m.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, OCT. 27.

CULLEN RECEIVED \$500.00.

A Discovery Before the Police Investigators.

BUT IT HAD A STORY TO IT

And What Promised to be Something of a Sensation Ended in a Smile.

The Police Investigation committee again sat last night, when all the members were in attendance, and the full complement of lawyers was present. Chief Detective Cullen was once more on the witness stand. He was examined by Mr. J. N. Greenshields respecting twenty-four alleged robberies. It appeared that in seventeen cases no complaint had been made to the detectives, whilst four cases had been attended to, but without result, and in three other cases arrests had been made. Continuing his evidence, witness said he could not swear that there were any gambling houses in the city at the present time, neither would he swear that there were none; he was not aware of them. He had been aware of some since the beginning of 1892; but he could not say how many. He could not recollect how many gambling-houses he had raided; it might be five or six. He did not remember that he had raided any gambling-house in the city since 1892, except the Turf commission. He was told about a gambling-house on Notre Dame street and

ARROWER ON ST. LAWRENCE STREET. He tried to get into the latter, but could not. He did not, however, try to get into the one on Notre Dame street, because he saw the difficulty that some other persons had in that direction, and he knew that he would not have as good a chance as they did.

Ald. Prefontaine—We should know, first, if there was any complaint. Mr. Greenshields—We don't require any complaint before the committee, surely, to protect the city against gambling houses.

Ald. Prefontaine thought that the committee had a right to make objections.

Witness, continuing, said that he had received a written complaint about the house on Notre Dame street being a gambling house. It was about eighteen months or two years ago. He did not remember whether he had torn up the letter or not. When he received the letter he told Superintendent Hughes about it, and the latter remarked: "If anyone has any complaint to make, let him come and lodge his information and we will very soon attend to it." Witness did not communicate that to the writer of the letter, but simply let the matter rest.

By Ald. Smith—The letter was from a well known citizen, but witness did not call upon him on the subject. Perhaps it would have been better if he had done so; but the letter did not give him any more information than he already possessed.

By Mr. Greenshields—Later on the place was shut up, but he did not know by whom, as he had nothing to do with it. It was not his business to find out who closed up the place. Although witness did not now remember it, yet the writer of the letter might have mentioned that he could give all the information necessary to arrest those who ran the gambling house. The writer of the letter might also have asked him to take steps and have the place closed up; but even if such a request were made, witness could not comply with it, as he had no more control over the gambling-houses than had any other constable. There were about eighty second-hand stores in the city; but the Detective department

had no special supervision over them. Sometimes the keepers of these stores reported upon property taken in; but if

THE DETECTIVES' SUSPICIONS were well founded this did not happen so often as it might. Witness' department had no supervision over the illegal selling of liquor; the detectives did not bother with it, as it did not belong to their department. Witness believed that there had been such a thing as lotteries, and that tickets had been openly sold on the street. He had seen a lottery on St. James street, near La Banque du Peuple. He had seen other places where signs were exhibited that lottery tickets were for sale; but he had never bothered with them.

Mr. Geoffrion wished to know where Mr. Greenshields was "driving to." The sale of such tickets might have been illegal or it might not.

Mr. Bisillon enquired if there was anything in the municipal law which obliged either the chief detective or the Detective department to look after lotteries.

Mr. Atwater said that Mr. Greenshields was trying to show that for two or three years lotteries flourished in open defiance of the law, until finally the Attorney-General of the province and the provincial Legislature interfered and promptly shut them up.

Messrs. Geoffrion and Macmaster spoke of the amount of litigation to which the lottery business gave rise, and contended that for their suppression the federal Government was primarily responsible, then the Attorney-General, and that the police and detectives only occupied a third place of responsibility.

Mr. Stanley Weir then rose to address the committee, but Ald. Prefontaine objected. Mr. Weir insisted on speaking.

Ald. Prefontaine said that Mr. Weir had no right to be heard, and if he had any respect for the committee he would sit down.

The chairman said that they were willing to give every latitude to persons; but it must not be supposed that the committee was going to hear ten lawyers on every point. They had already heard two lawyers on each side, and it seemed to him that ought to be sufficient.

Mr. Weir again rose, whereupon Ald. Prefontaine wanted to know whether or not the committee had any rights, and whether or not the members had to sit there and be dictated to as to what they should do. He did not want a lawyer to go there and say that he would be heard, in spite of anybody, and at once. When such a person was ordered to sit down he should do so.

REFUSED TO LISTEN.

Mr. Weir said that he respected the committee and sat down; but after the chairman had expressed his opinion on other matters, Mr. Weir again arose to his feet, whereupon Ald. Robert, with a gesture of impatience, remarked: "If you talk about lotteries, I won't listen to you."

After some further discussion it was decided to leave the lottery matter over until the next meeting, the committee in the meantime to find out whether or not lotteries are legal.

Continuing his evidence, witness said that sometimes when a detective had done good work on a case the persons for whom he had worked would give him a few dollars to cover expenses. Sometimes a detective incurred expenses and got nothing. He did not know of any cases where a detective had refused to act because he was not paid. He had heard of a few cases where detectives had sent in bills for their services. Some ten years ago witness did a good deal of work for the Grand Trunk, in connection with which he disbursed some of his own money for expenses. He asked the then chief what he was to do, and he was told to send in a bill which he did, and the money was paid. He could not re-

member what the amount of the bill was, and he could not remember how many bills he had sent in on various occasions.

Mr. Bisillon wished to know if Mr. Greenshields had any personal charge against the witness.

Mr. Greenshields said that he had not, and he did not think that it was necessary. Witness had admitted that he had received money, and it was of interest to know all the circumstances. Sure-

ly, it would not for a moment be pretended that the witness was not to be asked the question.

Ald. McBride—If Mr. Cullen doesn't object to answer, I don't see why the committee should object to the question.

Ald. Prefontaine—We want to have charges.

