

TOWN PLANNING BILLS TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE

**TAX REFORM COMMITTEE WILL
CONSIDER MATTERS DURING
THE SUMMER.**

The two town planning bills introduced in the Legislature by Mr. W. D. McPherson (West Toronto) and Mr. J. A. Ellis (West Ottawa) will not be passed this session, but will be considered by the same special committee of the House to be appointed to make investigations regarding tax reform during the summer recess. The bills came before the Municipal Committee yesterday morning, and without discussion were referred to the Committee on Tax Reform.

The clause in the Toronto bill introduced by Mr. George H. Gooderham, giving the city power to prescribe the width of new streets to be laid out, was also referred to the same committee in spite of the protests of Mayor Geary and several members of the City Council who were present, and who urged the need of haste.

A sub-committee of the Municipal Committee appointed last week to report on the regulation of apartment houses in cities of more than 100,000 population reported an amendment which defined apartment and tenement houses as houses in which three or more families are living. The amended clause provided that the erection of this class of house shall be confined to certain streets to be stipulated. The clause as amended was carried by the committee.

The bill introduced by Mr. McPherson to assess the cost of erecting electric light standards and of laying underground wires as local improvements was at first unfavorably received by the committee. Hon. W. J. Hanna pointing out that it would be unfair to make a man who did not use electric light pay for the erections of standards and underground wires. Mr. T. E. Meredith of London urged that if these were not put under the local improvement section of the assessment act any "dog in the manger" could hold up a whole street which wanted to lay wires underground. The bill was held over to be considered at the next meeting of the committee.

The clause in Mr. Ellis' bread bill to empower municipalities to license and regulate bakers' premises was struck out on the ground that the licensing of bakers was a new idea and would require further consideration. Mr. Hanna pointed out that butchers might just as well be licensed as bakers.

The bill to prevent minors from frequenting poolrooms was held over, as a provision in another bill to the same effect is still before the House.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR MEDICAL ACT

**DR. JAMIESON'S AMENDMENT
WILL BE SO CON-
SIDERED.**

A special medical committee of the Legislature will consider the amendment to the medical act introduced by Dr. D. Jamieson (South Grey) to provide for interprovincial registration of medical practitioners, and for the recognition of the practise of osteopathy. Dr. Jamieson explained his bill in the House yesterday, and moved that it be referred to a committee composed of Dr. Reaume, Dr. Pyne, Dr. Jamieson, Dr. Jessop, Dr. McQueen, Messrs. Thompson, Marshall, Musgrove, Johnston, Bowman, McNaught, McPherson and Sinclair.

Adolescents to Go to School.

Hon. Dr. Pyne explained his adolescent school attendance act, which came up for its second reading. The act is to give municipalities the option of passing a by-law to require children between the ages of fourteen and seventeen who are not receiving an education to attend some school. Those children who may be employed shall, if the majority of the ratepayers desire it, be required to attend a night school, and the employers shall be required to allow them a sufficient number of hours off from work to attend such schools. Such laws were in force, Dr. Pyne explained, in France, Germany, Switzerland, Scotland, and other European countries. The act he proposed would be operative as soon as the child is free from the provision of the truancy act.

Insurance Bill Amended.

With the exception of two sections the insurance bill was passed through Committee of the Whole. Mr. Rowell called attention to a lack of clearness in the section providing that an insurance company once having disputed a claim on the merits of their case cannot also claim immunity from payment on the ground of a technicality. Mr. Rowell also pointed out that under certain conditions the section requiring a period of sixty days to elapse after the proofs of loss are sent in before the settlement of a claim for insurance may be unfair to the policyholder. He advocated reducing the period to ten days. The two sections were held over and will be amended.