

Senator REID: I believe the responsibility rests on a commission of three?

Dr. DAVIDSON: Yes; but they have you on that commission, have they not? You are worth any other two.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there some further questions?

Senator PEARSON: Referring to Vote 10d under Forestry on page 10, may I ask why Western Feed Grains does not come under Agriculture rather than Forestry?

Dr. DAVIDSON: I think the only answer I can give you, Senator Pearson, is that this responsibility was originally in the Department of Agriculture and was transferred to the Minister of Forestry, under the Rearrangements and Transfers of Duties in the Public Service Act, in February 1964. It was a decision of the Government that this should be handled by the Minister of Forestry. That is the explanation, as I can give it to you.

Senator BAIRD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question about an item on page 12. It is vote 15d, expenses of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary group. Is that the total amount?

Dr. DAVIDSON: No, sir.

Senator BAIRD: That is just a supplementary?

Dr. DAVIDSON: That is the additional amount required.

Senator BAIRD: Have you any idea of the total amount that was spent?

Dr. DAVIDSON: Yes, sir. May I read this explanatory note, Senator Baird? This is the \$55,000 item. It reads:

This supplementary estimate is required for the additional costs of a visit to Canada of five members of the French National Assembly and to cover a further amount required to liquidate the outstanding accounts and commitments of the Fifty-fourth Annual Interparliamentary Conference.

The original appropriation for planning and organizing the Fifty-fourth Annual Interparliamentary Conference in Ottawa, 1965, was \$200,000; and this additional \$50,000 is required to make up the costs which have already been incurred.

This was to pay the outstanding bills, in other words. The bills have in fact been paid, because we have advanced \$50,000 out of our Finance Contingencies Vote to this purpose. When this amount is approved by Parliament, if it is, it will be refunded to the Finance Contingencies Vote.

Senator VAILLANCOURT: We read on page 12 ". . . expenses of the Interparliamentary Conference to be held in Ottawa in 1965." Why does it say "to be held" when the date has already passed?

Dr. DAVIDSON: I appreciate the point you make, Senator Vaillancourt. We are here in some difficulty because it is necessary to maintain consistency between the vote wording of the main estimates and the vote wording of the supplementary estimates, when you are asking for supplementary appropriations to add to the appropriation already made. The wording given in the main estimates, and which appears in the Blue Book, referred to the Interparliamentary Conference "to be held in Ottawa in 1965", as it was looking forward at that time. That is why it was worded in that way in the main estimates. Our legal advisers tell us that we should keep that wording, no matter how ridiculous it seems from our point of view; because if we change the wording, then it may be interpreted as being a separate vote—which cannot be used for the same purpose as the original vote was used for.

Senator VAILLANCOURT: That is satisfactory.

Senator AIRD: I would like to ask a question regarding an item on page 13, National Defence, Vote 40d—Development. We have the single word "Develop-