Witness was informed that he need not answer a question leading to a personal charge unless he chose to do so, but he said that he was quite willing to answer any question relating to himself and the Grand Trunk. Continuing, he said that he could not tell when he first received money from the Grand Trunk, but he thought that it was about twenty years ago. He had kept no account of the money he had received from the Grand Trunk. On one occasion he received \$25 from them to pay a person from whom he had got information. He also got \$15 on the same occasion for another person.

Mr. Greenshields—What was the largest amount of money you ever got from the Grand Trunk in one year?

Witness—I could not tell you.

"Have you no idea?"

"I have not the slightest."

"You cannot tell us whether it was \$5 or \$500?"

Ald. Robert—He got too little.

Mr. Greenshields—I am glad to see that the learned gentleman approves of detectives collecting money from outside places for services rendered.

Ald. Robert—Certainly I do. When he does a good thing he should get his expenses.

Continuing his evidence, witness said that he never in one year received \$500 from the Grand Trunk, neither did he ever receive \$500 or \$200. He might have got \$100 in small amounts.

THE EXPENSES FUNNED.

By Ald. Smith—There was a fund in connection with his department for legitimate expenses, but he did not take money for expenses from that fund. It might be better, but it was not the custom that the clerk should send out an account for expenses and let the money go to the funds of the department generally, rather than to a particular detective.

Mr. Greenshields—Did you ever get paid any money before working on a case?

Witness—A few times.

Ald. Prefontaine—For expenses.

Witness—For expenses. I once got \$5.

Mr. Greenshields—Who from?

Witness—I do not think it is right to say from whom, as none of the people have complained. I am ready to answer any complaints.

Ald. Robert objected.

Mr. Greenshields—Now, Mr. Cullen, did you ever receive any money from any citizen?

"Yes, I once received \$100 and a very flattering letter with it."

"Did you ever receive money from a citizen in advance in connection with a case before you completed it?"

"Yes, I got \$12 twice for expenses, but very often spent more than I got."

"Are they within the last three years?"

"One was; another was four and another ten years ago. But at no time larger than \$5."

"Are you aware that other members of the detective force received money for their services?"

"I could not say; they can speak for themselves. If I received any money I divided it with the man who was working the case with me. Once I received \$500."

MR. GREENSHIELDS ASTONISHED.

"Five hundred dollars," exclaimed Mr. Greenshields. "Who from?"

"The Mayor of Montreal."

Mr. Geoffrion—"We'll suspend him."

(Laughter.)

Mr. Cullen—"He's dead. I divided that amount among the members of the force. I worked on a case with another detective and spent \$9 which I have never got back."

"Who was the mayor at the time you speak of?"

"Mayor Courel and I got the \$500 at the time Mr. Gaul was shot."

Mr. Macmaster—"Was there any result in that case?"

"Yes, the man is still in the penitentiary."

Ald. McBride—"Then it was a reward offered by the city for arresting a murderer."

"Yes."

"Oh, that's a different thing," said some one.

Mr. Geoffrion—"It shows that the city showed a bad example."

Ald. McBride to Mr. Geoffrion—"If you were short we would offer a reward."

It being 10 o'clock the committee adjourned until Tuesday night at 8 o'clock.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, OCT. 31.

HE DECLINED TO ANSWER.

Mr. Cullen Adopts This Course in Two Cases.

UPHELD BY THE CHAIRMAN.

The Robbery of Mr. Meredith's House Is Discussed—Detectives out of Town and Their Expenses.

When the Police Investigating committee resumed its sittings last evening Mr. R. Stanley Weir presented a petition giving the names of the parties he represented.

"Would any general question be allowed if the evidence was produced?" asked Mr. Atwater.

Ald. Rainville—"We are agreeable to allowing the production of witnesses."

"Is Mr. D. A. Watt here?" asked the chairman.

"I am," answered Mr. Watt.

"I don't think we will require you until we are through with Mr. Cullen," replied the chairman.

Then Mr. Cullen was called for the continuation of his evidence, with his numerous books.

Mr. A. W. Atwater, in the absence of Mr. Greenshields, undertook to examine Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Cullen—"I say, fearlessly, that I never received \$50 from any one, and if any questions in this line are asked, I am ready to answer them."

Mr. Atwater—"That is straightforward. Have you ever received any money?"

Mr. Cullen—"If I have let the parties complain."

Mr. Atwater repeated his question, Mr. Cullen—"I decline to answer."

Ald. Rainville, the chairman, said that he would not force the witness to answer.

Ald. McBride—"Mr. Cullen says that he only received money for expenses."

Mr. Atwater—"Did he ever receive any money outside of expenses?"

Mr. Cullen—"I decline to answer."

Ald. Brunet—"The committee has decided that point."

Mr. Atwater—"I want to know the course to be adopted by the committee."

Ald. McBride—"Let us know if the detectives take any money from citizens or not?"

Ald. Brunet—"The committee has already decided that."

Ald. Smith—"Let Mr. Cullen answer."

HE REFUSES TO ANSWER.

The chairman to Mr. Cullen—"Why do you refuse to answer the question?"

Mr. Cullen—"Because I might incriminate myself and others, and I don't want to do that."

Mr. Atwater—"Oh, you don't want to incriminate yourself?"

"No."

Mr. Atwater said that he understood that the investigation was to be a full and thorough one.

Ald. Prefontaine—"Yes, it will be."

Mr. Atwater—"If you refuse to allow him to answer the question the public will look upon this investigation as a farce." (Applause from the galleries.)

Ald. Prefontaine at once objected. He asked that the galleries be cleared as well as the floor of the house, with the

exception of the official stenographers and the representatives of the press. "Let us adjourn," he said, "if we are not going to be respected."

Ald. Smith—"They will respect us."

Ald. Prefontaine—"They don't respect us."

Ald. Brunet—"Let the public take our place."

Ald. Robert—"I move we adjourn."

Ald. Smith—"On what grounds?"

Ald. Robert—"On the grounds that they don't respect us."

Ald. Smith—"Well we are not here for fun."

Ald. Prefontaine—"Are we going to sit here and be insulted?"

Ald. McBride—"I don't care whether we adjourn or not."

The Chairman—"I am not in favor of the applause, or the signs of approbation."

"KEEP QUIET OR GET OUT."

