

I might add that the hon. member for Peterborough-West (Mr. Fraser) asked a similar question, but the figures he received do not jibe with those I received. Some of the figures are the same, but not all of them. He asked for the number of employees as at January 1, 1947, and my question was as to how many there were on December 31, 1946. There was a considerable decrease in respect of several items in only one day.

Mr. McILRAITH: That is all right, it was the end of the year.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): While I am speaking about this matter of returns, I should like to know why it is that a minister of the crown can obtain figures so quickly. Of course his figures refer only to the civil service of Canada, and they do not refer to the number of employees. It took fifty-two days for me to get an answer to my question when I asked how many people were employed by the government of Canada. The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann) made a great play in the house about the reduction in the number of civil servants. Well, those were civil servants. But what the country wants to know is not so much with respect to the number of civil servants in the country; the people want to know the reduction in the total number of employees of the federal government. That is what they are interested in. They want to know how much money we have to pay them. Despite the fact that the minister showed a reduction of 21,000, that still represents an increase of 52,000 since before the war.

Then, here is an interesting fact. When the minister placed his figures on *Hansard* last Friday he left out the figures for all corporations. In addition to that, ten other departments were left out. I cannot understand it. In the return which I received some smaller branches were not included, such as the House of Commons, the library, the Senate, the international joint commission, the tariff board and the Veterans' Land Act. There were 2,141 people not included in that return. It just does not make sense. The sum total of the whole thing is that we have 173,961, plus the 2,141; that is the total taking into account the employees of all crown companies and the ones omitted from the return. We paid them at the rate of \$317,544,000 a year, leaving out the 2,141 employees. On March 31, 1946, we had 148,711, not including those in the House of Commons and so on, and we paid them \$254,865,000, which is not chicken-feed. When we consider that in March, 1944,

we had only 145,500 and in March, 1945, we had 149,700, we will realize the increase there has been in that length of time.

As I have said before, there seems to be very little effort on the part of the government to make a real reduction in the number of people employed in the government. We do not know whether in the case of those who were left out of the return there has been an increase or a decrease. There is no use in putting stuff on *Hansard* like the minister put on the other day, because it gives a false impression of how many people are employed by the government and have to be paid by the taxpayers. If the minister wants to put it on he should take the return that was tabled on March 17 and make a comparison. He will then get somewhere. It is all very well to say that there is a reduction in the number of civil servants, but we know there are lots of people employed who do not even belong to the civil service. One thing about it is that there is one government employee in Canada for every seven people.\*

Mr. CLAXTON: That is not correct, and I should like to know where the hon. member got that figure.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): It was tabled in the house.

Mr. CLAXTON: The figure is about 1.24 per hundred in the case of federal government employees.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): You had better get the return and look at it.

Mr. CLAXTON: The per capita rate in Canada is lower than that of any other civilized country.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): It is roughly 179,000 and you can divide that into 12,000,000; perhaps my arithmetic is not very good.

Mr. MACKENZIE: How does that work out?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I do not know.

Mr. CLAXTON: It is one zero out.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Only 1,000 per cent wrong; that is all.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): There is 173,961, plus 2,141, which gives 176,102. As I said, there are too many trying to look after too few. That is all there is to it. That is not the whole story as far as extravagance is concerned, because you require hundreds of thousands of square feet of office space to house these people. That is not the only

\*See also page 3051.