

deal more money than if he had been granted the advantages of the weather provision in the contract. As I recollect them, these are the circumstances.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The only thing is that the minister's explanation hardly harmonizes with the date which is given in the item. A governor general's warrant for \$6,726.56 was evidently issued on September 1, 1925.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I beg my hon. friend's pardon?

Mr. GUTHRIE: September 1, 1925 is the date of the warrant as given in the estimate now before the committee.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That was the date on which it was paid, but the work was done in January and February of the winter before.

Mr. GUTHRIE: A governor general's warrant for the expenditure of money can be issued only when the House is not in session, and only to meet urgent and necessary payments. This work, as I understand it, took place during the preceding winter, some time in January or February. Parliament was then in session, and the matter could have been brought to its attention and the necessary money voted. But the government allowed the session to conclude without making provision for this money, and then seven or eight days after the dissolution of parliament, followed by a general election, they resort to the process of a governor general's warrant to make a payment which has stood evidently from the preceding winter, and which could not be either urgent or necessary in view of the circumstance. I think we should offer a reasonable protest to the issue of governor general's warrant under such circumstances.

Mr. STEVENS: I should like the Minister of Finance to convey to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he returns, a request that he lay on the table of the House all correspondence in regard to this item, also a copy of the governor general's warrant and of the order in council on which it was based.

Mr. ROBB: I will bring the matter to the minister's attention.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I point out to the ministers concerned that questions asked when the estimates were last before the House, I think on December 15 last, have not been answered, at least there has been no answer in my own case. I was promised an answer at that time which, however, has not yet been given. I would ask that some recognition be accorded the rights of members and

that answers to questions be given by the minister from whom information has been sought.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): What minister?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): One of the ministers was not present at the time but the matter was to be brought to his attention by one of his colleagues.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will be prepared to give my hon. friend an answer to his question to-morrow. I have not the necessary information with me to-day.

Item agreed to.

Payment of compensation levied against employers by workmen's compensation boards in respect of pensioners who are engaged in industry (governor general's warrant of September 7, 1925), \$45,000.

Mr. STEVENS: We would like to have an explanation now in regard to this item of \$45,000. The occasion for the warrant is not clear and we do not know what it is for.

Mr. ROBB: I frankly admit to my hon. friend that I have not the information before me. I will furnish the information to-morrow, and bring down any papers we have in connection with it.

Mr. DUNNING: It is the regular vote.

Mr. STEVENS: If the minister or his colleagues cannot explain it, it is rather difficult to expect us to appreciate why a governor general's warrant was necessary on September 7th, 1925, I think the very day of dissolution that year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh no.

Mr. STEVENS: It was two days after my hon. friend's famous speech at Richmond Hill, and I think he will find dissolution occurred just after that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, dissolution took place the day of the speech as a matter of fact.

Mr. STEVENS: Then it was within two days of dissolution. I submit it is rather straining the credulity of hon. members on this side of the House to ask us, without any explanation at all, to accept this resolution:

Payment of compensation levied against employers by workmen's compensation boards in respect of pensioners who are engaged in industry.

My understanding of the various workmen's compensation acts is that they are provincial legislation, wholly under the administration of the provinces and presumably—I cannot say