

Mr. DUFF: No; go and look at your files and find out.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): How can I go through all the files to find out?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I ask my hon. friend to confer a favour and enable me to investigate this matter to see if there is any further action which should be taken. I ask him to give me sufficient information to do this. If he is not prepared to do it now, will he write me a letter?

Mr. DUFF: My hon. friend can look over the returns which I asked for last year. There were not very many.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): There were a good many last year.

Mr. DUFF: Not by me.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes, a good many.

Mr. DUFF: No.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Will my hon. friend write me a letter giving me such information as will help me to trace this matter or to identify it?

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough has charged the Minister of Public Works with having done certain things. The minister has asked him for the name of the constituency, and if he cannot give that; for the name of the work and the name of the foreman, but the answer he has received is "go and look at the files".

Mr. DUFF: I did not do the work.

Mr. BENNETT: Most hon. members of this house are at least fairminded. I have always found them thus, although the bitterness of their criticism of myself is not always fair. Let hon. members just reverse the conditions; put one of you in as Minister of Public Works. If a member on this side made a charge and then you, as minister, asked for the name of the foreman, of the work or of the constituency, would you not expect an answer? He who asserts must prove. A charge is made but the only answer given is "go and look at your files." Is that fair?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Read the amendment.

[Mr. H. A. Stewart.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): It is moved by Mr. Mackenzie, Vancouver Centre, seconded by Mr. Casgrain, that section 5 be amended by inserting the words "and appropriated by parliament" after the word "necessary" in line 16.

Amendment (Mr. Mackenzie, Vancouver) negatived on division.

Section 4 (now section 5) agreed to on division.

Section 5 (now section 6) agreed to on division.

Section 6 (now section 7) agreed to on division.

Section 7 (now section 8) agreed to on division.

Section 8 (now section 9) agreed to on division.

On section 9 (now section 10)—Payment of delayed accounts in excess of amount authorized.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): This is a new section?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. This is to meet a situation which developed in the case of Montreal, for instance, and I trust my mentioning this will not cause any unnecessary discussion. In this case the accounts were received yesterday, which is several days after March 31.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): It is retroactive in effect?

Mr. BENNETT: It is to cover a situation of that kind. Yesterday we received the accounts only down to July and we have not as yet received the remainder.

Section agreed to.

On section 10 (now section 11)—Duration of act.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): An amendment is moved by Mr. Ralston, seconded by Mr. Stewart (West Edmonton), that section 10 be amended by striking out all the words which follow the words "March, 1935" to the end of the section.

Mr. RALSTON: I am sponsoring this amendment. Could the Prime Minister give the committee an explanation for the proposal that a liability incurred before March 31 but not paid shall be authorized by this bill rather than follow the usual practice of the audit act? The fiscal year expires on March 31 and that act makes provision by order in