

*Supply—Agriculture*

botanical congress, we would be asking the committee now, within four days of the end of the fiscal year, to vote additional money.

The additional money is not required in this item. The item is simply asking for legislative authority to use money that is available there now for a purpose which parliament, in the Appropriation Act, did not contemplate.

I think the situation is perfectly clear. We have to put a one dollar item here. It is not to say that we have \$9,999 remaining in the item ready for lapsing. It means we have \$10,000 there. This is the accepted means of showing that we already have the amount required in the item, and consequently we put in the one dollar amount. That has been the practice for years and years. The effect is legislative. It is not to seek the vote of additional money, because additional money is not required here. I would not consider myself justified, in a situation like this, in asking parliament to vote additional money in these late days of the fiscal year, unless additional money is actually required.

**Mr. Benidickson:** It occurs to me that we have an enlargement. I hope the minister will obtain from his officials a review of whether there is in the supplementary estimates an enlargement of the use of this one dollar estimate, such as we have in the four items for his own department.

It occurs to me that there is such an enlargement. I may be wrong. However, I can see the minister's point. The public accounts committee has for several years considered revising our method of preparing the estimates in a way which would take account of lapsing items and record them in subsequent years. That committee has also considered taking into account additional revenue, so that we have net figures with respect to items that are simply gross expenditures, such as we have here.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** That is a different matter. That is in the main estimates. That suggestion which was made in the public accounts committee has no application to this situation.

Item agreed to.

Production and marketing branch—

659. Subsidies for cold storage warehouses under the Cold Storage Act—further amount required, \$98,432.

**Mr. Hellyer:** Mr. Chairman, would the minister tell us the terms and conditions which regulate the granting of these subsidies?

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** They are to be found in the Cold Storage Act, which is in the revised statutes of Canada, chapter 52 as amended by chapter 313. The cold storage regulations are published; they were first

[Mr. Fleming (Eglinton).]

promulgated in 1954, and they were amended in 1958. Provision is made for the payment of subsidies not exceeding the lesser of 33½ per cent of the approved expenditure, or \$50,000. This limitation of \$50,000 applies to a good many of these subsidies for the construction of cold storage warehouses.

**Mr. Hellyer:** Would the minister tell us the conditions for recovery of part or all of the subsidy in the event that the cold storage plant is subsequently sold for purposes other than those for which it was originally intended, or if it were just sold.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** I do not quite follow the hon. member when he speaks about the subsequent price. This is a matter of the construction of cold storage warehouses. It has been public policy to encourage the construction of cold storage warehouses. Therefore there is a provision made for the payment of a subsidy toward the cost of construction.

This subsidy is \$50,000 of the cost, or 33½ per cent, whichever is the lesser amount. That is determined as a matter of proof in relation to the cost of construction.

**Mr. Hellyer:** I understand the purpose and the policy. The minister has not answered my question regarding what provision or regulation there is for recovery of the subsidy if the cold storage plant ceases to be a public cold storage plant. What guarantee is there to the crown that the subsidy is recovered? Under what conditions is it recovered?

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** In a situation of that kind the statute confers a discretion on the minister.

**Mr. Hellyer:** In other words, there is no laid down rule by which the recovery takes place? It can be administered in an arbitrary fashion by the minister.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which has been under study in the public accounts committee. It is under discussion there at the present time and it may be the subject of a report to the house later this present session. I do not think I should go beyond that at this time.

**Mr. Hellyer:** I do not wish to labour the point. I wondered whether the minister had under advisement the possibility of putting into effect a regulation which would govern the system of recovery, rather than leaving it a discretionary matter as it is at the present time.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** I am sure that only good will come of the study the public accounts committee is making of this matter