

Supply—Agriculture

1958 butter	\$ 301,367
1958 dry skimmed milk	2,866,096
1959 shell eggs	750,000
1958-59 hogs	600,713
1958 B.C. tomatoes	77,671
1958 B.C. raspberries	5,077
Total	\$4,600,924

Mr. Benidickson: Has the minister any figures with reference to the present stocks of commodities which are being supported?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Which particular ones does the hon. gentleman mean? Does he wish me to give the whole list?

Mr. Benidickson: No. I should be glad if the minister would table that statement. Has he got the comparative figures for an earlier date, perhaps a year ago?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): In the case of butter, the estimated amount on hand at March 31, 1959 was 25,184,071 pounds; cheese, nil; shell eggs, estimated at March 31, 1959, 3 million dozen; fowl, nil; dry skimmed milk, 65.4 million pounds; lamb, nil; hogs, 33 million pounds; B.C. tomatoes, 2.3 million pounds; B.C. raspberries, nil.

Mr. Benidickson: Can the minister relate that to the figures of a year ago? Are the comparative figures in that reference paper? I know he is not Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I can in some instances. I have not the figure for butter for March 31, 1958, but the figure for 1956-57 was nil. May I supplement that statement in part and correct it in part by giving to the house the information, Mr. Speaker, that at March 31, 1957, the inventory figure of butter was 29,638,010 pounds, and the inventory figure of March 31, 1958, was 25,184,071 pounds. In the case of dry skimmed milk, at March 31, 1958, the figure was 27,719,717 pounds. In the case of shell eggs, at March 31, 1958 the figure was 88,754 cases.

Mr. Benidickson: Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated that there was a profit of \$253,000 with relation to this year's operations under the stabilization act, with respect to butter. Does that mean that the support or stabilization scheme with respect to butter during the current year's operations is not expected to bear any loss at all but that on the contrary it will provide a profit to reduce the cost of stabilization payments with respect to other items?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): The profit was made as a result of sales of 1957 butter in 1958-59.

Mr. Benidickson: Is it a profit, or is it simply income during the year?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): It was a profit.

[Mr. Fleming (Eglinton).]

Mr. Benidickson: A net profit on butter for the fiscal year resulting in a surplus of \$253,000?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): The price advanced from the time of purchase in 1957 to the time of sale in the fiscal year 1958-59.

Item agreed to.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

International Shortwave Broadcasting Service—

724. Maintenance and operation—further amount required, \$84,000.

Mr. Fisher: Would the minister explain this item in some detail so that we may be able to understand why this expenditure is necessary. Does it reflect some expansion in the service or the provision, possibly, of new capital equipment?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No. This is an item with respect to the international shortwave broadcasting service. It is not for the general operation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation at all. Nor does it reflect an increase in the scope of operation of the international shortwave broadcasting service. Actually it was a mistake on the part of the C.B.C. with respect to a billing in the previous year. This really dates back to the previous year; we are simply picking up a delayed billing in this item.

Mr. Fisher: What does the minister mean by "billing"?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): A billing for the service which was rendered. This is a service which the C.B.C. performs for the government; it is no part of their general broadcasting operations but an entirely separate matter. In this case instead of rendering a bill to the government for this service prior to the close of 1957-58 there was an oversight and the bill was rendered in the fiscal year 1958-59. No provision was made for its payment in the 1958-59 estimates.

Mr. Benidickson: I noticed that in the main estimates for 1958-59 it was expected that the cost of this operation would be reduced by \$6,405. I think that during meetings of the external affairs committee a great deal of criticism was expressed in the past by members of the party which is now in power with respect to the expenditure under this particular item. I take it that the result of this supplementary estimate is that the overall cost, instead of being less than in the previous year, will be up to the extent of \$78,000 or \$79,000? Is that the result?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): That would not be a true way of describing the operation. I have indicated that this item, or certainly the bulk of it—\$72,285—is attributable to a payment