Ald. Prefontaine—"I move that unless the people keep quiet they be expelled."

Ald. Smith—"There is no necessity for that."

The Chairman—"I promise to maintain order."

"That's right," came from all sides.

Mr. R. C. Smith was very much of the opinion that the detectives would be wise to answer the questions put, as otherwise it might imply that something was wrong.

Ald. Brunet held that Mr. Cullen should not have answered the questions put to him about the Grand Trunk affair, as it gave a false impression to the public.

In answer to a question from Ald. Smith, Ald. Prefontaine stated most emphatically that the detectives were justified in not answering questions which would incriminate themselves; let the charges be specific.

Then followed some legal quibbling as to whether Mr. Cullen should or should not answer the question put by Mr. Atwater.

The chairman was appealed to and he ruled that Mr. Cullen was not forced to answer the question.

Ald. Prefontaine—"It's a farce."

The chairman—"We have been here four times and there have not been any specific charges."

Mr. Macmaster stated that the principle of the law was that a man was innocent until he was found guilty and when a personal charge was made against any man that man ought to have a chance to defend himself; hence the reason for specific charges.

Mr. Smith said that if the citizens had had any idea that criminal charges were necessary, perhaps they would not have undertaken this inquiry. There should not be thought to be any exacting of specific charges.

The Chairman—"Bring in a witness who has given money to any detective, and we will hear him."

NOT ON A FISHING EXPEDITION.

Ald. Prefontaine—"We are not on a fishing expedition."

Ald. Smith—"Yes, we are."

Ald. Prefontaine—"No, the fishing season is closed."

After further discussion of the matter, the committee ruled that the witness should not be compelled to answer the question unless a special charge were made.

By Ald. Smith—Witness had often-times incurred expenses in connection with cases which he had never been reimbursed; but sometimes persons for whom he had worked, and who had been well pleased with his labors, had given him money to cover his expenses. Putting the losses against the gains, he was not much ahead. He did not think that any member of the detective force would accept money offered other than to cover expenses.

By Mr. Atwater—He did not know of any cases where a detective had asked for money before taking up a case. His opinion of a man who would do that would not be a very favorable one. He would prefer not to answer the question what his opinion would be of a man who sent in a bill after detective work was done. After being questioned as to what detectives had been out of town during the past year, witness said that the persons whose business they were engaged upon paid their expenses during the time they were away. They did not fur-

nish any memorandum of these expenses to witness, nor, so far as he knew, to the Chief of Police. He did not know whether they sent a memorandum to the persons for whom they worked.

MR. MEREDITH'S ROBBERY.

He remembered that a robbery was said to have been committed at Mr. Meredith's in October, 1893, and that some \$4,000 was stolen. He believed that a complaint was made to the department about it.

The complaint book was produced, but witness failed to find an entry referring to the robbery.

Witness, continuing, said that he took steps to find the criminal, and he had a person arrested upon a certain charge. He took the man to Mr. Meredith, but what passed between them he could not say. The stolen money, however, he believed, was recovered from the man by Mr. Meredith.

Mr. Atwater—Did you receive any remuneration for your services in that case?

Witness—"You had better ask Mr. Meredith."

"Did you or did you not? Do you refuse to answer that question on the ground of incriminating yourself?"

"I decline to answer the question."

Mr. Atwater asked for the ruling of the chair.

The Chairman—"I suppose the same ruling as before."

Ald. Smith—Mr. Cullen ought to answer in his own interests.

Mr. Macmaster—This is an individual transaction of Detective Cullen's. If he chooses to object it is his own matter; but as far as the police force of Montreal is concerned as a whole it is a different question.

Ald. McBride—I think the question should be answered; it is getting pretty near a personal charge.

The chairman was again asked for his ruling by Mr. Atwater, and he ruled as in the previous question.

The committee then adjourned until next Tuesday night.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, NOV. 7.

CHIEF CULLEN STEPS DOWN

From the Witness Stand, His Testimony Being Finished.

POINTS FOR THE DEFENCE

Brought out by Mr. Macmaster's Cross-Examination—London as an Example.

The Police Investigation committee again met last evening, when, before Chief Detective Cullen was recalled, Mrs. Hawkins, widow, 51 St. Antoine street, was examined by Mr. R. C. Smith. She deposed that when she was removing about April last, there was stolen from her a small basket containing \$35 in bills of the Bank of British North America, a silver chain, three rings and a book. On the following day she went to the detectives' office and spent the whole forenoon there without being attended to at all, beyond being told by a policeman when she arrived that the detectives were not in. She was not shown a detective at all, and eventually she went away. The next day she returned, a young man apparently a bookkeeper, entered her complaint in a book. The next day she again returned, and saw Detective Cullen, to whom she told her story, and also gave the name of the person she suspected of having committed the theft. Detective Cullen

PROMISED TO "SEE TO IT."

adding that as the man might be a sharper, he must be cautious how he arrested him, or he (the detective) might lose his job.

Cross-examined by Mr. Donald Macmaster—Witness told Detective Cullen that the man she suspected of the theft said he got the money of which he was possessed from Messrs. Wilson, paper box manufacturers, but the detective never went to Messrs. Wilson's to ascertain if this were correct. Her case was such a plain one that anybody might have got to the bottom of it, much more a detective. (Laughter.) If Detective Cullen had done his best in the matter he would have gone and told her what he was doing, and how he was working up the case. She suspected the person she named to Detective Cullen, because after the robbery he went to a store on St. Antoine street with a sackful containing \$35, the exact amount she had lost, to pay a small bill which he had been unable to pay at the new year, being out of work.

Chief Detective Cullen was then recalled. In reply to Mr. Atwater, he testified that the man who stole money from Mr. Meredith, as stated at the last sitting of the committee, was arrested and prosecuted on a charge of stealing some papers from a newspaper office. He was not prosecuted for larceny from Mr. Meredith.

MR. MEREDITH'S CASE.

Mr. Atwater—I understand it was to your knowledge that he was guilty of the offence of larceny or embezzlement from Mr. Meredith?

