

but all agricultural sections of New Ontario would receive proper attention. An effort would be made to establish a pulp mill in the Temiskaming district, which would provide immediate employment for settlers going into that section of the country.

It would be necessary, Mr. Hearst pointed out, to send engineering parties out through the country to determine the character of the land, to indicate where the best land is to be found, and to avoid road construction into districts where no settlement would likely follow.

An immigration policy would have to be worked out, and some settled method of disposing of the land. "We will be willing to submit every dollar of the five millions to the approval of this House," the Minister said in conclusion.

House Would Punish.

Sir James Whitney was severe in his denunciation of the opposition to the terms of the bill. He disagreed with Mr. Rowell as to the appositeness of the precedent found in the defeat of the Sandfield Macdonald Administration in 1871. The Government was thoroughly consistent with accepted constitutional practice in the line it was following. "Suppose we improperly spent one dollar of this money," he said, "the members of this House could rebuke us. They could punish us—and I believe hon. gentlemen would do it."

When the bill was in committee Mr. Rowell objected to the inclusion in the bill of the words "and such other objects as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may deem expedient." He urged that all the objects for which the money was to be spent should be approved by the Legislative Assembly. These other objects could be approved by the House at the next session.

Mr. Rowell said he had an amendment to make to the bill that a department of the Government be created to have charge of the work of opening up New Ontario. He would make the formal motion later.

Mr. Z. Mageau (Sturgeon Falls) called attention to the fact that more than \$350,000 had already been voted for work on roads in Northern Ontario, and more than \$150,000 for bridges. He inquired if this additional money was to be spent irrespective of politics and by competent engineers. He suggested that the larger part of the money might go to the constituency of Temiskaming, and that the member from Temiskaming was confident that it would. He hoped that the constituency which he represented would not receive unfair treatment.

Mr. H. A. C. Machin (Kenora) while the bill was being considered in Committee of the House, called the attention of the Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines to the needs of northwestern Ontario, and urged that all the money be not spent along the line of the T. & N. O. Railway.

Hon. Mr. Hearst pointed out that it was along the Government railway where most of the settlers were likely to go in. Nevertheless he promised that Mr. Machin's constituency would not be neglected.

Leave Osteopaths Out.

By introducing his amendment to the medical act giving recognition under certain restrictions to osteopaths practicing in Ontario, Dr. D. Jamieson (South Grey) found that he had stirred up such a "hornets' nest" that he moved in the House yesterday to strike out all the clauses in the bill which related to osteopaths.

Under the circumstances Dr. Jamieson thought "it would not be in the interests of the medical profession and the public" to have the bill pass at the present time. Accordingly he proposed to let the legislation go over until next year, when it might be brought up again. In the meantime to prevent "the country becoming flooded with all sorts of irregular practitioners," Dr. Jamieson thought next year's legislation could be made retroactive for a year.

The sole remaining clause in the amendment to the medical act provided for interprovincial reciprocity in the registration of medical practitioners. This clause was passed by the House in committee.

The principle of Mr. W. D. McPherson's bulk sales act did not commend itself to the House in committee. Messrs R. R. Gamey (Manitou-

lin), A. A. Mahaffy (Muskoka), and T. W. McGarry (South Renfrew) expressed themselves as opposed to it, and Sir James Whitney agreed with them, saying that with a measure of such importance it would be wise to "make haste slowly." Accordingly he asked that the bill be held over until next session.

Maintaining that he considered the bill "a tardy measure of justice," Mr. McPherson consented to letting his bill go over. He explained that although the bill was intended to place restrictions on retailers wishing to dispose of their stock in bulk for the protection of wholesalers, he understood the Retail Merchants' Association were in favor of it.

When the license act amendments were in committee Mr. Rowell suggested that the Government put into law its practice of refusing club licenses in districts where local option was in force. Mr. Hanna did not think this was necessary.

'COWARDLY ATTACK' SAYS SIR JAMES

Prime Minister's Reply to Plea for Rights of Members

APPEAL AGAINST RULINGS

Mr. Rowell Maintains Right of Members to Question Ministry—Motion Was Lost by 69 to 20 and Amendment Carried.

Heated words crossed the floor of the Legislature last night on the debate on Hon. A. G. MacKay's motion of protest against the ruling of the Speaker in refusing to have certain questions placed upon the order paper. The questions related to the bilingual school question, involving pre-election utterances of the Attorney-General and Minister of Public Works, and were not allowed on the ground that the contents were debatable.

Mr. Rowell, in support of the motion, made a careful, well-reasoned analysis of the position of the Opposition. He quoted from the journals of the House to show that identical questions to those proposed had been asked by members of the present Government when in Opposition. Disclaiming any intention to cast any personal reflection upon the presiding officer of the House, he said: "We protest against your ruling, because it deprives the members of this House of important rights and privileges which they are entitled to enjoy, because we believe if we acquiesce in it we would be permitting this House to lose one of its most important rights and privileges. We put this resolution on the order paper in respectful protest against your action, and we ask that this House direct that these questions be placed upon the order paper for answer."

"Covert, Unmanly and Cowardly."

Sir James Whitney was not inclined to accept the statement of the leader of the Opposition that no personal attack was intended on the Speaker. He referred to Mr. Rowell's speech as a "covert, unmanly and cowardly attack on the presiding officer of the House." The hon. gentleman was unable to hide the "fear, malice and personal reflection with which he desires to place upon you, sitting defenceless in that chair."

Mr. Rowell rose to a point of order and asked whether the language of the Prime Minister was Parliamen-