

TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1920.

MANY REGARD RIOT DAMAGE BILL ASKANCE

Curry's Measure Treated to
Sharp Criticism in the
House

IS SENT TO COMMITTEE

Members Agree That It
Should be Given Further
Consideration

There was severe criticism and even condemnation from some quarters in the Legislature yesterday of J. Walter Curry's bill to make Toronto liable for damage done restaurants and other shops in the riots of August, 1918. It was, after second reading, sent on to the Municipal Committee with such blessings as "vicious principle," "unfair" and "radical departure" bestowed from the Conservative benches.

After Mr. Curry had explained the intention of the legislation, Hon. Thomas Crawford opened the attack, declaring the bill might be construed as unfair. In his opinion it ought to be laid over for a session so that the views of the municipalities could be heard. Wilson A. Crockett, Labor member for South Wentworth, objected strongly to a clause which made the legislation retroactive. He, too, urged a year's delay. Neither was Hon. Walter Rollo in favor of the bill, and J. A. Calder, Liberal member for South Oxford, thought it should stand over. Mr. Dewart and Major Tolmie, Windsor, supported the principle of the proposed legislation.

Might Prove Incentive.

Hon. Mr. Raney agreed that there was merit in the suggestion to secure the views of the municipalities before enacting the legislation. His suggestion was that it be sent to a special committee, but, although Mr. Curry had no objections, other members insisted that the Municipal Committee was the proper body to deal with it.

Premier Drury also supported the principle of the measure, but agreed that there must be further consideration of it. He thought it important that at this period law and order should be maintained, and believed that liability for riot damage might prove an adequate incentive to some municipalities whom he suspected in the past of winking at disorders on the part of a certain section of its population.

Before the discussion was concluded Hon. Thomas Crawford criticized what he termed Premier Drury's indecision on the matter.

Should Encourage Prospecting.

Major M. Lang (Cochrane) objected to the clause in the bill amending the Ontario Mining Act which raised the fees to the prospector staking a claim on proxy. The proposed act lowers the prospector's fees, but increases them when he stakes by proxy. Major Lang thought both should be reduced. He argued that a prospector staking his own claim and two others would pay more under the new act than the old. Under the new act he pays \$5 for his own claim and \$15 each for the others. He wanted them all fixed at \$5 each.

Hon. Harry Mills, Minister of Mines, said that it was intended to