

EVIDENCE

WEDNESDAY, April 8, 1959.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we now have a quorum. May I just refresh your memory a bit. At the last meeting we were dealing with revenues, paragraphs 6 to 15. Today we commence with paragraphs 16 to 26, at least, dealing with expenditures. However, before we start, Mr. Watson Sellar was asked several questions at the last meeting and possibly he has the answers at this time. We are continuing the examination of the accounts, with Mr. Watson Sellar as our chief witness.

Mr. WATSON SELLAR (*Auditor General*): Mr. Chairman, Mr. McGregor and Mr. Fraser asked me two questions about the sale of cameras. Mr. McGregor would like to know how many have been disposed of in the last five years and how much was received for them. Mr. Fraser, in turn, wanted me to find out whether they were sold to a firm or individuals. I regret to say I cannot give you a very satisfactory answer because Crown Assets Disposal Corporation does not receive a great many cameras and does not maintain a special classification, for statistical purposes. Therefore, it was unable to inform me how many were received or how much money was obtained for them. I was told that as a rule the cameras are rather old and are thrown in with a lot of other stuff. Dealers come in and make a bid on the lot. That is one reason I have not the record.

The chairman asked me what was the recommendation of the royal commission on broadcasting with respect to financing the deficit and operating costs of the broadcasting corporation. At page 279, the royal commission made three alternative suggestions:

A. To vote, at one time, five stipulated annual sums to cover the next five years, with the text providing for adjustments on account of inflation or deflation in the value of the 1956 dollar;

B. to provide by statute for an annual payment, with provision for annual increases;

C. to pay annually an amount equal to a percentage of total personal expenditure on consumer goods and services as calculated by the bureau of statistics.

The last would be the equivalent of a \$7 or \$10 levy on the family a year.

Mr. Charlton wished to know whether any special contributions have been made by the government to the unemployment insurance fund. In the years 1949-50, 1950-51, and 1951-52, a total of \$6,836,860 was credited to the fund in connection with unemployment assistance, arising out of the terms of union with Newfoundland when it entered Canada. Also in the same three years \$1,828,863 was credited to the account to reimburse supplementary benefits paid to loggers, class 3, and this included any unemployment that was not insurable but was declared insurable under section 87F, as amended in 1950, within a twelve-month period prior to the claim under class 4. In regard to these two sums, the largest amount was in 1950-51. The amount in 1952 was relatively small. If you like, I can give you the figures in more detail.

Mr. Hellyer asked what were the terms of the loan made to India last year. It took the form, you might say, of a line of credit, because the money was not paid to India, but on request paid to the Canadian wheat board to finance the purchase of wheat. The loan authorized was \$33 million. Up to