

—that is the gross figure—  
of which the federal payments are expected to be \$41 million.

So, taking those two together, the 1963-64 federal expenditure on winter works was \$34.1 million, and in 1964-65 the federal expenditure was \$41 million. In each case that represented somewhere between one-half and two-thirds of the total cost of the program.

Senator MOLSON: The labour content of the program?

Dr. DAVIDSON: Yes, the labour content of the program. As you know, the contribution of the federal Government is 50 per cent of the labour content, except in areas designated as areas of high winter unemployment, where it is 60 per cent.

I should also perhaps mention that the figure of \$41 million which I have referred to as the federal contribution to the 1964-65 winter works program should, in fact, be supplemented by an additional \$6 million of carry-over from the 1964-65 program which was not paid in the fiscal year 1964-65 because the accounts had not been settled. It has been carried over into this year's program and is part of the reason why we need \$54 million under this heading for the winter works program, 1965-66, and for cleaning up the carry-over accounts from previous years.

Could I just say one word, Mr. Chairman, before we get too far into the detailed discussion of these estimates? It is a word I offer in self-protection, because I am going to have to say it otherwise quite a few times during the course of the morning. I would not like the members of the committee to think that I am in a position to explain in detail all of these items, or the details of all the programs in all of the departments of Government. What I can do is to give the explanations that the Treasury Board had received from the departments, and accepted, as to the need for these additional items. I can give you factual information on this.

It may be that some questions will arise from certain members of the committee, asking for information about a program, the reasons for the program, what it is expected to accomplish, and so on, in which case I may have to ask you to put such questions over and, if the committee so wishes, it can call a representative of the department itself who would be in a much better position to speak with knowledge on this kind of question.

I hope the committee will understand if I find it necessary to plead ignorance with respect to some of the questions it wishes to put to me.

Senator ISNOR: As a matter of interest, Mr. Chairman, you tabled two replies today, with instructions that they be inserted in the minutes. I think the answer to the question asked by Senator Smith (Queens-Shelburne) should, in the same manner, also be included in our minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand, Senator Isnor, that you are referring to the answer to Senator Belisle's question?

Senator ISNOR: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I gathered that the consensus of the committee was that it should not be included in the minutes, and that this was also Senator Belisle's request. I am in the hands of the committee. Senator Belisle was particularly interested in that. Is there support for Senator Isnor's suggestion?

Senator ISNOR: It was not my suggestion. It was Senator Smith (Queens-Shelburne) who raised the question.

The CHAIRMAN: In the case of Senator Smith, these are direct financial questions. In the case of Senator Belisle it was a question of whether or not . . .

Senator SMITH (Queens-Shelburne): May I say another word on that? So far as I am concerned, I was interested only in the general principle involved.