Witness—I strongly suspected he was. "Is it not to your knowledge he was guilty of the offence?"

"I had no more knowledge of it than anybody else who heard it; but I had my suspicions."

"Did you make any charge against him of larceny?"

"I did not."

"Do you know if Mr. Meredith recovered his money?"

"I could not say; but I suspect he did."

"And he gave you some of it, didn't he?"

"I was asked that before." Continuing, witness said that he had nothing to do with recovering Mr. Meredith's money, concerning the loss of which there was no complaint. Witness had been absent twice this year, one day in Ottawa and three days at Niagara. When he was away it was usually for only a very short time, and the secretary had charge of the office. He did not appoint anybody as acting chief during his absence, as he knew the man would do the best they could. When he was going away he told the Superintendent about it.

Mr. Atwater—Do you tell the superintendent when you get a reward for any of your services?

Witness—It is the rule now that we shall, but I have not got any rewards since I saw the new rules. (Laughter.) "Were there no rules until the present ones, published about two months ago?"

THE RULES WERE LOST.

"There were rules brought out several years ago, but they were lost. They had neither date nor signature affixed to them."

"Is that the only set of rules you have for the governance of the police or detectives?"

"Except the by-laws."

"Have you these rules?"

"No."

"How were you guided?"

"We were guided by our own common sense—(laughter)—and by the laws of the province and the city."

"So you had no system to govern your united action?"

"We never got any blame." Continuing, witness said that the entry in the complaint book relating to Mrs. Hawkins robbery stated that the money and other articles were lost while she was removing. All hands were put on the case, but he never received any report. Mrs. Hawkins did not mention the name of any person she suspected of the larceny.

COUNTERFEIT BANK BILLS.

There was no entry in the complaint book of a raised bill being presented at Molsons bank last July; but witness knew about it, as he was sent for to the bank, and was shown the bill, which had been raised from \$10 to \$50. He told some of the detectives about the matter, and made a note of it in his own book.

Mr. Atwater—Did you ever do anything in regard to this matter yourself? Witness—I think I got one of our men to work. "What report did that man ever make to you?"

"I forget."

"You forget."

"I do."

"Has he made any report?"

"I don't know; I will find out by next time."

"We want to know now."

"I cannot call to my memory now."

"According to the evidence given before, you have to enter every complaint in the complaint book."

"I ought to do so."

"Here is a complaint made to yourself, and you did not enter it."

"I did not."

"And you have no means of tracing the person who raised that bill?"

"We have not."

"Did you report that case to the Molsons bank?"

"No; because there was nothing to report."

"In August last, did you receive any information about Mr. McIntyre's case?"

"Yes."

"Is it in the books?"

"Yes; it was given to Lafontaine, and there were no results."

A QUESTION OF SYSTEM.

"Have you any system whereby second-hand stores report goods received to you?"

"No. Mr. McIntyre's coat was found in a carriage. Sometimes the second-

hand dealers report to us, but they have no system. True, they have books, but it is hard to understand them. The new rules have been in force about two months. I have never received any complaints about the members of the detective force."

Mr. Atwater then referred to the letter which had been sent to Mr. Cullen about gambling houses and which the latter was accused of tearing up. "Look at this and see if it is a copy of the letter you received?"

Mr. Cullen—"I think it is a copy of it. But I have no more jurisdiction over gambling houses than an ordinary constable."

"Do you remember Mr. Bond calling on you?"

"I do."

"Do you remember the answer you gave him?"

"I don't. But at all events that is a matter which should have been attended to by the Superintendent. If I had a warrant I would have gone there. I may have told Mr. Bond that I reported the matter to the Superintendent. If any complaints had been laid they would have been attended to."

CHIEF JUST DO AS YOU'RE TOLD.

"If a place is pointed out to you as a gambling house, and a man as a criminal, is it not your duty to interfere?"

"They are two different cases. We are not responsible for all those. We are only seven and the police number about 400, with inspectors, captains and lieutenants."

"I want to know definitely, Mr. Cullen, whether you could get the authority or not to raid these places?"

"I don't recollect ever having said to anyone that I could not."

Mr. Atwater announced that he was through with Chief Detective Cullen, but reserved the right to recall him. This was agreed to.

Mr. Macmaster then took Mr. Cullen in hand in cross examination. His questions were to the point and brief, and he requested, Mr. Cullen to come down to actual facts without going into lengthy details. "I only want half an hour with you Mr. Cullen. I don't propose to keep you for three or four nights. Come down to facts. Is it not a fact that there are two police magistrates; two Crown prosecutors; a high constable and deputies, and a staff of officials in the Court house?"

"They are all paid by the Crown."

"Supposing one of the cases mentioned, could the complainant go and make a declaration before a police magistrate?"

"Any citizen can."

CITIZENS' LEAGUE CASE.

"I see that you have received a letter from Mr. H. Timmis; do you know him?"

"I don't know Mr. Timmis, nor do I know of his making any complaint before the Police Magistrate."

"Did Major Bond ever say to you that he was ready to go over to the Police court and swear out a warrant against those houses?"

"No."

"How many of these places are there in the city of Montreal; answer roughly and quickly?"

"About 370."

"How many streets are there in the city?"

"I suppose about 500."

"How many corners, including mileage of streets?"

"About 150 miles."

"How many houses do you think there are in Montreal?"

"About 3,000."

"Could it be possible for seven or eight detectives to cover that territory, even on Sherbrooke street, where my learned friends live?"

Mr. Greenshields—"You live there."

Mr. Macmaster replied—"True; but, thanks to the police, nothing has been stolen from my house."

THE CHIEF'S RECORD.

Witness, continuing, said that he had served the city thirty-eight years, and no complaint had ever been lodged against him, nor had he ever received a "crooked dollar." He had not this year received a dollar from the Grand Trunk; he had last year received \$20, but in the last nine years he had only received \$40. In ten years he might have received \$80. The amount that Mr. Meredith lost was \$4,400, and in connection with that case he got \$50, half of which he gave to a brother officer on the force. Sometimes constables were taken off their beats to attend to other duties, such as the Court of Queen's Bench. He did not consider that one man who had to watch a quarter of a square mile was sufficient to guard against thieves and robbers. Only about 5 per cent. of those who complained of robberies, etc., gave intelligent information.

