

ment members had apparently changed their minds on the measure, and so on.

Hon. Mr. Raney—What is the honorable member say about his own party's attitude?

Mr. Lewis—Only that there was a big difference of opinion on the matter in different parts of the House, and that I voted for the bill.

#### Not to Embarrass.

Hon. Mr. Raney—Did he say that members in his quarter of the House voted against this bill so as to embarrass members on this side—so as to create cleavage between Farmer and Labor member?

Mr. Lewis—No; the member did not.

Mr. Raney—Did he say that his group would obstruct a bill in the House for six weeks if the bill was brought down?

Mr. Lewis—No; he said nothing of the kind about obstruction or anything that could be interpreted as that.

Then the Conservative Leader produced the last newspaper item of the day—that from The Globe heralding child welfare work co-ordination. Hon. Mr. Ferguson protested that if that were the purpose of the Government it ought to have been announced on the floor of the Legislature and not in the Press. He recollected, too, that the Prime Minister was reported to have made a somewhat definite announcement along that line in Ottawa.

Premier Drury admitted that the Government had a co-ordinated scheme of child welfare work under discussion, but if he had been quoted as definitely announcing it at Ottawa he had been misreported.

## 'BLUE SKY' MEASURE WINS APPROBATION AMONG LEGISLATORS

### Attorney-General Raney's Bill Favored by Legal Members of Ontario House

#### PROTECTION FOR UNWARY

Although Attorney-General Raney's Blue Sky measure did not get through its second reading in the Legislature yesterday, it was brought down for discussion, and received what seemed to be a very favorable reception from the few members present, after the able exposition of J. W. Curry, K.C., who acted as Chairman at the special committee which considered the measure during the recess.

Discussion of the measure was adjourned in a slim Friday afternoon House for the attendance of more lawyers. At that time there were three lawyers on hand—Messrs. Raney, Ferguson and Curry. Yesterday's debate found only one legal member added to that number—W. F. Nickle, K.C., Conservative member for Kingston. The discussion, which it was found practical to discuss more or less informally, was practically between these four members.

#### Explained by J. W. Curry.

Mr. Curry explained the bill from beginning to end, bringing down special reports and information brought to the attention of the special committee, and emphasizing for the benefit of the House those points which the special committee had deemed of outstanding importance. Hon. Mr. Ferguson and W. F. Nickle, K.C., found proposals in the measure not wholly to their liking, but there was no disposition to criticize the principle, and the desire behind the bill—to eliminate fraudulent stock flotations in Ontario.

With statistics gathered from reports and expert testimony, Mr. Curry impressed the House with the magnitude of the evil which it was sought to cure. Scores of millions of dollars were estimated as being the annual harvest in Ontario from fraudulent stock sales, and he went on to say that because of the

rapid tendency to legislate against stock frauds in the United States and other Provinces of the Dominion, Ontario was fast becoming the Mecca for the "fly-by-nighters."

#### Cannot Protect Fully.

The member for Southwest Toronto agreed with the opinion of Hon. G. H. Ferguson that no law on earth could protect a fool against his own folly, but he was firmly of the opinion that it would effectively curtail the annual loss totals from deliberate stock swindles.

It was not proposed, he said, to blacklist any financial venture which had a prospect or possibility of success. The proposed Commissioner of Securities would have power to demand full and complete information respecting stock flotations, and the obviously deliberate attempts at fraud would come under the ban.

Mr. Curry also admitted that the proposed law would not stop fraudulent solicitation by mail, but he was quite sure that the fact that such solicitation was by mail and from outside the Provincial jurisdiction would cause careful scrutiny on the part of the intending investor. Emphatically he stated that it was not the intention of the law to place a stamp of Government approval or guarantee upon financial speculations. Speculations as such must retain their element of gamble, but it was hoped to eliminate the deliberately attempted fraud.

## TRANSFERABLE VOTE IS FEARED BY HENRY

### Second Choice of Either Liberals or U.F.O. Cold Comfort for Conservatives

#### ARGUES AGAINST "P. R."

Although admitting he was in the dark as to the intentions of the Government, Hon. G. S. Henry, in addressing a meeting of the North Toronto Conservative Association at the old Eglinton Town Hall last night, declared that there was a "feeling" at Queen's Park that the Farmer party would adopt the single transferable vote in single member ridings throughout the Province in preference to effecting a redistribution of seats before the approaching Provincial election.

Mr. Henry also stated that it was rumored that a trial of proportional representation was likely in Toronto and district, and that the 12 city and suburban York ridings would be grouped in two large constituencies to permit of the experiment.

Nothing daunted by a slim attendance—his audience numbered only 35—the former Minister of Agriculture spoke at length on what he claimed were the delinquencies of the Drury Government.

#### Scores Government Indecision.

To his way of thinking one of the present Administration's worst sins was its inability to come to a decision, particularly with regard to redistribution and the proportional representation issue.

Notwithstanding that hesitancy on the part of his opponents he seemed to be much concerned over the possibility of the introduction of "P.R." in Toronto, for he devoted a considerable portion of his address to attacks on that system of voting. He admitted that "P.R." would elect a Legislature that would reflect accurately the voting strength of various parties, but declared that that fact alone was enough to condemn the proposal. It would, he said, introduce a series of "wobbly" Administrations and tend to make group government a permanency in Ontario.

"There is a feeling that they are to try the most innocuous form of proportional representation—the single transferable vote in single-member constituencies—rather than change the constituencies."

It was the single transferable vote that worried the speaker, however, for he declared that its adoption would be detrimental to the Conservatives. The Government members, he said, argued that were the single