

*By Mr. Fleming:*

Q. What three cases?—A. The chief of the division, district construction supervisor for Ontario and the district construction supervisor for the province of British Columbia.

Q. The British Columbia man had nothing to do with the Sarnia work?—A. I know that.

Q. The other two Ontario men, the district construction superintendent at Toronto, what was the reason for inviting his resignation?—A. On account of the number of complaints and defects which arose in connection with Ontario matters in Ontario.

Q. What projects did those complaints arise from?—A. Sarnia, Windsor, I believe one in Scarboro Township; a small one at Port Hope; those are the chief ones which I can recall.

Q. You have indicated you had a number of complaints from veterans at those spots?—A. Yes.

Q. What was the nature of the complaints there?—A. Complaining about defects in the houses; complaining about matters such as drainage or the functioning of this or that septic tank.

Q. Were they complaints similar in kind to those we have heard about from Sarnia?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, those are for the second and third men you have mentioned. The first man you mentioned of the three whom you had personally invited to tender his resignation was who?—A. Chief of the construction division.

Q. At Ottawa?—A. That is right.

Q. What was the occasion of your inviting his resignation?—A. There were two reasons; the first centred on the amount of criticism which had developed by the members of the House of Commons; criticisms expressed in the Canadian press and criticisms coming from individual veterans. That was one of the first reasons. The second was that these projects as such were nearing completion. There had been no new project developments undertaken since the first of January, 1946, nor was there any indication of going ahead with any new projects of that character. Our construction operations from that date onward, so far as new houses were concerned, would relate entirely to individual units where they would be built on a firm bid by a small contractor. Consequently, the need for a chief engineer with the experience and training of the gentleman I had on my staff at head office was disappearing.

Q. Well I take it that by reason of the fact that the program did not occasion any need for a man of his qualifications, he was surplus to your staff at that stage. Is that correct?—A. Yes.

Q. Now you have indicated you had complaints from a number of these other sources similar in kind to those you received from Sarnia. When did you ask for these resignations?—A. Speaking from memory I believe it was about the end of March.

Q. Of this year?—A. Yes.

Q. Were the resignations promptly forthcoming, that is of these three men you are speaking of now?—A. Yes.

Q. Let us go back to Mr. Methven. You indicated yesterday that he was an architect by training?—A. Yes.

Q. And was the inspector of the Sarnia project, I think you said? Is that correct?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall his salary there?—A. \$2,400 a year.

Q. Did you take him on the staff?—A. I had no personal association.

Q. I take it you were head of the department when he was taken on the staff of the department?—A. Yes.