

cents, Defence 13 cents, Fiscal Transfer Payments to the Provinces 9 cents, Transport and Communications 7 cents, Internal Overhead Expenses 6 cents, General Government Services 4 cents, Education Assistance 4 cents, Culture and Recreation 2 cents, Foreign Affairs 2 cents.

The kind of examination that can follow from these figures is indicated by something that will interest Senator Beaubien particularly. I take the two cents devoted to culture and recreation, which in terms of total budget amount to \$298 million; that is, translating the cent into the \$14.3 billion figure.

Of the \$298 million, no less than \$181 million is the cost of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I mention that because here is a kind of examination that surely can be given to these estimates, when we are asked to approve the spending of them. Does it really make sense that, of our total investment in culture and recreation in Canada taking this whole large field, out of \$298 million, \$181 million should go into one particular item, the CBC?

Is this really the kind of balance in our concept of the requirements of culture and recreation in Canada, that something like two-thirds of the total should be supplied by the national broadcasting service? I am not saying the system is not a good one, but I doubt very much that this was ever a policy decision. I think that, like Topsy, it "just grew". I suggest this is the kind of thing that we need to examine very carefully.

Hon. Mr. Martin: That growth has been applauded from time to time by Senator Beaubien.

Hon. Mr. Grosart: I did not catch what the leader said.

Hon. Mr. Martin: I was just facetiously remarking that Senator Beaubien has always applauded that growth.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: I think he would like to sell it, but I do not know what he would get for it.

Hon. Mr. Grosart: I think that from time to time he has recorded that growth, but I myself have not heard him applaud it. I doubt if he has. As the Leader of the Government said, his remark was facetious.

Honourable senators, I have used that illustration to suggest there is an area of overall examination of the decisions that go into this macro that we call budgetary expenditures and also of the items that are not included and which we should have before us. I know Senator Langlois is very interested in this aspect of the presentation of the supply bill, and I am quite sure that we may on the next occasion have a reply from him, unless he wishes to reply now. Having said that, may I say that our committee looked at these Estimates and found an increase of about half a billion dollars. We examined the major increases item by item, and whereas the report of the chairman indicates we were not entirely satisfied, I see nothing to be gained at this moment by opposing the passage of this appropriation bill, although on some future date I might be inclined to do so if there is not the kind of improvement in presentation that I suggest.

Hon. Mr. Benidickson: Honourable senators, before Senator Langlois concludes the debate, there is one point

I should like clarified. I realize the figures repeated by Senator Grosart were accurate in themselves, but it was suggested that this supply bill would take us to the end of the year. I wondered if that meant the end of the calendar year or the end of the fiscal year, the one being December 31 and the other being March 31.

Hon. Leopold Langlois: Honourable senators,—

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Honourable senators, you realize that if Senator Langlois speaks now his speech will have the effect of closing the debate.

Hon. Mr. Langlois: Honourable senators, I wish briefly to comment on the remarks made by my honourable friend Senator Grosart. I stated last night that this bill had been examined by the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance and that every opportunity had been given to the members of that committee to question the officials of the Treasury Board who were present. I must add now that most of the questioning was done by my honourable friend at that time. I agree with some of the suggestions he has made, but I would say that most of his suggestions, although worth considering, are not practicable at this stage of the consideration of the supply bill. For example, I do not see how we could on the examination of a supply bill go into the operations of the Old Age Security Fund or the Unemployment Insurance Fund, because there is nothing provided in this bill for those funds. It would be irrelevant were we to discuss those funds on the basis that he has suggested.

On the other hand, and I stand to be corrected here, when the honourable senator referred to the discussion before the National Finance Committee of the sums of money spent on regional economic expansion, I think the discussion at that stage was centered on the budgeting for such a program. I recall it was Senator Manning who closed that discussion by saying that in budgeting for such a program one had to go by Estimates and by past experience, and that it was very difficult to arrive at very precise figures. I thought that my honourable friend Senator Grosart and other members of the committee had agreed with the intent of Senator Manning's remarks at that stage.

There is also to be considered in the expenditures on such programs as economic expansion, the many ingredients which one has to take into account in arriving at a reasonable estimation of what the total expenditure is going to be in the final analysis. One has to bear in mind that these grants are given on the basis of the number of jobs a particular project will provide, and therefore the amount to be allotted to any program cannot be ascertained until such time as the minister in charge of that program knows how many jobs this particular project will provide. The amount of the grant being dependent on the number of jobs to be provided, it is almost impossible to evaluate the total expenditure beforehand.

There are also many other ingredients in such programs which are impossible to forecast with any accuracy.