

able to draw the line at grandmotherly legislation," said Mr. P. H. Bowyer (East Kent), in urging his bill to amend the pharmacy act by permitting country merchants to sell harmless household remedies before the Legislative Municipal Committee yesterday morning. Hon. W. J. Hanna presided.

Mr. G. E. Gibbard, on behalf of the College of Pharmacy, opposed the measure. So far as he was personally concerned, he had not done any lobbying on the measure. He declared the danger in the bill rested in the fact that country merchants knew nothing of unscheduled drugs and the contents of many medicines sold.

Secretary E. M. Trowern of the Retail Merchants' Association volunteered the information that the retail merchants of the Province were not asking for the bill, and thereby thrust his head into a hornets' nest.

"You don't know what you're talking about," retorted Mr. Reid (Renfrew).

"Hear, hear," put in Capt. Machin (Kenora).

"I know that the retail merchants in my constituency are unanimously in favor of it," put in Mr. McElroy (Carleton).

"As a retail merchant myself, I know they are," added Mr. McCart (Stormont).

The preponderance of opinion in the committee was in favor of the bill. On the suggestion of the Chairman, however, before any final draft was approved, a special committee consisting of Messrs. Bowyer, Macdiarmid, Nickle, Neeley and MacKay (Oxford) was appointed to confer with the druggists and report.

Killed This Bill.

The Legislative Municipal Committee yesterday morning threw out the bill of Mr. E. E. Fraser (Welland) to give municipalities the control of the erection of all billboards.

SUBSIDIZE THE C. N. R.

Delegation From Port Arthur Will Ask Government to do so.

"Our paramount endeavor here will be to show to the Ontario Government how imperative it is to open up that large tract of land in New Ontario lying between Port Arthur and Sudbury—a track of land 500 miles in extent, practically uninhabited, and not served at present by any railroad." This statement was made to The Globe last night by Mr. F. H. Keefer, Port Arthur's solicitor, who is one of a delegation from that city. The others are: Mayor J. L. Matthews and Ald. J. G. King. Speaking of their mission, the solicitor explained that the Canadian Pacific was located on the rock-bound shore line of Lake Superior, while the Grand Trunk Pacific was being constructed away back on the height of land. In between the territory opened by these roads was a great clay belt, rich in mineral wealth and timber. It was in this district that the Canadian Northern Co. intended constructing a connecting link between their western and Ontario lines. The revenue to the Province, he thought, would easily warrant the opening up of the country, and the mere fact of its being a through transportation road in no way displaced its use as a colonization road. Moreover, if that road be not built a great deal of grain and general traffic will go through by American roads. We are in favor of the C. N. R. or any other company getting a liberal subsidy at the hands of the Province.

Serene Henry to Gentle James.

While bestowing a few love taps on the Electric Light Company at the big Tory rally in Riverdale Rink on Monday night the Premier of Ontario suddenly turned his attention to Mr. Henry O'Brien, K.C., the company's solicitor, and a distinguished Conservative, and charged that in the columns of The Canada Law Journal, of which he is editor, he had made an attempt to destroy, or at least injure, the financial credit of the Government because the Government insisted on carrying through the Hydro-Electric project. Mr. O'Brien asks The Globe to publish the following reply:—

"My attention has been called to a statement made at a recent political meeting by Sir James Whitney in reference to me as the editor of The Canada Law Journal. I do not desire to refer to the language used on that occasion further than to say that Sir James apparently forgets the responsibility of the dignified position which he at present occupies. Sir James might have seen, if he had taken the trouble to look, that the article in question was not written by me, but contributed by one eminently qualified to discuss the subject in its legal aspect. When a man of such high standing, recognized ability and learning in constitutional matters and extensive Parliamentary experience as Col. O'Brien sent us an article on this subject we were pleased to give our readers the benefit of it.

"Sir James Whitney's acquaintance with constitutional matters is necessarily limited, and his opinion as to the functions and province of legal journalism is of little value as compared with the opinion of those who have been engaged in such journalism for half a lifetime. It ought to be unnecessary to say that a legal journal is not only concerned with the discussion of matters of practice and case law, but also very properly deals with the larger subjects of international and constitutional law. Not the least important of its functions is the criticism of statutes which, as everyone knows, are too often crude and ill considered. Of such statutes we have, in the legislation discussed in that article, a striking illustration.

"A gentleman who with reckless glibness characterizes men who are, to say the least, not less respected nor less highly esteemed than himself, as 'a bunch of fakirs' would scarcely seem to be a person fit to be trusted with the enactment of legislation of the careful and deliberate description which is requisite if the public are to be adequately protected. In the judgment of the writer of the article referred to (with which I thoroughly agree), any damage which the 'financial credit of Ontario' has sustained is really due to the improvident and, as many think, unfair legislation of which Sir James Whitney is the author. Under these circumstances it is preposterous to lay that damage to the charge of those who have criticized such legislation and exposed its true character and tendency."