

Mr. MACE: No, it was a separate vote. It just happens that this number happens to be item 5. But, there has been a general re-numbering and re-grouping of the votes into these main program areas. This was the recommendation of the public accounts committee. I must admit it has made things very confusing for comparative purposes, and it is confusing our work today when dealing with these individual items.

I would suggest, if you have a particular interest, you will find this through the sub item of these main items.

As I pointed out, item number 1 really covers departmental administration, which is head office administration. The district services administration and veterans bureau are both in item 1. We will have to watch this so we do not pass an item which may include a subject on which you wish to put questions.

Mr. McINTOSH: My concern is the reason it was done. Did you say that was on the recommendation of public works?

Mr. MACE: No, the public accounts committee.

Mr. McINTOSH: It was the committee, was it?

Mr. MACE: Yes. The public accounts committee had to approve the recommendation. This was subsequent to a study by treasury board.

If I could explain further, there is a new concept of financial management developing, primarily as a result of the Glassco commission recommendation, and the trend is toward program budgeting. As a result, the fiscal arrangements of different departments are being reorganized into programs, and this is the first step that the treasury board took. They regrouped the estimates as they were previously into main program areas. Of course, the main items are detailed on pages 496 and 497 and the details of what is in there is shown on the subsequent pages. I must say this is rather confusing.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Mr. Chairman, in view of this, I suggest it would be helpful if the deputy minister indicated when the item came up what it covered.

Mr. McINTOSH: There are only two changed, item 5 and item 35.

Mr. MACE: No. As a matter of fact, they all have been changed. I could tell you what is in the different items. I think as you approach each item as Mr. Herridge has suggested, it would be helpful if we then delineated what exactly was in that item. I think this would provide useful information.

Mr. HERRIDGE: It would be very helpful. What methods do you use now to notify applicants for various services or organizations of the visit of one of your field officers into a particular district.

Mr. RIDER: This varies. It depends on the part of the country. In areas where welfare officers go less frequently or where population is more scattered there often are notices in newspapers and announcements on radio advising of the visits of officers. Notification is made through local district offices and different veterans' organizations before the welfare officer goes out on his trip.

Mr. HERRIDGE: And that information gives the dates the field officer will be present?

Mr. RIDER: Yes. In some areas of Canada this is not done at all because the ability to make contact is much simpler; veterans organizations are much closer together. There are more N.E.S. offices and the veterans go to these places. The officers call at the N.E.S. offices or the legion branch and ascertain that certain people wish to see them, and then they go out to see them. Wherever possible, if a veteran writes in, an effort is made to make a specific appointment with him in a specific place, either at his home or some central point where a number of veterans may be meeting to see the welfare officer.

Mr. HERRIDGE: What is the mileage allowed at the present time for the travelling expenses of these officers?