Senator Grosart: Speaking to the amendment, I would say first of all that obviously the principle of the bill is not in support of solar energy as such, or of research into solar energy. The principle of the bill is clearly stated. It is for Parliament to establish, by an act of Parliament, a specific institute. It is an institute which may or may not decide to make a profit. It is an institute which may or may not have shareholders. It is an institute which may or may not be subject to audit.

The principle before Parliament is: Should we give approval at this stage to the principle of a bill of this kind, approving it in principle in the Senate? It is all very well for the Leader of the Government or the sponsor to say, "There have been assurances given." The sponsor in the other place has said this. The sponsor here has said this.

Senator Austin started to give us a lecture on the interpretation of statutes. I do not know how much study he has made of that particular subject, but I assure him that I should be very glad to sit in on a consortium with him at any time, if I can help him in his understanding of the principles of the interpretation of statutes. Certainly, it is no part of the principle of the interpretation of statutes that some comment made in respect of a bill, some assurance that is given, even by a cabinet minister, has anything whatsoever to do with the final authority or the final interpretation of that bill by the courts. If we give approval in principle to this bill we are giving approval in principle to an institute that can be a runaway institute, that can cause unbelievable problems in the future. Because if we do it with this bill we may create a precedent to do it with many others.

To my mind it is absurd, and I agree entirely with Senator Godfrey that if we approve the principle that this Senate will approve the principle of such bills, anyone can come in and say, "I want you to establish an institute for me. I won't tell you whether I am going to make a profit. I won't tell you if I have got shareholders. I will tell you nothing about it. I won't tell you if we have members. I will just tell you that we are limited; we must have twelve and not more than twenty-five directors." That is all. The bill itself authorizes—and this adds to the danger—this institute to collect money from the public. It authorizes the institute to seek money from the government. But there is no indication whatsoever of the control of that, which has always been the essence of our discussion of any such private bill, which in effect is what it is, to establish a private company with practically no knowledge of its structure, no knowledge of its handling of money, no control whatsoever.

For that reason I support Senator Godfrey's amendment, seconded by Senator Cook, that the substance of this bill be referred to the committee. It can be discussed there, without it going to that committee with the stamp of approval of the Senate, which it would have if we approved it in principle.

Senator Molson: Honourable senators, I should like to ask the sponsor if this is indeed a private bill, as is my understanding?

Senator Austin: It is a private member's public bill.

Senator Flynn: How public? What makes it public?

Senator Austin: You were in the other place, Senator Flynn. You know what a private member's public bill is.

Senator Flynn: What is a private member's public bill?

Senator Grosart: Define it.

Senator Austin: I am amazed that you should ask me to define it.

Senator Grosart: Don't be amazed.

Senator Argue: A public bill in the name of a private member.

Senator Flynn: Why is it public?

Senator Argue: Because it has to do with a public question.

Senator Flynn: Oh!

Senator Austin: Of course.

Senator Molson: Honourable senators, in the middle of a discussion on the definition of private or public bills, might I call your attention to rule 94, which states:

> After its first reading and before its consideration by any other committee, a private bill from the House of Commons, for which no petition has been received by the Senate, shall be taken into consideration and reported on by the Committee on Standing Rules and Orders in like manner as a petition.

I wonder if we have complied with our own rules in this respect.

Senator Argue: Honourable senators, I think the bill is perfectly in order. I think it is a public bill. It is a bill to deal with a public question in the name of a private member. I introduced many public bills in my day in the House of Commons, and others have done the same, and they are doing it today by the hundreds.

Senator Grosart: Nobody objects to that.

Senator Argue: This is one of those public bills in the name of a private member. I think the member who introduced the bill in the other place should be congratulated on the form of the bill. It is a far-reaching bill. It has to do with a very important subject. It is introduced by a private member, and he is able to introduce it and get around the question of its being an appropriation bill by saying in clause 5:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to require an appropriation of public revenue or an expenditure out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The amendment moved by Senator Godfrey is a negative amendment. It is an amendment that the bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to a committee. That is an old trick. "Trick" is the wrong word, but it is an old method that is often used to kill a bill. You don't really dare vote against the bill on second reading and kill it that way, so you endeavour to kill it by moving that the bill be not now read a second time. That is the negative, and that is the way it is killed. The subject matter is referred