

Mr. FRASER: When this man was ordered to the hospital by the doctor he did ask a man to carry on his work and he did sign these blank certificates. There is no question about that; I am not disputing it, but what could the man do? Kamloops is a long way from Ottawa. If a man is ordered to the hospital by his doctor what better can he do than to put in a substitute during his absence? Let me tell the minister that the man who did the inspection while he was in the hospital had helped him in the stock car inspection previously and was acquainted with the work, so the inspection was carried on just as efficiently during his absence. I submit that this is only a paltry excuse.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Then will it suit my hon. friend if I submit this question a second time to the Civil Service Commission and to the Department of Justice? We will submit all the evidence on the files and all the additional evidence my hon. friend has in his possession, and if they say I should pay this account it will be paid. Is that fair?

Mr. FRASER: This man inspected 146 cars for you, to the satisfaction of your officials. Why should that question be referred to any other body? Your own officials will certify that the work was done efficiently and this man is entitled to that \$146. If it were only for one month I would not have persisted in the matter, but when you drag a man along for five months and allow him to fill a dual position I think in all fairness you should pay him without referring his account to any commission. You could put a special vote in your estimates to-night if you wanted to, and it is only fair that you should do so.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think I could do that.

Mr. FRASER: You can do anything you like in matters of this kind.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, we cannot raise the amount, although I think it could be reduced. I could not override the decisions given by the commission and the Justice department. They will have to rescind their decision after hearing new evidence, before any different action can be taken.

Mr. FRASER: I quite understand the limitations imposed on the minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We have spent over half an hour on this item of \$146. I have no doubt as to the sincerity of my hon. friend and of the minister, but if we passed to another item and allowed these two hon. gentlemen to have further conversation with

respect to the particular matter under discussion, they could possibly come to some agreement.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I would like to ask—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Allow this item to stand in the meantime.

Item stands.

Pensions—To hereby provide, notwithstanding anything in the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act or any other act or law, for payment out of the consolidated revenue fund to Mrs. Beatrice Bell, widow of the late Graham A. Bell, of an annuity at the rate of \$1,750 per annum, to commence from April 1, 1929, and continue thereafter until the remarriage or death of the annuitant, \$1,750.

Mr. KENNEDY: Will someone explain just why this item appears in the estimates? I would like to know what principle governs these cases.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Allow the item to stand and it can be taken up when the minister gets the information.

Pensions—to hereby provide, notwithstanding anything contained in the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act or any other act or law, for payment out of the consolidated revenue fund to Rebecca J. Farrow, widow of the late Robinson Russell Farrow, of an annuity at the rate of \$1,411.60, to commence from October 3, 1928, and to continue thereafter until the remarriage or death of the annuitant, \$2,109.79.

Mr. SPENCER: Could we have some information on this item?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think we had better pass to the next item and allow that one to stand.

Pensions—To hereby provide, notwithstanding anything in the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act or any other act or law, for payment out of the consolidated revenue fund to the widow of the late Chief Justice Taschereau, of an annuity at the rate of \$1,200, to commence from April 1, 1929, and to continue thereafter until the remarriage or death of the annuitant, \$1,200.

Mr. HEAPS: I should like to know why it is necessary to provide for pension in a case of this kind.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is a vote to cover a pension to the widow of the late Chief Justice of Canada, who had been the Deputy Governor General and a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This case was called to my attention by various members of the house and especially by the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail). This lady was in difficult financial circumstances, and in consideration of the fact that her husband had served this country for so many years, parliament considered the pay-