

Mr. BENNETT: Well, if that is the basis upon which the business of Canada is being conducted—!

Mr. HOWE: It is a matter of bookkeeping, whether the scaffolding was charged properly to the second job, as my right hon. friend knows as well as I do.

Mr. ROGERS: Why did not my right hon. friend write me a letter about this? I would have looked into it.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, this I think is in order, having regard to the mutterings of one of the hon. members of this committee in the distance. Since man first emerged from the condition described by Darwin, mutterings are supposed to have disappeared and speech has taken their place.

Mr. BRADETTE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am not muttering. I said the right hon. gentleman is quite a spectacle, and if people could see him now they would judge him.

Mr. BENNETT: We now come to a question that was touched yesterday, some facts I wish to get from the minister. He said: Write me a letter and I will give an answer. What I want from him is a public statement; for it is a matter affecting the public and not the individual. The question is whether or not this work at Fort Henry was done on a cost plus basis; also whether or not the contract was extended. There is nothing on the record to show, because it was done by day work. Now what day work was it, cost plus or by contract?

Mr. ROGERS: I will get the information, gladly.

Mr. BENNETT: If it was done by contract, why were tenders not asked for, in accordance with what was said the other day? In the case of the work done under the Department of Highways, with respect to the first contract tenders were called for, and many people tendered, but that was a little \$70,000 job; we have now spent nearly a million dollars, and no opportunity, public at any rate, has been given to anyone to tender. I should like to know the reason for that. I pointed out the other day what was the situation. This I think the minister must have seen; he says part of it he has not seen, but part at least he must have seen. I wonder if he realizes that a citizen of Kingston was charged with the non-support of his wife—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: He was charged with non-support—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DUNNING: It certainly was not my right hon. friend or the Minister of Labour.

Mr. BENNETT: And the answer he gave as his defence, according to the press—and I have verified it as well—was this: He said that if he could secure a job he would take care of his family, but he did not have sufficient funds to provide Mooers—who was at one time the president of the Liberal association in Kingston, and who is superintendent of the employment agency, the man we were speaking of yesterday—with a beer account at the Prince George hotel. He said if he could get sufficient funds to provide Mooers with a beer account he would be all right, but as he could not do so he could not get work. That is a matter of public record; and what is more—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, yes, it was in the newspaper; he appeared before the police magistrate, who adjourned the case advising the man that he would investigate the matter and bring him up again after he had done so. The case still stands adjourned.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: Free beer.

Mr. BENNETT: You see, Mr. Chairman; this indicates how little people do care. One of the ministers of the crown says, "Free beer."

Mr. DUNNING: Which one? Who said that?

Mr. BENNETT: I heard it just now; one of the four ministers there.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not hear it, and the ministers sit closer to me than to my right hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT: I heard the words "free beer."

Mr. DUNNING: No minister said any such thing.

Mr. BENNETT: I say they did; that is the difference.

Mr. DUNNING: My right hon. friend must retract that.

Mr. BENNETT: No. I say they did and the minister says they did not.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I did not say it.

Mr. DUNNING: I did not say it.