

you two examples to indicate to the committee these conditions. The development of the North Atlantic treaty organization has made an enormous increase—well, enormous is perhaps extreme—a considerable increase in the work of certain divisions of the department. As the organization which Mr. Pearson was referring to at one of the committee's recent meetings has developed, so the amount of work to be done by the department or by the divisions of the department who have to do with that organization has also increased. The development of technical assistance work under the Columbo plan of the United Nations that has imposed an additional burden on the officers of the department who are concerned with these things. I would not wish to give the impression we would like to go before the commission and the Treasury Board for large increases but there will, if I judge correctly, be some increases which will be desirable.

Mr. CROLL: Getting back to the talk of increases and decreases of people in your department. What sort of people would you let out of your department when you talk of decreases? Give me an example of what sort of man or woman you would let out?

Mr. STICK: Of those fifty, you let out.

The WITNESS: The first people to go in any of these squeezings down are, of course, to be found amongst the temporary employees, not amongst the permanents; and where one stenographer, for example, can be made to do for two officers, where previously she had served one, that is the kind of situation which we try to develop.

*By Mr. Croll:*

Q. Would that fifty consist of stenographers?—A. No, but it would include stenographers, clerical staff, messengers, generally known as subordinate staff.

Q. Will you now be hiring the same sort of people you let out some time ago?—A. We may have to hire some of these. Our first request will be for additions to officer strength and that will entail, inevitably, having to hire some of the staff we had to let go.

Q. What I was getting at is that your department ought to resist some of this precipitate letting out of people whom you may reasonably require in the future because of the special training they receive in your department. It is all very well to let out the cleaners or a chauffeur but it is a little difficult to let people out of your department when three months later you have to go looking for them again. I think I gather that this desire to reduce the staff—

Mr. STICK: —can be carried too far.

Mr. CROLL: Your attempt to co-operate, I think, did not do the department much good.

Mr. BENEDICKSON: It was government policy.

Mr. CROLL: Government policy is to let out people who are not needed.

Mr. MURRAY: It is just a normal turnover anyway.

Mr. FRASER: May I ask Mr. Heeney a question: Did quite a number of these people change to other departments?

The WITNESS: Shall I take the first question first?

Mr. CROLL: Yes, take the first question first.

The WITNESS: I am informed that I would be correct in saying that of those who were let out, there were something under 100, the whole would be amongst the subordinate staff, stenographers, clerks, messengers, and classifications of that kind. I think it is equally true to say that we did not let go within that number people who had acquired special skill. Some of these people would have left within a short time in any event; I am informed that,