

*Supply—National Defence*

for one, I would like to know why it would be at all difficult to give the very information we have asked for, when the public accounts show that that information is available.

**Mr. Claxton:** The public accounts make it very clear that that information is available in respect of the year 1949-50, when the amount was paid. I am not responsible however for the form of our estimates, and they have been made in a form which involves the grouping together of items in accordance with the recommendations of the Auditor General and the Department of Finance. We are now being asked to put under each item the number of clerks, the rate of salary, and so on. That might be done in a static year, but we have not had a static year. Each year has been one of tremendous growth, as is revealed in the development of the expenditures of the department. It was \$192 million four years ago, about \$425 million for the first half of this year, and it is now maybe \$1,879 million.

At a time when there is that kind of development it was felt, perhaps not so much by the officers of this department as by everyone concerned, that to put down three stenographers at \$500 each or fifty soldiers at this or that amount would be likely to be found misleading—

**Mr. Knowles:** Civil salaries.

**Mr. Claxton:** —in consequence of the development of the department, which we were going to increase by fifty or sixty per cent or more each year. That, I understand, is the reason why this practice was adopted—and it was adopted before I came into the department. This year we adopted the form recommended by the Auditor General, and have conformed to the practice of other government departments, but without giving details as to civil servants. Details as to civil servants would take up a great many pages and it would be meaningless, and would not help the work of the committee. I think that must be the conclusion of everyone.

**Mr. Noseworthy:** Would it be in order to pass on to the next item, and ask—

**Mr. Drew:** No, no.

**Mr. Fulton:** On this item I would ask the minister to give us a clear picture of the number of assistant deputies and associate deputies.

**Mr. Claxton:** That has already been done.

**Mr. Fulton:** I must confess it is not clear to me. Would the minister at the same time say whether there is any effort in the department whereby either assistants or associates

should concern themselves with one or other of the services? In other words is there an allocation of deputies or associates?

**Mr. Claxton:** No.

**Mr. Fulton:** Is there an allocation to any of the services?

**Mr. Claxton:** No, not at all.

**Mr. Fulton:** How many assistant deputies and how many associate deputies are there?

**Mr. Claxton:** I just gave that information. Do I have to give it again? We have a deputy minister, and two associate deputy ministers, and one assistant deputy minister. The organization of the department is completely on a tri-service basis. All of the services are performed at that level by civilians for each of the three services. We consider it desirable that the unification should extend in that way.

I should like to have one more word with reference to the public accounts. There they have an alphabetical list of employees. What I have been asked for tonight is a list related to something in a future year which does not correspond either to the alphabet or to functions as indicated in the estimates. I would be glad as we come to each item of the estimates to give as full information as is available.

**Mr. Drew:** That is exactly what we are asking. We are asking for full information respecting the category of each of these employees, and of the amounts paid, except in such cases as they are being paid at ordinary wages; and in that case we would have them bulked as they are done ordinarily. That is what we are asking.

**Mr. Wright:** It seems to me that in preparing the estimates to present to the Minister of Finance the minister's department must have had certain numbers of people in view, whom they were going to employ in different capacities. All we are asking is to have some of these figures which the minister must have presented to the Department of Finance.

**Mr. Claxton:** May I recall that I have already given those figures in relation to the item under discussion. I gave the amount of \$3,489,842. I have described the number of employees, and their association with the department. It totals 1,270 employees. I have already given that.

**Mr. Wright:** But the minister has not broken it down in various classifications, namely those who are stenographers or inspectors, or whatever classification they may have had. He must have had that information when he presented his estimates to