

As to the hon. member's later remark, I think he is correct in saying that the government had in mind that an organization established on a long term basis, with instructions to put together an administration which suited the needs and requirements of a country such as ours, has had the effect of making the activities even under the same legislation rather more forthright than was the case prior to our formation.

Q. I think Mr. Mansur is being too cautious. I am of the opinion we would not have had the housing we have without Central Mortgage. I do not think private enterprise would have able to do it at all, and I do not think it would have been justified in building—I am talking country-wide now. I was hoping that that continues to be the policy of the corporation, if private investment is not forthcoming that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation will do its best to see that it is done.

Mr. HUNTER: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Laing is confusing the National Housing Act with the functions of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Central Mortgage may have canalized the thing, helping the thing on, but surely the big operation under Central Mortgage is for the purpose of building houses under the National Housing Act, formerly the old Dominion Housing Act, which would have been built under such Act even if Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation had not been formed.

Mr. LAING: I am talking about the many thousands of small homes that have been built by veterans and for defence workers, and many other small homes, that would not have been built if Central Mortgage had not been formed.

Mr. FLEMING: Doesn't that come back to Wartime Housing that Central Mortgage took over, but at a much later period. The type of building I think Mr. Laing is referring to was largely done by Wartime Housing Limited, which did not operate under the National Housing Act.

Mr. LAING: I am merely saying that another corporation came in.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. One other question of a general nature before we go into the pages of Mr. Mansur's memorandum. I was wondering about the executive functions of the corporation, to what extent does the board of directors participate in the executive direction of the corporation, and to what extent does the executive committee, and to what extent is the executive direction of the corporation largely left in the hands of the president as the chief executive officer.—
A. Mr. Chairman, under the terms of the Act there is a requirement that there be four directors' meetings a year and that there be an executive committee meeting not less than once a month. The practice is that there are five directors' meetings a year and there is an executive committee meeting twice a month. The operations of the corporation, I think I can truthfully say, are very much under the control of the board of directors. We use the executive committee in our day to day operations as the control point in decisions which must be taken. I would like to believe, and I think it is true, that the minutes of our executive committee are the Bible, so to speak, for our internal auditors and for the secretary and for anybody else who is looking for confirmation of decisions taken by the corporation. It will be recalled the board of directors is made up of five of what we describe loosely as outside directors, those appointed by the government who are not in the public service. One of these directors comes from each region of Canada. Our original directorate was made up of a contractor from British Columbia, a social worker from the Prairies, a lawyer from Ontario, an architect from Quebec, and a labour leader from the Maritimes. The executive committee is made up of the president and the vice-president and two directors selected by the board. I may say that in addition to the five outside directors, there