

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I got the inference, perhaps wrongly—and I am not very thin-skinned—that the minister was suggesting that I had sabotaged Mr. MacMillan, which of course is quite wrong, quite false. I had a good deal to do with Mr. MacMillan when he was timber controller. I want to say this to the minister, that I have not seen Mr. MacMillan personally on business since he took the position of chairman of the war-time requirements board. I have met him in the dining room at the Chateau Laurier, where we have had meals together—on more than one occasion—and where we chatted about everything. We avoided any business references, but I think if I wanted to see Mr. MacMillan he would see me.

Mr. HOWE: You suggested if you had seen him he would have told you all about it. I hope you never asked him to do that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In the light of what the minister has said about the question of oaths—and I had forgotten about it—I would not suggest for a minute that Mr. MacMillan would break his oath any more than I would suggest that the minister would break his. It may be I was wrong in having that impression. At all events I want to convey the impression that my relations with Mr. MacMillan were absolutely clean and above board. They always have been, and, I hope, always will be. On one occasion he was good enough to help a friend of mine in connection with a very important business transaction regarding timber. A question of United States exchange was involved. My friend is eternally grateful to Mr. MacMillan, and so am I.

But that is not the point at this time. These manufacturers—I am not sure how many there were, but I understand there were six—interviewed the acting minister at his request on or about January 7, and submitted to him a unanimous recommendation as to what should be done. I have not a copy of that report, but I was told what was in it. According to the minister's statement this afternoon I was not given the fifth item, but I was given the four items, which I put in my statement, and which the minister repeated here to-day almost verbatim.

Mr. HOWE: May I say that if my hon. friend did not have the facts he was the only one in Canada who did not. Every newspaper did.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I give my word I did not.

Mr. HOWE: Every newspaper man has had it. It was part of the contents of a paper, signed by Richard Guthrie, a man I do not know and have not been able to trace.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not know him either—never heard of him.

Mr. HOWE: Neither did I.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But these are the four recommendations which were made to the acting minister. There was a fifth to which the minister referred, but I cannot recall what it was. This is what I understand their recommendations were:

(1) that Federal Aircraft Limited be dissolved; (2) that de Havilland Aircraft of Canada be asked to manage or administer, for the Department of Munitions and Supply, the Avro-Anson project, taking over the personnel, materials, records, et cetera, of Federal Aircraft; (3) that de Havilland Aircraft assume responsibility for engineering and procurement of materials; (4) that the Department of Munitions and Supply take over the contractual and financial obligations and the financial functions of Federal Aircraft.

That is to say, the government was to assume responsibility for its own baby. There was a fifth, but I do not recall what the minister said it was. At all events I never had the statement in black and white, and I cannot say. The minister to-day, however, admits that that is a true statement of the position.

Mr. HOWE: I said that by an odd coincidence it was in the exact language of the letter.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): This certainly was published more than once in the newspapers. Did not Mr. Grant Dexter send this to the *Winnipeg Free Press*? Was it not published there?

Mr. HOWE: I do not know.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It was in the *Financial Post* and in quite a number of newspapers. It is a matter of common knowledge that this happened, and what the contents of the letter were. I do not know who gave it to the press; I have not the faintest idea. I have not, and I never had, a copy of it. But I was seized of the contents of it.

This document was signed by the chief executives of the six corporations under contract with Federal Aircraft to manufacture these planes. The statement goes on to set out the names of those companies, as follows: Canadian Car and Foundry, Ottawa Car and Aircraft Limited, National Steel Car Corporation, de Havilland Aircraft, Boeing Aircraft of Canada, and Massey Harris Company, Limited.

I should like to be corrected if this is not a correct list. If there are any more, I should like to know who they were. That was their recommendation to the minister. I pause here to say it is my understanding that their reason for making these recommendations was that Federal Aircraft, not-