

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Has my hon. friend any explanation or justification to give for dropping the grant, formerly \$8,000, to the Canadian Horticultural Council? If this subject is going to cause any discussion, I shall not press the matter, but I presume my hon. friend has some reason for dropping this grant.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The matter may be taken up in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: All right.

Item agreed to.

Seed, feed and fertilizer control, including grants to seed fairs, etc., also grant of \$18,900 to the Canadian Seed Growers' Association, \$413,200.

Mr. VENIOT: What is meant by fertilizer control?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The administration of the Fertilizer Act and the testing of the strength of fertilizers.

Mr. SANDERSON: What is the Canadian Seed Growers' Association to which there is a grant of \$18,900? Just how does it function?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): This is in the nature of assistance to an organization known as the Canadian Registered Seed Growers' Association, not a government organization. It is to assist them in investigational work to keep up the standard of our registered seed and to help in the production of registered seed, and to help defray the expenses of meetings of the executive in this connection.

Mr. SANDERSON: Is this organization dominion wide in scope, taking in all the provinces?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Yes.

Mr. DONNELLY: There is quite a reduction in this item, amounting to \$159,000. How does the minister account for the decrease?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): It is accounted for as follows:

Publications and stationery. . . .	\$ 1,000
Subventions and seed competitions, etc.	73,800
Market reporting.	2,000
Inspection and sale account admin- istration.	3,000
Agricultural pests control act administration.	5,000
Laboratory inspection services. . . .	60,900
Chemical analyses of feeding stuffs, etc.	8,000
Grant to Canadian Seed Growers' Association.	2,100
Development of seed cleaning centres.	4,000
	<hr/>
	\$ 159,800

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What was the total grant to the seed growers' association last year?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): \$21,000.

Mr. DONNELLY: Did I understand the minister to say that there was a reduction of \$5,000 in the expenditure on the control of pests?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): My information is that this reduction was made because the full amount was not necessary, as the work is being handled through the general laboratory vote. This has nothing to do with the administration of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act.

Mr. DONNELLY: I was wondering why the pests came in here.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Where is the headquarters of the Canadian Seed Growers Association, and what suboffices, if any, have they?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The headquarters are at Ottawa. They have no suboffices.

Mr. MacLEAN: With reference to fertilizer, we were led to believe when our friends came into power that they were going to do a great deal to help the farmer. The farmer was going to get his fertilizer cheaper and be assisted in a great many other ways. We were led to believe that all the ingredients for mixing fertilizer would be allowed to enter this country free of duty, and that generally our farmers would be in a haven of rest so far as the cost of fertilizer was concerned. But according to the returns of the statistical branch last year, I find that there was a large amount paid out in duty on the fertilizer that was brought in. Last year the ten per cent duty on fertilizer, not including the one per cent excise tax, netted the government a revenue of \$144,185. This year, in addition to paying that ten per cent duty, our farmers will be faced with a three per cent excise tax on all fertilizer imported. The statistical returns of last year show that over \$5,000,000 worth of fertilizer was imported, and an excise tax alone of three per cent on that would amount to \$162,955. So I cannot see where this government is helping the agriculturist very much.

We were also told that the imposition of a duty on fertilizer would not increase the price. Some, indeed, claim that the price has not increased, but when we look at the decrease in the price of the raw materials entering into fertilizer, we find that the farmer during the last two years has been paying