POLICE SEEK DR. BRUCE'S ASSAILANTS

Attorney-General Tells House Guilty Persons Will Be Punished

WITNESSES QUIZZED

Osteopath Executive in Meantime Says Croll Was Unfair

Provincial police, directed by Inspector E. D. L. Hammond of the Criminal Investigation Branch, yesterday launched a determined hunt for the persons who subjected Hon. Dr. Herbert A. Bruce, former Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, to insults, threats and intimidation at Queen's Park on Tuesday.

Announcement of police action was made in the Legislature yesterday by Attorney-General Conant. He stated that those found to have been implicated will be brought to justice with the least possible delay

The police investigation, which Mr. Conant declared would be "exhaustive," began early yesterday morning. Inspector Hammond and two other officers interviewed witnesses of Tuesday's episode in which Dr. Bruce was the central figure. Dr. Bruce is said to have complained formally to the authorities.

The riotous scene was created by some thirty or forty supporters of the osteopaths' bill which the Private Bills Committee of the Legislature rejected after the former Lieutenant-Governor, who is an eminent surgeon, had spoken emphatically against it.

Conant Voices Indignation.

"I believe I express the sentiment of every honorable gentleman
in this House," said Mr. Conant,
"when I protest against the unseemly and inexcusable occurrence
which took place yesterday, particularly so when the gentleman
who was formerly Lieutenant-Governor of this Province was insulted or threatened or perhaps
both.

"There is no place for that sort of conduct in this building, whether in this chamber or in committee rooms. It will not be tolerated under any circumstances. Ample provision is being made so that such occurrence in the future will be impossible. I can also assure the House that the Provincial Police have the matter in hand and will make an exhaustive investigation. All persons responsible will be apprehended and brought to justice."

Both Opposition Leader Leopold Macaulay and Premier Hepburn concurred in the Attorney-General's attitude.

The time had come, Mr. Mac-

aulay declared, when opinions in some quarters that anything could be got away with in the Legislature should be definitely smashed.

"I thoroughly agree with the Attorney-General in what he has said and what he is doing," he said. "It's time we discouraged this sort of idea and asserted our rights and our dignity not only in this chamber but all through the buildings. Let's carry on and maintain our British traditions."

"I want to associate myself with what has been said by the Attorney-General and the Leader of the Opposition," Premier Hepburn remarked. "I would like to express to the former Lieutenant-Governor my sincere regret for the unseemly conduct toward him by these individuals. I trust and hope they will be apprehended and suitably punished."

Pocock Applauds Action.

In commenting on the latest development, Hubert Pocock, representative of the Ontario Academy of Osteopathy, said:

"As far as the members of the osteopathic profession are concerned, we know nothing whatever of anything that might have been done to injure, verbally or bodily, the former Lieutenant-Governor, Dr.

Herbert Bruce, and are in absolute

"I saw the former Lieutenant-Governor." he continued, "leaving the Parliament Buildings, escorted by two policemen, and I didn't know what had happened. I left the committee room as soon as the discussion of our bill was closed.

"A man who has rendered such distinguished services to the community deserves a hearing, no matter how objectionable his remarks may be to the audience."

Accuse Croll of Unfairness.

London, Ont., March 30 (CP). — E. S. Detwiler, Secretary of the Ontario Academy of Osteopathy, in an open letter to David A. Croll, M.L.A., Chairman of the Legislature Committee on Private Bills, charges unfair treatment in consideration of the Drugless Practioners' Act, under which osteopaths would have been permitted to use the title "doctor."

With respect to his reception given Dr. Herbert A. Bruce, former Lieutenant - Governer, the

writer believed that Mr. Croll had been overawed by the dignity of the speaker, or else the committee had been given its orders to defeat the bill before it was presented.

Text of Letter.

The letter follows: March 30, 1938, Mr. David A. Croll, Parliament Buildings, Queen's Park, Toronto.

Dear Sir: The questions involved in the drugless practitioners' bill presented to your committee on private bills yesterday morning were so clearly ones of trade or occupational restriction that there should have been no difficulty in considering the bill and in barring irrelevant matter in the discussion. Your conduct of the hearing was unfair and deserving of protest from your petitioners.

Discussion of the educational qualifications and the professional skill, or lack of it, of the proponents of the bill should have been allowed only in an attack on the Drugless Practitioners' Act and not on the bill as presented.

You rightly checked one of the speakers for the bill when he tended to depart from its immediate purpose and provisions, but you did not mete out the same treatment to the opposing speaker when his remarks were all entirely irrelevant. You sat silent and did not check Dr. Bruce in his remarks which were entirely an attack on the provisions of the Drugless Practitioners' Act and not germaine to the bill before the committee

Your action strongly suggested either, or both, of two things—you were so completely overawed by the dignity of the speaker and the respect in which all Ontario holds the former Lieutenant-Governor that you could not bring yourself to hold him to the subject, or what, from the whole hearing, seems to most of us to have been the case, your committee had its instructions to defeat the bill before it was presented.

You gave the petitioners no opportunity to reply to the opposing speaker, although his presentation was so unfair and irrelevant. On the contrary, the motion "that the bill be not reported," your "in favor," "opposed," "carried" and "meeting's adjourned" tumbled so precipitantly one upon the other that we in the audience saw no vote in opposition to the motion, nor was there any proper vote taken.

One conclusion is forced upon the minds of your petitioners, and that is that the Private Bills Committee had no intention of seriously passing or reporting the bill.

The most unfortunate and muchto-be-deplored incident so gloatingly reported by the papers that followed the meeting of your committee, was due, not to the defeat of the bill, but to the unfair treatment meted out to your petitioners.

Regrets Disturbance.

The writer has been a law-abiding, tax-paying citizen, as have many of his fellow practitioners, for more than twenty-five years. Every member of the Ontario Academy of Osteopathy has every respect for the person of the former representative of his Majesty the King in Ontario None of us would under any circumstances condone or be a party to such a disturbance as was reported to have occurred in the parliamentary halls yesterday. We all regret it more than we can say, and in fact, are not at at all sure that its instigators came from among our ranks.

Our protest to you, sir, is that you did not treat the opponents to the hill as you did the proponents: that you did not give the sponsors of the bill an opportunity to reply to the unfair address of the distingaished doctor and thereby allowed irrelevant matter by a man whose presence, not his argument, unfairly prejudiced an honest petition; that no proper vote was taken or allowed (as was so carefully done in the bill immediately preceding this one); that you so hastily adjourned, without due motion, the meeting, and did not allow any protest: and that as a result of these actions, honest citizens were prevented from receiving a fair hearing of a worthy petition or courteous treatment.

To this we strongly protest.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. Detwiler, Secretary,

Ontario Academy of Osteopathy.