

ment," although there is a sum of \$9 million concerned. In most of the cases there is an explanation for expenditures. I wonder if this was a matter of technique for that particular department or what the explanation is in relation to it.

Dr. DAVIDSON: I will give you first the technical answer and then I will tell you what this is all about. The reason that this says "development" is that, if you will turn to page 270 of the main estimates, 1965-1966, it says "development"—and again, for the same reason as that which I gave to Senator Vaillancourt, we have to maintain consistency.

As to what this program relates to, you are perhaps familiar with the so-called hydrofoil program, in which we are attempting, through National Defence and through this Development Vote, among other things, the development of a hydrofoil prototype that will, as you know, permit the ship to rise out of the water and proceed at much greater speeds than it would if it had to remain in the water. This is a program which has been under way for a number of years. The target date for the production of the full prototype, as I understand it, is April to August of this year.

This is merely a reflection of the fact that the costs of the program have had to be revised upwards, number one; and number two, that the funding of the program has had to be accelerated, because there has been greater progress made this year than was anticipated when the vote was originally put into the main estimates.

This \$9.3 million is required to pay the accounts that will be incurred, that have been and are being incurred at the present time, largely at de Havilland but also at the shipyard in the lower St. Lawrence, in respect of this program.

Senator AIRD: Thank you. The main point I was trying to make is why there is not a short description given along the lines that you have given.

Dr. DAVIDSON: Could I just have another look at the main estimates and see if there is anything in the detail that would throw any light on that. I have looked, and I see there is not. Senator Aird, I think that is a good question, which I would like to take under consideration myself. It does not tell you very much.

Senator YUZYK: Would Dr. Davidson kindly give me a general explanation of the item on page 1, which comes immediately after the figure "16". It says: "Departments for which no Supplementary Estimates are Required". I notice in the previous estimates and in the present estimates that in all cases there were increases for every department. I would like an explanation as to which departments there were for which there was no increase at all and for which there is no provision in the supplementary estimates, as the previous estimates and the present are exactly the same. Do these departments spend extra money every year or are they stationary?

Dr. DAVIDSON: The departments for which no supplementary estimates are required are departments whose budgetary requirements are included in the main estimates presented at the beginning of the financial year. They may or may not have been included in supplementary estimates A, B or C, or they may be departments who, because they have been able to live within their estimates and have not been faced with any special contingencies or emergencies requiring additional funds, are able at this date to say: "We are still in a position to live within the amounts of money that are included in this total for our department and we do not at this date foresee any supplementary requirements." Some of these may turn up in the final supplementaries of the department concerned, depending on whether they can make it to the end of the fiscal year without overexpenditure.

Senator YUZYK: Could you state one department of this kind which does not require an increase?