Mr. Macmaster—Did you ever hear of "Jack the Ripper" (Laughter.)

Witness—Yes.

"Are you aware of the fact that he advertised, through the newspapers, that he would cut up thirteen women consecutively in the streets of London?"

"I did."

A QUESTION OF PROPORTION.

"What is the strength of the police force of London?"

"Six thousand."

"I am informed that it is 13,000. How many detectives has Scotland Yard?"

"I believe they have several hundreds."

"I am well informed that they have 800, and with this army of skilled detectives 'Jack the Ripper' killed his thirteen women."

Ald. Robert—There were "no results" in this case.

Mr. Macmaster (to witness)—"What is your business?"

Witness—"The detection of crime."

Mr. Greenshields was trying to make you out a bookkeeper. Were you brought up to that business?"

"No; I was on a farm until I was nineteen years of age."

In answer to further questions, witness said that in the Molsons bank matter he did the best he could, but he was not able to cope with all the rogues in the country. If he were to attend to all the complaints he saw in the newspapers, he would have no time to look after his legitimate business.

Mr. Greenshields wanted an official list and official numbers of all men appointed on the police force from January 1, 1892, to October 31, 1894, and the names of those discharged during that period; also the names of applicants and the names of those who have received promotion in that period, as well as the positions they held previously.

An adjournment was then made for a week.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, NOV. 21.

THEY STAYED AWAY.

There Was No Quorum at the Police Investigation, and Chief Cullen Was Not Heard.

As it was announced that the Police Investigation committee was to meet last night, the usual interested crowd congregated in the City hall. They were, however, doomed to be disappointed, as no meeting took place for the reason that there was not a quorum of the committee obtainable. The telephone was brought into requisition, but to no purpose. Ald. Rainville and Robert were reported sick at home, while it was ascertained that Ald. Prefontaine and Farrell had left their homes. Ald. Brunet favored signing the minute book and leaving. Ald. McBride and Smith wanted him to wait a bit and see if they would turn up. All the legal luminaries engaged in the case were present and chatted freely together. Finally it was learned that Ald. Prefontaine and Farrell had gone to attend a meeting of the Roman Catholic School Commissioners, and consequently could not be present. Therefore Ald. Brunet, McBride and Smith signed the book, and then the people left with a degree of disgust in their minds.

Ald. McBride thought it was very strange that if there was a possibility of there not being a meeting they should have been notified.

It was decided to have the next meeting on Friday evening, and to hold two weekly until the investigation was finished.

Chief Detective Cullen was on hand ready for examination.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, THURSDAY, NOV. 20.

THE POLICE ENQUIRY.

No Attention Paid to the General Hospital Robbery.

GOT NO SATISFACTION.

So Says Mr. Gillespie, Whose Place Was Robbed of Cigars—A Detective Asked for Money, But for a Warrant.

The Police Investigating committee resumed its labors yesterday afternoon, after a rest of three weeks. Ald. Rainville presided, and there were present Ald. Prefontaine, Robert, McBride, Smith and Farrell.

Mr. R. Stanley Weir said that he wanted to put a few questions to Chief Detective Cullen, but as that officer was not present, he asked that he be requested to be present at the next meeting.

Mr. R. G. Smith asked if the information asked for by Mr. Greenshields was ready. It was for the names of those receiving promotion and those discharged from the force within a specified period. The answer was that the information asked for was not ready.

THE HOSPITAL ROBBERY.

Mr. Smith then called Dr. Ridley MacKenzie, medical superintendent of the Montreal General Hospital.

"You had a robbery in the hospital in September last?"

"Yes, on the 11th of September."

"Did you take any steps to get the guilty person prosecuted?"

"Yes."

"What did you do?"

"I reported it to Mr. Richard White, one of the committee of management, and

he volunteered to go with me and see Chief Detective Cullen. We went to his office about one o'clock, but he was not in, and we waited until he arrived, when he was told all. It was in the presence of Mr. Richard White I told all about it."

"What did Mr. Cullen say or do?"

"He promised to send up after he was told that suspicion rested on one of the employees."

"What was done?"

"I went back to my office and waited in all day and telephoned again, but found Mr. Cullen had gone out and I got the boy to telephone down, but got no satisfactory answer."

"When did you first hear from them?"

"About six o'clock on the following evening."

"How long was that after you lodged the complaint?"

"About thirty hours."

"What did you do next?"

"I consulted my president, Mr. F. Wolferstan Thomas, and he advised me to go and see a private detective—Mr. Grose."

"The reason you called in Mr. Grose was because the city detectives took no notice of your complaint?"

"Yes, because they did not take the slightest notice of it."

Mr. Macmaster then cross-examined Dr. MacKenzie.

"What was stolen?" queried Mr. Macmaster.

"Money" was the answer.

"Was the person arrested?"

"Yes. His name is Alfred Hughes."

Mr. Macmaster then asked the doctor where the Police court was, and if it would not have been

BETTER TO HAVE GONE TO JUDGE DUGAS or Judge Desnoyers and sworn out a warrant before either of them? Continuing, he said: "The man was arrested, prosecuted and punished and the law has been vindicated."

"Yes, at considerable expense to us."

"Who was he arrested by?"

"By Private Detective Fraser, of Carpenter's staff."

"You did what you thought was right?"

"Yes, acting under orders of Mr. White, of the committee of management. Fraser was working on the case three days and three nights."

Mr. Smith—"When you went to see Mr. Cullen did he give you a lecture on the law or advise you to go over to the Police court?"

"No; he promised to attend to it."

"Did he?"

"He did not."

Mr. George Gillespie, of Messrs. Gillespies & Co., wholesale commission merchants, was next examined by Mr. Smith.

