

by passing the legislation; but once the legislation is passed and the authority is given to provide this guaranteed Income Supplement, really the amount of dollars involved in any year's expenditures is merely the mathematical result of the conditions of eligibility set out by Parliament itself in the land. It has no particular significance in terms of anyone controlling the amounts the Government can spend on the program. The details spelled out in the act determine that.

Senator GROSART: I agree fully with that. That is the point you made earlier about statutory disbursements. I am not concerned with that at all. What I am concerned with is the fact that we do not know—and I think we should know—what percentage of this money is going to one particular group of beneficiaries under the act and what percentage is going to another group.

It is a matter of public interest, perhaps public concern, who is going to get the money. In this we have a reasonable idea because we have a complete breakdown of the \$236 million and these other figures—and this is not an isolated case. I am not discussing Government policy, but I am suggesting that if the Treasury Board has the figures—and the breakdown is in very large amounts—it would be in the public interest that they be made available to the minister, or that it be in his discretion what he wants to do with them.

Senator SMITH (*Queens-Shelburne*): He really spoiled his question, did he not?

Dr. DAVIDSON: Well, I suspect that if the discussions of the guaranteed income supplement arise in the House of Commons when the house is discussing supply, and the Health and Welfare estimates are called, the minister of that department will have available all the information that could be given to him as to how the estimates are arrived at.

Senator GROSART: We had the minister before this committee dealing with that and he and his officials said they were sorry but that the figures were not available.

Senator BAIRD: How much of this money has been spent?

Dr. DAVIDSON: It would be difficult to say how much has been spent. I can only say that some of it has in fact been spent. Take, for example, the money that is shown in the first two items in the Agriculture estimates—there is authority for the Agricultural Commodities Stabilization Board to pay out of an advance account, that is put in its hand under proper legislative authority—to pay these amounts for dairy subsidies and sugar beet subsidies, etc. They are paid out of a special advance account, but they are authorized. Since \$89.9 million is paid out of that account, the purpose of this vote is to authorize the money to be taken out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and the special account of the Agricultural Commodities Stabilization Board is reimbursed from this vote for what it has already paid out.

Senator THORVALDSON: It really has statutory authority—there is authority for paying it out?

Dr. DAVIDSON: That is right, and the statute authorizes that an advance account may be established, and the minister can make advances from time to time to the board to pay these amounts.

Senator THORVALDSON: Does the same apply to the Secretary of State? I notice there is a sum of some \$22 million—I assume that is to cover the additional gifts of foods to India. It is on page 20.

Dr. DAVIDSON: This item in the Secretary of State's department does not cover food for India. That would come under External Affairs. The Secretary of State will use the \$22 million for the final instalment of the \$5 per capita grants to universities, which it was originally intended to pay in May 1967; consequently it would have appeared in the Estimates for next year. But, because of the