

Mr. FLEMING: Those are inferences for the committee to draw rather than for the witness to draw.

Mr. BEAUDRY: The witness was one of the persons in charge of disbursing the money. The witness has been asked at times whether people thought that the money was, apparently, ill spent. I think it is my right and the right of the committee to know in what light that money was spent.

Mr. FLEMING: It is a matter of inference for the committee. It is not a matter for questioning the witness. It is a matter upon which every member can make up his own mind.

The CHAIRMAN: The witness has been asked so many indirect questions that it is hard to draw the line.

Mr. BEAUDRY: I am asking you, as one of the agents for spending that sum of money whether that sum of money could be regarded as a premium and whether it was regarded as a premium in your mind?

Mr. COTE: You are asking for an expert opinion.

Mr. FRASER: Mr Warren asked the witness in regard to material which the contractor would have to buy. He said if the contractor could not buy dry stuff he would have to buy wet stuff. Then, if that is true, he would have to use it. If the contractor used materials which were not according to the specifications, then it was the duty of the inspectors for the V.L.A. Department to check that. It would be your department all the way through which would be at fault.

Mr. CLEAVER: You just have to weigh a balance as to whether the urgency at the moment of occupancy was strong enough to offset the loss which was obvious.

*By Mr. Fleming:*

Q. Mr. Murchison, in your testimony last night, you said that the inspector on the job, Mr. Methven, who had been the architect is no longer on the staff of your department?—A. That is right.

Q. You also mentioned that the Ottawa chief inspector of those days is no longer on the staff of your department?—A. No.

Q. Are there any other members of the staff of those days who had anything to do with the Sarnia project?—A. The district construction supervisor for the Toronto district.

Q. Those three?—A. And I believe a substantial number of building inspectors.

Q. Have any of those whom you have mentioned been discharged for neglect of their proper duties in connection with the Sarnia project or did they all leave of their own accord?—A. Not specifically in relation to the Sarnia project because the Sarnia project was only one where there were defects.

Q. Did they leave of their own accord?—A. They resigned.

Q. Did they leave of their own accord?—A. Well, that is what I call a resignation.

Q. Then you could answer my question with a very simple yes. They did leave of their own accord?—A. Yes.

Mr. CLEAVER: They were, perhaps, eased out.

Mr. FLEMING: His answer is yes.

*By Mr. Cote:*

Q. Were they invited to resign?—A. In three cases they were asked for their resignations by me.