"Yes, there was a robbery of cigars in our place in November, 1892, and an attempted burglary in December, 1892. There were external marks on the cash drawer. It was after the attempted robbery that we wrote to Chief Hughes and asked him to send a detective, and Detective Lafontaine came. He was asked to take steps to discover the perpetrators. He examined the only clerk in the office and also the caretaker's wife, and said that he would return at three o'clock, and asked us to keep in all the clerks and the caretaker."

"Did he come at the hour promised?"

"No. A week later we again wrote to Chief Hughes and got no reply; another week passed and we wrote again without receiving an answer. Again we wrote, expressing surprise at

NOT RECEIVING AN ANSWER.

to our communications. This time we received a letter signed by the secretary, who stated that the letters had been handed to Detective Lafontaine, who did not consider the report asked for necessary."

"We wrote back, saying that we could not agree with Detective Lafontaine, and asked for a report after further investigation."

"Did you get it?"

"No, we got no reply to it."

"On the 6th of January, 1893, we wrote to the chairman of the Police committee, informing him of what had transpired, and we are without an answer to it."

The Chairman—"Do you say that you got no answer from the chairman of the Police committee?"

"None, sir."

Ald. Robert—"I was not chairman then."

Continuing, witness said that they waited until the 7th July, when the enquiry was opened by the Police com-

mittee. To Mr. Smith he said that all the satisfaction they got was that Detective Lafontaine

DID NOT THINK IT NECESSARY.

to report to them what he had done.

Cross-examined by Mr. Macmaster, Mr. Gillespie said that about \$27 worth of cigars had been stolen. "Yes, we had plumbers working up-stairs, and we do not know whether they stole them or not. Lafontaine went up and spoke to the suspected person, and came back and said that he did not think that party was guilty."

"Yes, Lafontaine told me that the suspected told him that one of our clerks and two strangers had been in the office one night. I did not say that I suspected any one of our clerks. There was nothing stolen from the drawers but there was evidence

THAT IT HAD BEEN FORCED.

I saw in the newspapers that the committee which was presided over by Ald. James had exonerated Detective Lafontaine."

Mr. Wm. Kearns, confidential clerk to Messrs. Gillespies & Co., deposed that he had knowledge of the robbery of several boxes of cigars. Whoever took them showed good judgment. They must have been stolen either late in the afternoon,

during the night or early morning. He did not know Detective Lafontaine.

Mr. Louis Nolan, of 109 German street, deposed that a pair of pants, with a sum of money in the pockets, had been stolen from his house. He reported the matter to Detective Arcand. He suspected a man.

To Mr. Bisailion—He said that Arcand had asked him for some money. Being pressed to say what the money was for admitted that it was for to get out a warrant against the suspected party.

Mr. Robert Greig, formerly of 15 Towers street and now of Cote St. Antoine, was asked by Mr. Smith to relate the outcome of a robbery in his house. He said: "One evening last fall, when we were all out, and when the servant returned also found the remnants of our supper all scattered about. This I reported to the sergeant in charge of the station corner St. Catherine and Gay streets. Again, on Sunday, March 4, the house was empty between the hours of 7 and 9 o'clock when we were at church, and when we returned we found that

JEWELLERY TO THE VALUE OF ABOUT \$155 had been stolen; these were presents to my wife from friends in the old country and here. I telephoned to the same station and a constable came along and looked over the house and went away. The next morning I went down and reported the matter to Mr. Cullen in his office and I have never heard anything about it, verbally or otherwise. I handed him a typewritten list of the stolen goods."

"What answer did I get? Do you want to know?"

"Yes."

Mr. Cullen said: "Here is another of these things and you will never hear anything more about them."

The Chairman—"And it seems to be true." (Laughter.)

To Mr. Bisailion witness said—"Yes, I have a copy of the stolen articles" (produced and filed like the Gillespie correspondence). "I told Mr. Cullen personally that the windows were broken and the house was all confusion. I had no suspicions as to who committed the robbery."

Ald. Wilson Smith—"You are now living in Cote St. Antoine. I suppose you thought it time to get out of the city?"

Mr. Bisailion—"Did you suggest anything to Mr. Cullen?"

"Yes, to get my goods." (Laughter.)

"Do you think it possible to recover all stolen goods?"

"Well, I help to pay the detectives' salaries for that purpose."

Detective Trempe is to be a witness at the next meeting, which will be held on Friday night at 8 o'clock.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, DEC. 1.

THE POLICE ENQUIRY.

Several Cases of Burglary Which Were Not Attended To.

MR. CULLEN AGAIN HEARD.

He is Examined as to the System Followed—The Detectives Are All Experienced Men.

The Police Investigating committee met again last evening under the presidency of Ald. Prefontaine. There were also present Ald. Farrell, Brunet, McBride and Smith, and Acting-Mayor Lyall; Messrs. Greenshields, Marochel and Smith, Geoffrion and Weir represented the legal element.

Being sworn, Amable L'Allemand, of Notre Dame street, deposed that his hardware store had been robbed in July last. Lieut. Berleau had examined his premises, but so far as he knew nothing had been done by that officer. Yes, he was insured with the Dominion Burglary Guarantee company, who recompensed him for his loss.

Mr. J. H. E. Denis, of 2099 St. Catherine street, deposed that his store had been forcibly entered at the beginning of the year. He lodged a complaint with the officer in charge of No. 10 station, on St. Catherine street west. The next day a detective visited his place, but he never heard anything further about the goods taken away.

Mr. G. Denis, who keeps a fancy goods store on St. Lawrence, was the next witness. His store was burglarized last August and \$300 worth of property stolen. He went to the detectives' office and informed a French-Canadian detective of the affair. No, the goods were never recovered. He also was insured with the Dominion Burglary Guarantee company, but he was not so fortunate as Mr. L'Allemand in having his loss made good by that company.

The grocery store of Mr. P. R. Maletta was likewise robbed last February. This was also reported at No. 10 station and a detective examined the premises, but no goods were recovered.

Mr. Geoffrion—"What did you lose?" "Champagne and rye." "What kind of rye?" "Walker's Canadian." Ald. McBride—"He took a good brand." (laughter).

