

met and will meet. I hope Senator McCutcheon will use his good offices to see to it that it does meet just as regularly as he would like it to meet—and I am sure he will.

With most of what Senator McCutcheon said about priorities in Government spending on all levels, I think we are all bound to agree. This makes good sense. There should and must be a clearing house, in view of the amount of public spending in this country. Public spending is undertaken by governments as a result of the pressure of people who want it. It is the business of all of us in public life to bring home to people who ask for so much public spending just what the consequences can be for the public institutions which do the spending.

With respect to the kind of comment that has been made here by the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Brooks) and Senator McCutcheon, and which so often falls from the lips of senators on this side of the chamber—because those on the Government side are in fact just as critical as are the Opposition of the amount of public spending we are exposed to—I say such comment, made frequently enough, can have an effect on public thinking. That is what we are here for. This is what we should try to do. Perhaps I am encouraging opposition. I do not have to. Opposition is here. This is our way of life. This is the parliamentary system.

I do not propose to engage in a discussion with the expert when it comes to corporate organization, corporate finance and all of the accounting and bookkeeping aspects that enter into these fields. I would point out that item No. 1 in the main estimates, respecting the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, deals with a grant in respect of the net operating deficit incurred by the C.B.C.

There is a good deal in what Senator Isnor has said about the payment of a grant to cover an operating deficit and the loan of a sum of money to create a capital asset. Senator McCutcheon says that the practice of doing it this way is unsound from the point of view of accounting practice. In any event, he says it is a misleading way of making budgetary proposals. I would point out, however, that the item is in the estimates. It is there for all to see. Whether it is a loan to be written off ultimately, or whether some day some of these properties might be sold and the capital investment or part of it is recovered, I cannot say.

Hon. Mr. Isnor: Or there might be an appreciation.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Yes—whether there is appreciation or depreciation. Perhaps we should have more accounting experts in the Senate than we have. The

point I think about is that whether it is a loan or a grant, it is in the estimates and, therefore, we can at least consider it. Whether it is poorly done or not is a matter of opinion.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

THIRD READING

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators when shall this bill be read the third time?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): With leave, I move third reading now.

Hon. M. Grattan O'Leary: Honourable senators, when last Easter a bill largely similar to this one came to this house I refused to give it may assent. I am prepared to admit that this is not exactly the sort of bill that came to us at Easter, and yet it has this similarity, that it has been brought here today at the eleventh hour and this house is asked to give it first, second and third readings at one sitting.

Honourable senators, why has this bill come to us in this way at this time? I suggest, sirs, that it has come to us in this way at this time for two reasons. The first reason is because there are certain people in high places in this country who do not seem to understand that freedom of speech in a free Parliament involves more than the right to speak; it involves as well a duty to answer. In truth, that is the very heart of a free Parliament, that men on the benches of power shall be compelled to answer, and the failure to realize that in another place during the past week or ten days was responsible, in the main, for our getting this bill in this way at this time. The heart of our system, I repeat, is accountability, and without recognition and honour for that you in fact have no Parliament at all.

I think I am in a position to say to this house that had that principle been understood and honoured in another place last week this bill, which we are now asked to pass holus-bolus in one sitting, would have been before us at least two or three days ago, thus permitting us to give it whatever consideration it deserves and at least permitting us to avoid the seeming position which will be accepted by very many outside this house, of the Senate being merely a doormat for the House of Commons.

Secondly, this bill has come to us in this way at this time because certain people in the other place do not seem to realize or understand that this house is an integral part of Parliament. They seem not to realize that this house has its own rights, its own responsibilities, its own duties, and its own dignities, and that under our system and under our