

Motor Car Expenditures Come Under Scrutiny

The Public Accounts Committee, called for the first time in the present Legislature session yesterday, accepted a resolution of Opposition Leader George Drew by which he proposes to inquire fully into expenditures on purchase and operation of automobiles in all Government departments during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1942. Colonel Drew sought to extend his inquiry into previous years and later, but was overruled by the committee chairman, H. L. Hagey (Lib., Brantford).

At Colonel Drew's request, the Deputy Minister of Public Works, R. A. McAllister, will be called before the committee to give figures as to cars purchased during the year, cost of car rentals and amounts paid for mileage. Col. Drew sought also to have original cost of cars now in operation brought out but it was ruled that inquiry must be confined to the fiscal year 1942. The committee is to meet briefly Thursday morning to permit Colonel Drew to submit additional questions so that material may be prepared.

It was pointed out by the Opposition Leader that in the 1942 fiscal year, \$856,000 had been spent on car mileage alone and \$23,791 on car rentals and in the ten-month period ending Jan. 31, 1943, \$534,133 on mileage and \$20,522 on rentals. Of this, \$326,000 in mileage had been expended by the Department of Highways and \$101,000 by the Attorney-General's department.

Conant Supports Hepburn Denial

Ex-Premier Mitchell F. Hepburn in the Legislature yesterday branded as "deliberately and maliciously untrue" a report in an afternoon paper that he held a "war chest" estimated at from \$500,000 to \$750,000.

Mr. Hepburn's denial of existence of such funds was supported by Premier Conant, who said he wanted to substantiate Mr. Hepburn's statement that, never since he became Liberal Leader in December, 1930, had he handled such funds. All campaign funds had been handled by the party treasurers, the late Senator O'Connor and now Bethune Smith.

"I know of no such fund, direct or indirect, or any other way," said Mr. Conant.

Anti-Discrimination Bill Fails to Survive

The anti-discrimination bill introduced by John J. Glass (Lib., St. Andrew) failed to pass second reading in the Legislature yesterday, being defeated on the Speaker's call for the ayes and nays. Mr. Glass was the only member in the House to raise his voice in favor of the bill.

The proposed measure sought to make illegal the posting of signs containing religious or racial bias; refusal to permit persons to occupy hotel rooms on the grounds of race, color or creed, and the making of any statements calculated to arouse prejudice.

Mr. Glass gave a brief explanation of the purpose of his bill, pointing out that it contained certain restrictions against the use of discrimination. It was a blot on Ontario, he contended, to permit posters and signs to be erected which appealed

to prejudice. Many visitors to Ontario left with a wrong impression of the Province, he declared.

W. J. Stewart (Prog. Con., Parkdale) did not think the bill would promote unity, and after giving his reasons why he believed it should not pass, asked the sponsor to withdraw it. When Mr. Glass made no move to comply, the Speaker called the ayes and nays, and it was voted down.

Mr. Stewart said that to attempt to put the bill through would be resorting to a policy of force contrary to democratic principles. One could not command respect, but one could elicit it, he said.