

March 31

Ontario Delays Cancer "Cure" Probe Hoping Ottawa May Take Action

Still with the hope that Ottawa may undertake an investigation of Ontario's various cancer "cures," the Hepburn Government has not made any further move to select the committee of inquiry which at one time it proposed to set up. Hon. Harold J. Kirby, Minister of Health, revealed this situation in the Legislature yesterday when he moved and got second reading to the bill authorizing the inquiry in question and compelling the various "cure" operators (among other things) to reveal their formula.

Tomorrow the Private Bills

Committee of the Legislature will consider the bill whereby J. E. Hett of Kitchener, one of the "cure" operators, seeks reinstatement in the medical profession, from which he was recently suspended by the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons.

An extensive lobby on this particular bill has been carried on at Queen's Park for the past few days, and yesterday Dr. Hett, who will speak before the committee Friday morning, was busy in the corridors, personally pleading his case with members and other parties concerned.

TWO LEADERS IN AGREEMENT ABOUT WINDUP

Business to Be Completed by
Next Thursday Under
Revised Plans

CANCEL NIGHT SITTINGS

Supply Motion, New Power
Contracts, Sweepstakes
Await Divisions

Agreement was reached by Premier Hepburn and Opposition Leader Macaulay yesterday whereby the present session of the Legislature will be wound up, in so far as business is concerned, one week from today, Thursday, April 7. Formal prorogation of the House has been set for Friday, April 8.

Contrary to original plans, there will be no more night sittings. Nor will a Saturday sitting be required.

The only disappointed people, as far as can be learned, are the thousand ticket holders who had been looking forward to a sitting tonight. Originally it was the intention to take divisions today on the supply motion, the second reading of the Houck bill ratifying the new Beauharnois and other Quebec contracts, and the McBrien sweepstakes resolution, which is cutting across party lines in a terrific manner.

This would have taken the Legislature well on to midnight, at the least. Now that they will sit only till 6 o'clock there is no possible indication of how far they will get with this trio of controversial issues.

VOTE PLUMPING CLAIMED RIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

Henry Measure to Reject
Ballot So Marked Is
Defeated

MINORITY PRIVILEGE

"Plumping," the gentle election art by which the voters are enabled in civic contests to roll up large counts for a favorite candidate by failing to ballot on other candidates on an election slate, was upheld yesterday in the Ontario Legislature as a democratic right and a safeguard to minorities.

Hon. George S. Henry (Cons., East York), pleaded in support of his bill designed to halt "plumping" by interpreting a "plumped" ballot as a rejected ballot, that an elector should have sufficient interest in a municipality to express his views on all candidates rather than on a particular friend.

The measure failed to pass second reading. Additional support from the Opposition benches came from William Duckworth (Cons., Dovercourt), who declared "plumping" placed a strong weapon in the hands "of a certain element in Toronto and other municipalities which is not in the best interests

of the people of this country. If you don't want to happen here what is happening in the South of Europe, vote for this bill."

Hon. Gordon Conant, Attorney-General, attacked the bill "because it is a very distinct limitation upon free choice in elections."

"It is undemocratic," claimed Aurelien Belanger (Lib., Prescott), "It might force me to vote for men of whom I do not approve and in whom I have no confidence. If this bill passes, minorities would not have a chance to elect representatives of their own. The only chance members of a minority have in securing representation is to go there and plump for their man and I don't know why they shouldn't do so."

Both J. J. Glass (Lib., St. Andrew), and Arthur Roebuck (Lib., Bellwoods), opposed the bill on grounds that it interfered with democratic rights and forced electors to divide their votes for candidates they might not like.