

these matters, for I do not believe he knew these things. But I say it is his duty to know something of them.

Mr. ROGERS: In several of these cases why did not my hon. friend bring them to my attention at once by letter, and have them corrected?

Mr. BENNETT: I will tell you why.

Mr. DUNNING: Because he wanted to make political capital out of it.

Mr. BENNETT: I will tell you why, and I will start with what I said at the very beginning. I was very, very much interested in Kingston in view of the Prime Minister's opening speech and the speeches made by the Minister of Labour when he was a candidate; I was anxious, as I am now, to see whether or not this political combination could destroy him and the principles that he asserted on the platform, his high principles, or whether he was going to be strong enough to control and stop them. That is the reason. I want to put it up to the minister as publicly as he put it up to the people of this country how he would conduct the public business if he got a chance; that was what he said when he was a candidate in Kingston. I say more, I say to the hon. gentleman and to all hon. members of this house that it is not good enough to say what your predecessors did. That does not constitute a defence. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because hon. gentlemen opposite asked for support, and got it, on the ground that they were going to do better than their predecessors; on the ground that they were going to improve on what had been done previously. And there never has been a worse condition prevailing than that in and around Kingston during the last eighteen months.

That is the position, and what has been done about it? Has a single thing been done? There you have the public press, and just think of the labour office, the employment office to which returned men went, as I indicated yesterday from a letter which I read. Did they get employment? They did not. Why? Because you have in charge of that office one who, it is true, has been investigated by the superintendent, or whoever it may have been; yet in the courts of the country, before the magistrate, we have it asserted by the man who is charged in the dock that if he could get a job he would not be so charged. But he said, "I cannot afford to make a contribution to this beer fund."

Mr. TUCKER: That statement was not sworn; it was an idle statement made before the magistrate.

51952—236½

Mr. BENNETT: The magistrate adjourned the case to make an inquiry.

Mr. TUCKER: The statement was not sworn to.

Mr. BENNETT: And the case has not since been heard.

Mr. TUCKER: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. BENNETT: Nothing, I take it.

An hon. MEMBER: A great deal.

Mr. BENNETT: What about the question of supplies I have mentioned? Now we have it asserted by Mr. Stansbury that he had the consent of someone to take the stone. Who gave the consent about the white lead? It was removed—

Mr. DUNNING: Do you allege Stansbury took the white lead?

Mr. BENNETT: Did I say that?

Mr. ROGERS: Who took it?

Mr. BENNETT: I asked who gave consent.

Mr. ROGERS: You suggested it.

Mr. BENNETT: I suggested nothing.

Mr. ROGERS: Where did it go?

Mr. BENNETT: I did say it was the duty of my hon. friend to find where it went.

Mr. ROGERS: Where does my right hon. friend get this information?

Mr. BENNETT: He has had it for some time.

Mr. ROGERS: He has not been anxious to have it followed up, apparently.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, because the storekeeper is there yet at Rockwood.

Mr. DUNNING: No, no. My right hon. friend himself said the storekeeper was dismissed. And Rockwood is not a federal institution. How can he say it is there yet?

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say "yet"; I said it was at Rockwood.

Mr. DUNNING: Those are the words; I will leave it to Hansard,—“the storekeeper is there yet.”

Mr. BENNETT: By “yet” I meant at Fort Henry. He is not there yet, but he is at Rockwood.

Mr. DUNNING: He is not in the employ of the federal government.

Mr. BENNETT: No, but Mr. Stansbury recommended him to the position which he holds; I happen to know.