

been put together. Now, within that organizational structure, like any other organization, we have some troubles, and the troubles are all over. Within the organization all branch managers are not as good as our top branch manager, just as each regional supervisor is not as good as our top regional supervisor; and to that extent there is always room for improvement, looking at that particular aspect of our operations. I would think that one of our greatest needs at the moment and one of our greatest deficiencies, one that the committee might criticize me the most for, is the fact that we need 30 to 40 qualified engineers for our construction division—and we need them quickly, but they are extremely difficult to get.

I also think in our development with the provinces under section 35 that one might criticize our organization for not having trained and had ready for the use of the provinces people with experience in the public housing field.

A very fair criticism of my operation—and I use that term because I am the one who is responsible—is that two years ago we might have sent ten people to the United States so that by now they could come back as trained housing people. I am not sure it is a mistake but it is the type of thing that might be criticized. I think it is to be remembered that our organization is fairly new. From January 1st, 1946, it has been growing very rapidly with ever-changing duties. The organization is fluid, continuously fluid, and I think we have all the growing pains of an organization that started with myself and a stenographer on January 1st, 1946 and is now 2,200 strong.

Another criticism you might have of the administration within this organization with which I say I am satisfied might arise from the fact, as I mentioned in my statement, that we have absorbed 1,916 people.

Now, the rights of those people from Wartime Housing, from the National Housing Administration, from Ajax, and Laurentian Terrace were most important to preserve. After all, those people had given loyal service to another branch of the Crown and it was up to us to fit them into our organization somewhere. Sometimes they fitted very well; sometimes they fitted fairly well; and some times they did not fit too well.

Now, you might say, if we were really forthright about this, that every case of non-fit should be heaved out immediately. I do not think any organization quite runs that way. But, in answer to the honourable member's question, that he asked me—whether I am satisfied with the administration within the organization—the answer is no.

By Mr. Fraser:

Q. I will say this, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Mansur is very quick to pick up constructive suggestions. I suggested in the House of Commons that the offices should be left open on Saturday morning for the convenience of people who were dealing with Central Mortgage, because that was the only time they could get in to see them. The offices are now open and I just wonder what arrangements are made for the office staff to give them the half day some place else?—
A. Is that in respect to Peterborough?

Q. Yes, Peterborough and the other places. They were closed on Saturday before and now they are open and they do a lot of business on Saturday.—
A. One of the advantages of being a Crown company is that you have a little more flexibility with regard to administration than you have in the rather larger public service. We have felt that the five-day week gears our organization much closer to the operations of those with whom we do business than does the continuation of the five and a half day week.

Incidentally, it has one other advantage which I think I can prove conclusively—that 39 hours spent in five days is a more efficient operation than 39 hours spent in five and a half days.