

67. (1) Where, in respect of a Crown corporation,

(a) no provision is made in any Act for the appointment of an auditor to audit the accounts and financial transactions of the corporation, or

(b) the auditor is to be appointed pursuant to the *Canada Corporations Act* or the *Canada Business Corporations Act*,

the Governor in Council shall designate a person to audit the accounts and financial transactions of the corporation.

(2) Notwithstanding any other Act, the Auditor General is eligible to be appointed the auditor, or a joint auditor, of a Crown corporation.

Senator Grosart: I wonder if I might ask the Leader of the Government if I heard him say that my question had an implication. I do not think it did. Would the leader not agree that my question was merely related to those crown corporations whose books were not subject to audit by the Auditor General?

The government leader has given his reply. He has provided the names of the six corporations which are currently not subject to audit by the Auditor General, although I understand now that there is legislation pending in the form of Bill C-20 which will at least give the Auditor General access to the information contained in those books, if not the right to audit. But the Leader of the Government has indicated an implication in my question that I do not think was there.

Senator Perrault: If there is any further clarification required, I would be pleased to make further inquiries. The information is as complete as has been made available to me to this time.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SALARY OF FORMER EMPLOYEE—REQUEST FOR FURTHER ANSWER

Senator Ewasew: Honourable senators, some weeks ago a question was asked of the Leader of the Government as to the salaries paid to former members of the CBC, or Radio-Canada, have it as you wish. One person in particular is now a member of the Parti Québécois cabinet. The answer given by the government leader was to the effect that Radio-Canada, or the CBC, felt that, basically, it was none of our business.

Having been trained in the law—rather feebly perhaps, having none of the laudatory titles that some honourable senators have; nonetheless, having studied at McGill under some of the country's greatest constitutional law professors, I decided to not only research this question myself but to seek their advice, and the collectivity of this effort leads me to question the partisan attitude of certain senators in this house to which I cannot subscribe—

Senator Grosart: Question!

Senator Ewasew: I am interrupted. Someone shouts "Question!" Well, question or no question, I did some research and I asked myself whether or not we, as the Senate, were not somewhat made fools of by the CBC reply. Is not the Senate,

regardless of who asked the question, entitled to the answer to any question put during the Question Period as a matter of law, delicate though it might be to the government, especially when put by a senator appointed by the reigning government?

I ask the government leader, very frankly and very firmly—and, hopefully, not too aggressively—that the answer be insisted upon and provided just as soon as possible. Furthermore, I reiterate that the position that I just adopted has nothing to do with partisan politics, but with what I believe to be the prerogatives of this body, the Senate collectively, and its members whatever their political beliefs individually.

Senator Norrie: Honourable senators, I concur 100 per cent with what the honourable senator has said.

Senator Perrault: Honourable senators may avail themselves of the opportunity, at periodic intervals, of having officials of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation appear before the appropriate committee of the Senate. I suggest that honourable senators avail themselves of the opportunity for cross-examination on such matters at that time. Certainly, I can convey to the appropriate authorities the dissatisfaction on the part of certain senators with the reply to the question posed about the former CBC entertainer who is now an active member of a political party in the province of Quebec.

● (2020)

Senator Ewasew: Honourable senators, may I just put this supplementary question to the Leader of the Government in the Senate? This is not just a matter of questions being asked by individual senators. It somehow strikes at the prerogatives of this house. I think, Radio-Canada or the CBC notwithstanding, a question like that, as innocently and as frankly as it was asked, obliges a reply, but the reply which the leader unfortunately had to give this house—and I am not blaming him personally—is totally and wholly unsatisfactory. I am sorry.

RAILWAY ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

The Senate resumed from Thursday, May 19, the debate on the motion of Senator Bosa for the second reading of Bill C-207, to amend the Railway Act.

Hon. John M. Macdonald: Honourable senators, as mentioned by the sponsor in his brief yet comprehensive explanation, Bill C-207 is an amendment to the Railway Act which would require a railway to give 30 days' notice of its intention to expand or change an existing line if such line is located within 1,000 feet of a residential, commercial or public building. The purpose of the 30 days' notice is to give interested persons an opportunity to make representations about the proposed change to the Canadian Transport Commission, and the commission could then require the railway to submit formal and detailed plans and, indeed, to hold public hearings if it thought it desirable to do so.

As was also mentioned by the sponsor, this is a non-controversial bill which was approved by all parties in the House of Commons. Indeed, it is strange that up to now public notice