

The CHAIRMAN: If we want to ask questions about Windsor we have two witnesses here. We can get the costs and we can learn if there have been complaints. Why should we, at this particular moment, call witnesses to make our meetings longer, especially if the House is adjourning on Wednesday. We will not have too much time for this. We should take and complete the evidence to-day. We will not have much time to have two or three more meetings and then bring down a report. You know we will have to talk about it before the steering committee meets and then the steering committee will bring its report which has to be approved by the full committee. If it involved only one meeting that would be all right, but it would be three meetings, one to approve the procedure, one to cover the steering committee's report, and one meeting for the main committee to approve the matters discussed in the other meetings. It means discussion in at least three or four meetings. For myself I submit we might as well go on. We have not completed the evidence on this particular matter and we have got two people here, Mr. Boucher and Mr. Cleaver, who have questions to ask, and perhaps the others will have some questions. I think we should carry on and at the end of this meeting this afternoon we can determine what we shall do next week.

Yes, Mr. Beaudry?

Mr. BEAUDRY: I quite agree with what you say. I suggested to Mr. Fleming that if it was agreeable to the committee, when we go into an investigation on other points outside of Sarnia, we will, to some extent I suppose, find things which would bear out the evidence regarding Sarnia. On the other hand, we will not destroy the evidence which is on the record concerning some of the aspects throughout the country at large. In my humble opinion we would only be adding to the Sarnia evidence without gaining anything which would change our vision on the proposition generally. I think we have enough evidence about Sarnia to justify our looking into the matter.

Mr. CLEAVER: I believe you had one corrective question to ask?

Mr. BEAUDRY: Yes, thank you for reminding me. There was a mistake in the calculations last night that I would like to amend on the record. When we figured the cost over all of Canada of the 2,381 houses from which there was to be deducted an amount for landscaping, specified for London, Toronto, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, there should be one correction made which will slightly alter the total. The correction is that landscaping was charged at the rate of \$145 per house for 792 houses in and about London and Toronto, instead of 944 houses. This amount was deducted from the original figure of \$15,914,707, and divided by the number of houses it will bring up the cost of construction per house from \$6,623.13 to \$6,632.42. In other words there is an increase of roughly \$9 per house. I do not think that will reflect to any considerable extent the cost per cubic foot.

Gordon B. Murchison, Director of the Veterans' Land Act and the Soldiers' Settlement Board, called:

By Mr. Cleaver:

Q. When the committee stopped taking evidence last night I was obtaining from you the number of homes and the amount of capital adjustment that was made, by provinces, in arriving at the actual selling price to the veterans. Have you that table ready?—A. Yes. This summary is by provinces. British Columbia, 576 houses, the reduction is \$208,428.49; Alberta, 280 houses, the reduction is \$53,106.95; Saskatchewan, 80 houses, \$70,089.07; Manitoba, 240 houses, \$65,767; Quebec, 170 houses, \$206,294.25; Maritime provinces, 135 houses, \$55,482.04; Ontario, 900 houses, \$487,227.82. That makes a total of 2,381 units and a total reduction of \$1,146,295.62.