

Dr. DAVIDSON: It cannot be done. It is not even called. In fact, there is no requirement whatsoever that the statutory items be printed in the Estimates that year. This is supposed to be a statement of the moneys that the Government is asking Parliament to appropriate, and we would be in a perfectly proper position if we came to Parliament with a blue book that asked you to vote us only \$5 billion instead of \$9 billion in 1967-68, because that is actually what we are asking you to vote when we present next year's Estimates. That is all we are asking you to vote; but for information purposes, in order that Parliament may have a complete picture of the total expenditure requirements of the Government, we also print the statutory items as part of the total presentation. So you see the total requirement of the year is, for next year, \$9½ million.

Senator BEAUBIEN (*Bedford*): Would all such statutes be introduced by a resolution?

Dr. DAVIDSON: All such statutes have to be introduced by a procedural resolution, of course, because they involve expenditures and revenue of the Crown. But you are all aware of the device of introducing a continuing statutory authority in a vote item in the Estimates. That has to be preceded, just as any appropriation bill has to be preceded, by the resolution. But one resolution may in an appropriation bill cover a good many continuing authorities.

Honourable senators now have before them the printed Supplementary Estimates and they will see the figures I have been referring to, at the bottom of the table on the first page. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what you would wish me to do with respect to the treatment of the individual items which are fairly numerous. Perhaps we could call the pages?

The CHAIRMAN: Let me call the headings and then Dr. Davidson can give a comment on each amount, and questions can be asked with regard to any other amounts. Under Agriculture, the largest amount is the Agricultural Stabilization Board. He can comment on that.

Senator MACKENZIE: May I ask a general question? Who scrutinizes the applications for requests for these supplementary amounts? I take it that the officials of the department do so. Does the Treasury Board go through them with a fine-tooth comb?

Dr. DAVIDSON: Very much so, Senator MacKenzie. The staff of the Treasury Board examines them in detail, it discusses them with the departments, eliminating, where it can succeed in doing so, items that the department is prepared to get along without. Where they do not agree with us that they can get along without a certain amount—

Senator MACKENZIE: They have to convince you?

Dr. DAVIDSON: They have to convince us, or the ministers over our heads. There is prepared for this group of estimates alone, a detailed set of papers for each minister on the Treasury Board, explaining in detail each of the individual items in the supplementary Estimates.

Senator MACKENZIE: This is what I assumed, and I just wanted to have it confirmed.

Senator BROOKS: On page 1, under the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, the previous estimate was \$2,510,000 but the total is \$13,209,000. I wonder why there could be such a difference in the estimate and the total amount.

Dr. DAVIDSON: It is very simply explained by the following, Senator Brooks. It has not been customary to present a request for repayment to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of the deficit they incur in operating the Welland Canal, until the end of the year. At the end of the year, when the operating deficit is known, it has been customary to include, in the final supplementary Estimates for the year, an item that represents the deficit on the Welland Canal system. At page 25, you will see, if my recollection is correct, that this is—except for \$549,000, attributable to the Welland Canal operation.