"Yes, you bet your life he did." Mr. Ed. Upton, grocer, of Wellington street, was the next complainant of two robberies in his store. He lost cigars, bottles of liquor, two caps and other things. The first case he reported to Lieut. Cambridge, and the police came and looked around, and then watched the movements of the suspected parties. The police at various times made enquiries, while he himself kept a sharp look out and always found the police watching.

To Mr. Geoffrion he said that he was insured, but not against burglars. Mr. R. B. Weir then took Chief Detective Cullen in hand.

A good deal of what he stated now he had stated a year ago, relative to the examination of the then system. The present system was an improvement on the old one. And it was the system which had been in vogue for years. Witness had neither been condemned nor praised as a result of the investigation a year ago. The Police committee did not make a regular examination of their system. There had been one examination since he had been appointed head of the department. He never saw the Chief of Police examining their books. He did not make a habitual examination of them, but said Mr. Cullen, "he is liable to any moment and he is welcome to do so." It was only in special cases that they reported to the Superintendent.

Since the investigation he (witness) had kept in the office more than formerly. He had never been approached by any member of the Police committee or the council, regarding any arrests he had made; could not say anything about other officers.

Questioned about houses of ill-fame, Mr. Cullen said that it was the duty of every constable to look after them. There were inspectors, captains and men for every district. The detectives were not solely responsible for them. A list of these houses was taken annually for the information of the police, who desired to know the character of these people. He never received any instructions about them, but the captains of the districts had.

Ald. Smith—"You consider yourself responsible for the workings of your department?"

"Yes."

"And under the supervision of the Chief of Police?"

"Yes, and we have been working under the new rules for about three months."

"And previous to that?"

"We carried on our work according to law."

"Do you daily instruct your men?"

"Yes, if necessary, I would, but they are all experienced men; I don't require to instruct them much. Although the cases were numerous they were not serious. We are certainly short handed, although they received assistance from the police. We want four more men to do duty around the pawn shops. There was a prominent jeweller in town who bought a \$1,000 worth of jewellery for a few \$100."

To Ald. Smith—"They are not first class jewellers, but hole and corner ones who would smash up the jewellery, we know who they are, but can't do anything with them as our witness is in Lockwood jail."

To Mr. Smith, he said that he only knew of one officer receiving money from the keeper of a house of ill fame. That case he reported to the Superintendent, who authorized him (witness) to investigate it. He did. Found out the man, who was fined and reduced and so far as he knew was still on the force.

In answer to further enquiries Mr. Cullen said that the man in question had been in the Central station, but had been removed.

To Mr. Geoffrion, he said that he had never been interfered with by his employers, but rather he had been encouraged. The man in question had denied ever receiving any money. The man had been reduced and removed for admitting that he had been in one of these houses.

To Ald. Smith—"The man was said to have been receiving \$5 per week for several weeks. This was denied, although he admitted he had been in the house."

Then came Detective Tramps, of whom great things were expected, but the look for bomb did not explode. He was questioned by Mr. Marochel principally relative to the fire at the R. & O. N. company's premises at Longueuil. He had been on the detective force since 1888, and had been on the police force before that time. Had never received any money from any one before working on a case, but had received money several times afterwards. Regarding the R. & O. N. company's case, he had received permission from the Superintendent and chief of this department to go and work it up. He admitted charging the company \$5 per day for fifteen days. Did not tell the Superintendent he had received \$75. Under the new rules they were required to do so.

The enquiry adjourned until Monday evening at 8 o'clock.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, TUESDAY, DEC. 4.

MUCH AMUSED INQUISITORS.

A Witness Who Laughed and One Who Would Not be Insulted.

AT THE POLICE ENQUIRY.

The History of Four Robberies and the Finding of a Watch and Chain.

There was more fun than one could shake a stick at at the Police investigation last evening. From the beginning to the end there was a continual outburst of laughter and an occasional display of indignation on the part of a witness or two.

Owing to the forced absence of Ald. Rainville, Ald. Prefontaine took the chair, and was surrounded by Ald. Farrell, Smith, McBride and Brunet. The lawyers present were Messrs. Macmaster, Geoffrion, Bisailon, Smith and Marochel. The first witness called was Mr. R. G. Brown, tailor, Bleury street, who was examined by Mr. R. C. Smith. Yes, the burglar had been busy at his store as he

HAD BEEN ROBBED SEVEN TIMES.

The value of the goods taken ranged from \$100 to \$500 each time. The cases had been reported to the police. In one instance three men had been arrested by the late Detective Boas, of the Grand Trunk, at Brockville. The city detectives had given him very little hopes of the recovery of the goods. That was the only satisfaction he got.

To Mr. Geoffrion—He considered himself unfortunate in being robbed so often. No, he did not suspect the police. He had been robbed seven times in ten years. He had been robbed twice this year, in April and May. He reported the matter to Mr. Grose and the sergeant at No. 5.

"Who is Grose?" asked Mr. Geoffrion.

"Detective Grose."

"Is he a city detective?"

"No, he is a private detective."

"Oh, I see, but he did not recover your goods."

"No, he paid us for the goods, as he thought it would be better to do so than have a detective going around looking for them."

"Good-bye Mr. Brown," said Mr. Geoffrion.

"Good-bye," replied Mr. Brown.

Mr. M. O'Connell, trader, 194 St. Antoine street, deposed to having had his store broken into four times. He lost about \$250. Twice he had been cleaned out. He reported the robberies at No. 6 station. It was only on the last occasion, Good Friday, that Detective Cullen visited him. One man had been arrested and sentenced to three or four months' imprisonment.

"Did you ever see any aldermen about your robberies?" asked Mr. Smith.

"Yes, one day I went down to Vipond & McBride's on business, and the alderman asked me how I was getting on, and I replied, 'Alderman, how can I get on when I have been robbed again?' And the alderman

TELEPHONED TO THE CHIEF

right away, and it was then that Detective Cullen came up."

"Whom do you mean by the Chief?" asked Mr. Geoffrion.

"How many chiefs have you?"

"Do you mean Mr. Cullen?"

"No, I mean his superior officer."

"Was it Chief Hughes?"

"I suppose so."

"How do you know what the Chief said?"

"I heard it."

