

Supply—Mines and Technical Surveys

they indicated to the country that things would be different if they sat to the right of the Speaker, I suggest that next year we will not have from the Minister of Finance at the end of the fiscal year appropriations in the supplementary estimates that are 120 per cent of the original estimate presented to the committee.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed a further word on that point I would say I believe the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River has implied that I went further in my observations and indicated that I was unhappy with this procedure. That is not indicated by the *Hansard* record. I was merely inquiring about the additional expenditures. If I had read further I would have noted that Mr. Harris went on to explain that the procedure was in the interest of economy and we came to the conclusion that it was justifiable under the circumstances. We were a very reasonable and constructive opposition.

Mr. Denis: By reading further down the hon. gentleman would have observed that the then leader of the Conservative party criticized the situation at that time.

Mr. Dinsdale: No, that was the end of the discussion.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, there is one little point the hon. member for Brandon-Souris brought up on which I should like to comment. I have just been listening to this discussion which seemed to me to develop from the explanation given by the minister. The minister is now taking great credit to himself for having parroted Mr. Harris' explanation which Mr. Harris understood, but there seems to be this difference. I may not have understood correctly and if I am wrong I, of course, unlike the minister am always perfectly willing to admit it.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): You are a great man.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member for Brandon-Souris read Mr. Harris' explanation that in some areas the weather was not good and therefore it was not possible to carry out photography in some areas under contract but that in other areas not covered by contract photography was undertaken and this vote was for the purpose of buying the photographs taken in areas not covered by the contract. I just heard the reading of this and had no previous knowledge of it but I believe that is the sense of what the hon. member read. If I understood the Minister of Finance he did not tell us that. He said there was such extraordinarily good weather everywhere that a whole lot was

[Mr. Benidickson.]

done. There does seem to have been a specific contract in 1955 in the case to which Mr. Harris referred for a specific area. What is there in this case? What is there in the original contract? If the minister had complied with the request of the hon. members for Trinity and Laurier an hour ago and produced the original contract and read it to us no doubt the committee would not have had to ask all the questions that have been asked.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

A—Department—

National health branch—

762. Administration of the Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act—further amount required, \$47,000.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, this vote involves a jurisdiction that is shared by the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice has been declaring policy which traditionally has generally been reposed in the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I refer particularly to the treatment of drug addicts.

The Minister of Justice has made no less than two statements that have come to my attention through the press in the last few months indicating that the government was giving consideration to the setting up of treatment centres for drug addicts. Can the Minister of Finance say whether or not any of this money is to be used for that purpose, directly or indirectly? What is the government's policy? Does it propose to establish treatment centres on its own or in co-operation with the provinces or does it simply propose to give financial assistance to the provinces for this purpose? I have in mind particularly the situation in British Columbia where there has been displayed a more than ordinary interest in this matter. Does the Minister of Finance think that his great knowledge of the problems of the government of Canada will enable him to give an answer to this all-important question?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, there is no provision in this item for treatment centres. This additional sum is required to pay legal fees, court costs and other services as clearly appears on page 20 of the details. This arises out of a higher level of enforcement activity during the year.

The committee will, I think, be interested to know that in 1958 there were 522 convictions under the Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act as compared with 454 in 1957 and 391 in 1956.