

racks on top of the hill, and give the names; I am permitted to do that. They had to have letters from the defeated candidates before they could get jobs, as compared with what they had done before. I do not say for a moment that evils did not exist, but I do say we endeavoured to stop them.

Mr. ROGERS: In what way did my right hon. friend endeavour to stop them?

Mr. BENNETT: Just the way I have mentioned without regard to the political faith of the individuals the names were drawn to determine where they should work.

Mr. ROGERS: Will my right hon. friend suggest at the same time that in connection with the administration of relief camps and the very large purchases made by the relief camps, of many kinds of material, the names of those who were allowed to tender were drawn out of a hat?

Mr. BENNETT: No, not for a minute.

Mr. ROGERS: Was it not based upon a preferred list consisting entirely of friends of my right hon. friend?

Mr. BENNETT: Not entirely, to my knowledge.

Mr. MacINNIS: Is that any reason why it should be done now?

Mr. BENNETT: But remember, this is the thing that was not going to happen. This is where my hon. friend was going to change it all. This is where the professor was going to see that decency prevailed. That is the way I put it.

Mr. ROGERS: I shall speak with a little less heat than my right hon. friend, but possibly with a little more light. The right hon. gentleman has dealt with this question on three different occasions.

Mr. BENNETT: And he is going to deal with it again.

Mr. ROGERS: Quite so, and his whole purpose has been, by a number of vague charges in the beginning, which I have no doubt were designed to bring more definite charges, to seek to create the impression that I as Minister of Labour had definitely connived at the violation of the terms with respect to employment under relief agreements.

Mr. BENNETT: And he will prove it in this house.

Mr. ROGERS: When my right hon. friend brought the matter up in the first place I said definitely and categorically that as far as relief work in my own constituency or elsewhere was concerned, politics had not

entered into it with my knowledge or consent. I stand absolutely by that statement. But I went further and said that there were two different kinds of employment provided in Kingston, and probably in other constituencies as well. There were works covered by relief agreements with the provinces, in which there was a definite undertaking that there should not be discrimination of the kind I have described. That was one type of work. With respect to that I said that I was absolutely in accord with that provision against discrimination, and would seek to see to it that it was observed. But with respect to other employment, casual vacancies occurring in the administration of various departments, I said I had accepted recommendations from my local executive and had sent those recommendations on with my approval, and I would not be hypocritical enough to say I had done otherwise. It would be dishonest to myself and to this house to say that I had done otherwise.

Mr. BENNETT: And you will remember that I said I agreed with you.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think my right hon. friend said he agreed with me at that time. Then my right hon. friend mentioned the name of Mr. Stansbury, who at the present time happens to be president of the Liberal association in Kingston. In the first place he suggested that Mr. Stansbury was a director of the Frid Construction Company, which had the contract in connection with the restoration of Fort Henry. I immediately dealt with that question; I preferred to get accurate information before making any statement in connection with it. I secured the information, and later my right hon. friend made a retraction and admitted that his recollection was faulty when he said that Mr. Stansbury was a member of the Frid Construction Company.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite.

Mr. ROGERS: But it was the most ungracious retraction to which I have ever listened.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, because I know a great deal about Mr. Stansbury's dealings. That is the reason.

Mr. ROGERS: Very well, but what the right hon. gentleman then said was that there were several other construction companies; there was the Campbell Construction Company and the Frontenac Construction Company, his whole purpose being to leave the inference that Mr. Stansbury was connected with one of these other companies; and he was not.