"Had you your ear to the telephone?"

"No, nor my eye either. Many a time I heard what went on at the telephone and was not in communication with it. No, I could not give the police any points to recover the goods."

Mr. Alph. Mousseau, of St. Lawrence street, had also been robbed. He was insured and got \$120, and the matter dropped there.

Mr. Joseph Levesque, of the same street, had also been robbed, but he had never heard anything about it.

Mr. M. Rudolph, of 2320 St. Catherine street, was also a victim to the burglars. This was a very funny witness. He had been robbed twice; the first time he had lost about \$300 worth of goods, but nobody went near him. The second time Detective Robinson called, but none of the goods were recovered.

A GREATLY AMUSED WITNESS.

To Mr. Geoffrion, he said that he looked upon the thing as a joke. He laughed very heartily when any questions were put to him. He put the audience into fits of laughter by some of his answers.

Mr. Samuel Sherman, jeweller, St. Lawrence street, had his store burglarized four times. The first time he suspected an apprentice boy, and when he spoke to the boy he cried, and he had no reason to do that. "I never like to see people cry, I always like to see them happy," said the witness. Continuing, he said he missed 25 cents and again 25 cents.

He was being examined by Mr. Smith, when Mr. Geoffrion said: "Mr. Smith, that will cost you ten cents per hundred words."

The witness got angry, jumped up, put his hand in his pocket and pulled out a ten cent piece, which he placed on the table, and left the stand disgusted, saying:

"You won't insult me."

"What did the detectives do?" asked Mr. Smith.

"Do," exclaimed the witness with astonishment, "Why, nothing, of course."

On the occasion of the last robbery the witness did not think it was necessary to call in the police at all. He just kicked the boy out, giving him a taste of the witness' shoe leather.

Mr. Macmaster then took the witness in hand and cross-examined him sharply. Being hard pressed he said that he heard about a man being sent to the penitentiary for fourteen years for breaking his window.

"Now," said Mr. Macmaster, "what about the fifth robbery?"

"I never said there were five, only four."

"Yes, but I will go you one better," said Mr. Macmaster.

"What about the police going to your place for a gold watch?"

"I will not answer that question until I tell the whole story. You can't insult me. I will speak to the committee."

He related the facts of the case. A gold watch was left with him for repairs and he had been asked to advance money on it as the man was hard up. It was Detective O'Keefe who called for the watch. "Now, what have you got to say to that?" asked the witness of Mr. Macmaster.

To Mr. Macmaster he added that he did not know who the owner of the watch was. He advanced \$15 on it.

AND ALSO A SILVER CHAIN.

"What about the silver chain?"

"That was a customer of mine, and I know him better than I know you; I never went to see you again."

"The detectives found the stolen watch and chain in your store."

"Yes, the brave detectives."

The witness then left with mutterings of being brought there to be insulted.

Mr. J. D. White, grocer, corner Sherbrooke and Bleury streets, followed. He was robbed at Christmas and the matter was reported to the police. The witness got a clue a week after and telephoned to the detectives, but he did not know what they had done.

Mr. W. J. Delaney, grocer, corner MacKay and St. Catherine streets, was examined by Mr. Marochel. His store was entered into last February. The detectives came one hour after being notified. All the information he got was that the detectives were working on the case.

Messrs. Gervais, Villeneuve and Turpin had all suffered at the hands of burglars, but had never heard anything about their losses.

The chairman stated that the committee had heard enough on this point and unless something more important facts were adduced they

WOULD HAVE TO STOP IT.

Mr. Smith stated that he did not think they would offer any more evidence in the line of burglaries. They had given evidence to establish what was a notorious fact that burglaries were committed and never detected.

Mr. Geoffrion asked for more definite information. They objected to any more sittings like what they had. It was a pity to put the city to such expense.

Mr. Smith stated that at the next meeting, which will be held on Friday night, he would examine Major Bond on the actions of the police on certain matters.

The Gazette.

MONTREAL, THURSDAY, DEC. 13

THE POLICE ENQUIRY.

Major Bond, President of the Citizens' League, on the Stand.

The Police Investigating committee met again last evening. All the members were present except Ald. Brunet. Acting-Mayor Lyall was present.

There was considerable discussion as to the acceptance of some documents by Mr. R. C. Smith, and their contents, which had passed between the Citizens' league and the Chief of Police, relative to complaints sent to him about liquor law contraventions, and also gambling and disorderly houses. It was finally decided to allow them to be produced.

Major E. L. Bond and Mr. H. Timm's were sworn together.

The former deposed that he had been president of the Citizens' league since 1891. Its duties were the due enforcement of the laws and obedience to them without prosecution, if it could be done. His evidence partook largely of the reading of correspondence which had passed between the league and the Chief of Police on subjects enumerated. The stronghold of evil to-day, he said, lay in the selling of liquor in houses of ill-fame.

To Ald. Smith, he said that the league was under the impression that it had been instrumental in closing up a well-known house on St. Constant street.

Other houses were mentioned, and Major Bond went on to say that the Criminal Code defined what houses of ill-fame were. All that the league asked was that the law be enforced. These houses should be suppressed with a firm hand. Major Bond related a harrowing case of immorality which he claimed, (as the mistress had told him) was under police protection. It was one of the worst places in America. If the police did not know anything about it, it was about the worst thing which could be said against them. The next question touched upon was the commission houses and gambling dens, and the open work which had been done in that line at Schermer Park, Royal Park, Lepine Park and the Exhibition grounds on several occasions. The witness went on to state that professional gambling went on according to his belief in some clubs under the guise of social clubs.

To Mr. Smith—The Chief of Police refused to act in the cases of houses of ill-fame and those of gambling notoriety.

To Mr. Bisailon—He had no personal knowledge of those facts; they had been laid on the information of the league's inspector.

To Mr. Smith—He had offered these facts, and those of his witnesses to the Chief, and also the statements of those people that they were under police protection.

Mr. Frederick Hamilton gave some testimony as to the trouble he had with the police before three houses of ill-fame were closed up which he complained about.

The committee will meet again tomorrow night.