

*Supply—Finance*

very much enlarged job and therefore, according to the comparison of the telephone books, he has a much enlarged staff. I notice also that the Minister of National Health and Welfare has added considerably to his personal staff, and so has the Minister of Transport. I am using, as I say, this red book and comparing it with the latest book which we use when we want to contact the personal staff of a minister. I regret to bring up this subject but I cannot help recalling the present minister's predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Harris. I knew something of his self sacrifice with regard to these affairs. I knew he had the idea that he must set an example of economy when it came to the expenditure of public money. So I wonder now about this business of private secretaries, special assistants, executive assistants, assistant private secretaries, associate private secretaries and so on. When I compare this red book, showing the staff in those years, with the latest directory I wonder whether the Minister of Finance really is doing the tough job he says he is doing as chairman of treasury board. For example, here is the Department of Trade and Commerce and provision for assistant private secretaries in English and French, associate private secretaries and so on.

**Mr. Harkness:** Is this all from the telephone book?

**Mr. Benidickson:** Mostly from the telephone book but I am a simple man and I think this is something which would appeal to simple taxpayers across the country. Although I do not have them with me this evening, I have kept civil service circulars relating to the enlistment of editorial and information personnel in the various departments. Despite what the Minister of Finance might say in debate about economy I can understand why he would have no control over treasury board or his associates in the cabinet when his own personal staff has increased and when over the last four years the people in the information division of each department have almost quadrupled in numbers. Hon. members on the treasury benches might say that these people are employed to be of service to the department as a whole, but there is a possibility that their first duty is to the minister of the department and the minister's organization in his own office. I merely raise that question and refer to a biblical phrase the minister frequently used to use in the debate. I ask: what about that mote and what about that beam?

If one looks at the old red-covered telephone book and compares it with the present telephone directory he will find some surprising results without going through the formality of placing a question on the order

paper. The public thought they were electing a government that aimed at economy. I would think that the leadership in economy would start at the ministerial level, but that is not the case in this instance. I think the minister should tell us something about that because he presides at treasury board and almost every year when presenting his budget he almost bursts his buttons in talking about the good management and economy that has come about under his guidance.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Benidickson:** Some hon. members applaud. In a return to a question asked by the hon. member for Niagara Falls under date of July 12, 1961 it is indicated that the personal staff of the Minister of Finance numbered ten in the fiscal years 1956-57 and 1960-61. The expenditure in 1956-57 was \$35,900 and again in 1960-61 it was about the same. Having served in that department I cannot reconcile the situation I have outlined with what is contained in the current telephone directory. I do not know how many stenographers are required but I shall deal with other employees. In April of 1957 at the time of the issuance of the directory I hold in my hand there was only a private secretary. The current directory issued in February, 1961 indicates that the minister has on his staff an executive assistant, Mr. William N. Allan, a private secretary, Miss A. Hanna, and a special assistant, Mr. G. Hamilton. All hon. members read about him some time ago. He was supposed to sort of "glamorize" the minister.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** He is overpaid.

**Mr. Benidickson:** Perhaps a better way of describing his function is to say that he was supposed to humanize the minister.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** In that case he certainly is overpaid.

**Mr. Benidickson:** The two other employees whose names appear in the directory for both years are the lady who takes care of phone calls to the department and the lady who takes care of the files of the department. It is difficult to understand why the expenditure would be the same in the two periods I mentioned, especially when one considers that the minister now has an executive assistant, a private secretary and a special assistant despite the fact that he strongly advocated economy prior to 1957. Perhaps the minister might explain this.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** Mr. Chairman, I hope I can be more brief in replying to these many matters than hon. members have been in raising them. I shall take the questions in order.