

Supply—Agriculture

the western provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, toward the cost of transporting haying equipment, fodder and livestock to and within these provinces after July 1, 1958, as indicated in the item No. 637. There have been payments made. The actual expenditure to January 31, 1960 was \$34,541, and it is estimated that the amount required to provide for these payments to the end of the present fiscal year is an additional sum of \$13,500 in round figures. The bulk of it is for the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Pickersgill: Was any of that money expended in the main vote for Alberta?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No, this is for Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Item agreed to.

638. To extend the purposes of vote 614, further supplementary estimates (1), 1959-60, to include the transport of livestock bedding other than straw, \$1.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River expressed some concern about this dollar item. Perhaps the minister would tell us what the purpose of it is?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Yes, Mr. Chairman. The purpose of this item is not to add money but to enlarge the scope of an item that was previously passed in the supplementary estimates which was an item of \$300,000. It made provision for payments toward transportation costs on shipments of fodder and straw and on the movement of cattle from October 12, 1959, to the end of the present fiscal year. It is desired to extend this cost-sharing to include sums paid on other forms of livestock bedding such as shavings and sawdust due to the shortage of straw, particularly in Manitoba.

Mr. Pickersgill: Could the minister say where the shavings and sawdust come from?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I cannot in all cases, Mr. Chairman, but it is intended for use in Manitoba principally.

Item agreed to.

Special—

639. Prairie Farm Assistance Act administration—further amount required, \$134,000.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance will perhaps recall that when we were discussing the crop insurance legislation last session there was some discussion about the relationship of prairie farm assistance to crop insurance. Can the minister say whether or not any of the reluctance of the provinces to participate in the federal scheme is due in any way to the attitude taken by the federal government toward payments with regard to prairie farm assistance

and any beneficial consequences to any individual farmer under the Crop Insurance Act?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I should think not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): In view of what the Minister of Agriculture had to say about this subject, I think the minister will recognize that his brief reply is hardly relevant or helpful in the matter. I am asking if one of the provinces has objected to the scheme because a farmer cannot obtain both benefits?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, the point of my answer was that I think the two subjects are not related. The hon. gentleman is seeking to impinge a discussion in relation to crop insurance on an item that relates to prairie farm assistance.

Mr. Argue: These two things are different, Mr. Chairman, but they are closely related because to the extent crop insurance may be adopted in given areas it will reduce the amount of crop insurance paid under prairie farm assistance and—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I think I can satisfy my hon. friend, Mr. Chairman. There is nothing in this item that is being voted now that provides for crop insurance. This is simply an additional amount of \$134,000 to be added to the amount previously voted by parliament to provide the administrative requirements of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. It arises out of inspections. That is the immediate occasion for asking for the addition.

Mr. Argue: I understand that fully. I can tell the minister why he needs the money. As time goes on and more and more inspections are made under the act during a given crop year, it is found that certain sums of money are required and so parliament has to vote them.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): It is specifically this situation in the west. These increased inspections were the result of early snow in the prairie provinces. It was necessary to re-inspect areas that originally were considered ineligible for assistance. In some cases several re-inspections had to be made. It is this situation which has given rise to the need for this additional appropriation.

Mr. Argue: If one could interpret from what the minister said that those with crops under the snow would become eligible it would be a welcome innovation, but I do not think that is what the minister is saying.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I repeat what I actually did say, Mr. Chairman. These additional expenditures were due to early snow