

is split in four parts, (a), (b), (c) and (d). I have complained mostly because these \$1 items amend statutes or acts. But, sir, CIDA was set up with a \$1 item. There was no proper statute. Now, with a \$1 item we are to amend several of the \$1 items which we passed previously regarding CIDA. How ridiculous can you get? We have estimates, we have supply for the voting of money, and we have ordinary bills for the passage of legislation. In the case of CIDA, no bill setting it up was passed. It was done with a \$1 item. Now, when changes must be made, and they all may be good changes, they are to be made with a \$1 item. We are now, by a \$1 item, changing legislation which in the first place was established with a \$1 item.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has raised an important and timely issue, and I think Your Honour, your friends at the table and those in the office who assist you, will have an interesting 24 hours. You must give this question serious consideration.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I observe confirmation that Your Honour and your associates will have an interesting 24 hours. This is not just a passing point of order which the opposition has raised. Actually, we are not objecting to the items. Last year, when we spoke on these \$1 items, I opposed Loto Canada. I do not think I particularly oppose any of these \$1 items. Actually, some of them I favour strongly. I think we should put them through, particularly the ones concerning veterans affairs. If they were brought in as a separate bill, they would pass almost at once.

Sir, the principle of bypassing the legislative process, of imposing closure on parliamentary debate which this method entails, is wrong.

Mr. Mazankowski: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I hope Your Honour and your assistants will study this whole proposition carefully. We hope, particularly, that you will study carefully the particular items raised by hon. friends to my right, and the four or five I have added. I think most, if not all, of them should be ruled as not proper in a bill the legal purpose of which is to pass money for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, you will be considering the learned arguments of hon. members who spoke this afternoon and considering, particularly, the procedures and precedents of the past. Much has been made of the government's effort to broaden or amend legislation or broaden the powers of the subject of the legislation. Eldorado Nuclear Limited has been cited as an example of that process. It might help if I were to deal specifically with this particular corporation. Hon. members mentioned vote L62d, which reads:

To authorize Eldorado Nuclear Limited, with the approval of the governor in council, to borrow money for capital expenditures by the issue and sale of securities up to an aggregate amount not exceeding \$40,000,000 bearing such

rates of interest and subject to such other terms and conditions as the governor in council may approve.

Hon. members should understand that Eldorado was set up with broad powers. It was set up as a proprietary corporation and was intended to operate as a commercially successful venture. It became, in the process of its birth and through the enabling legislation, an agent of the Crown which technically requires authority for borrowing. That is all we are seeking. We are not seeking funds from parliament; we are seeking only authority to borrow.

In committee hon. members had an opportunity to deal with the question of the borrowing powers and whether there was to be widening of those powers or any new direction with respect to those powers. I think members of the committee were satisfied on the point. This is not an attempt to widen the powers of Eldorado in any way. No new directions are contemplated. We were contemplating merely the financing of the corporation's growing operations. It does not seek money from the government. It does not seek a guarantee from the government, and it does not seek an appropriation of any kind from the government or from parliament. It is seeking permission to raise on its own credit, not that of the government, a certain sum of money up to a maximum. However, no specific amount is stated. This vote would provide the corporation with the flexibility it requires for its growing operations.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments about the serious issue raised in connection with several votes in supplementary estimates D. I know Your Honour will have noted carefully the argument of the Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council about the parallel between the impact of items in the estimates which are substantial and those which are \$1 items but have legislative impact. That point perhaps relates to the argument raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West about lawyers' procedural problems and difficulties in finding the law. Obviously, whether the item is substantial or a \$1 item, the point remains that lawyers must keep track of the law and its many amendments, and many systems are available for helping them do so.

It is sometimes argued, in connection with substantial items or \$1 items that if a certain amount is originally set out in the statute more cannot be added or voted in an estimate because the item would have to say, "Notwithstanding the statute, the following may apply."

● (1620)

It would seem to me to be rather strange that if in an estimate item one could vote \$400 million for a new program one could not add \$100 million to a program if in a previous situation a certain sum had been voted perhaps as a result of specific legislative enactment. It seems clear to me that the addition of money should be possible and that explains why, on occasion, items which are powers to borrow, and the like, rather than actual votes of money and which require a \$1 item and have in the past in particular pieces of legislation or estimates been included as an accompaniment to the actual