

Supply—Agriculture

at the present time. If a recommendation is made by the committee it will of course be very seriously considered.

Mr. Batten: I should like to know how many warehouses are involved in this item and the location of each.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): This present item involves two new contracts entered into after the previous estimates were presented. The first is in connection with the Chaine Coopérative du Saguenay of Chambord, Quebec, and the amount of the subsidy is \$47,500. The second is the Barker Storage Company Limited at Meaford, Ontario where the approved subsidy is \$14,615. There is a third, the cost of the completion of a warehouse being built under a subsidy contract which was not foreseen at the time the previous estimates were completed. That is the Dairy and Poultry Co-operative Marketing Association Limited of Saskatoon. The subsidy in that case is \$50,000.

Mr. Benidickson: Has the minister, after looking up the details on page 14, given any thought to the fact that we are not very consistent when we set out details of these expenditures for the convenience of members of parliament? I have observed that this has been the case in the past, also. With respect to items where the expenditure is not particularly great we are given details of individuals and how much they receive—sums of the order of \$5 or \$20, or \$70—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I think that is another item.

Mr. Benidickson: I know. The total there is about \$12,000. But when my hon. friend asks a question with regard to companies across this land which might have been overlooked in last year's estimates as being entitled to subsidies under the legislation dealing with cold storage he is faced by the situation that a lump sum appears in the estimates—\$98,432—with no details given. This obliged the hon. member for Humber-St. George's to ask the questions he did. It seems to me inconsistent to say so little when in the course of the next few pages, with respect to agriculture, we let it be known that Mr. So and So of rural route so and so gets \$5 compensation for the loss of animals. What we see before us in connection with this item is complete repetition. There is no point in putting it there, because it is a mere repetition of the gross amount, though it is called a detailed item. I am not saying this has not been the practice for a long time but I just draw attention to what appears to be a lack of consistency when it comes to giving details.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): As the hon. gentleman has acknowledged, this is the form in which the supplementary estimates and, indeed, the main estimates have long been presented. There is a very good reason for the use of the form to which the hon. member drew attention when he referred to compensation for the slaughter of animals. If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, to comment in advance on that item in view of the fact that the hon. member has done so, may I say we are dealing there with payments which are to be authorized to individuals; there is no such thing as a shift within an item. The ordinary right to allot within the total does not apply. In the case of item 659, however, there is, of course, the normal right to allot within the item. It is because there is a deficiency to meet in connection with the three particular projects to which I have referred that the additional sum is asked for, and in keeping with the form of the corresponding item in the main estimates it is a lump sum total.

Item agreed to.

661. Compensation for animals slaughtered—further amount required, \$1,113,869.

Mr. McMillan: This item shows an increase of about 50 per cent over the estimates of last year. It is a large item—larger than usual—and no details are given with respect to it. Could the minister give us some more information?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Yes, I shall be pleased to do so. There has, indeed, been an increase in the operations of this particular branch in relation to the slaughtering of animals and this item arises out of a need to pay compensation. The item consists of several portions. The first is the increase in the number of cattle slaughtered for which compensation is payable under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act brucellosis eradication program involving a sum which amounts to \$545,662. The second portion is compensation for hogs slaughtered in swine herds infected with hog cholera. That total is \$534,667. The third portion is the increase in the number of sheep slaughtered for which compensation is payable under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act scrapie eradication program, and the amount there is \$138,376. The total of these three items can be taken as being \$1,218,705. There is a reduction in that sum of \$104,836 because of a smaller amount paid in respect of tuberculosis reactors slaughtered. Thus we arrive at a figure of \$1,113,869.

(Translation):

Mr. Boulanger: I should like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming) his views on the epidemic hog cholera.