

1927 concerning the border between Labrador and Quebec, that decision became part of the Constitution of Canada under the terms of the British North America Act (No. 1), 1949. It is therefore now an internal matter and not fit subject for adjudication before an international court.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

**Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, if questions nos. 157 and 1,831 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately. I again point out that we are treating these questions in this manner because of the lengthy and detailed nature of the answers.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Text]

#### DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

#### Question No. 157—Mr. Orlikow:

1. What was the number of persons employed by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in each of the past five years?
2. For each of the same years, what was the number of persons employed in (a) Ottawa (b) each region and, in each case, how many were (i) Native people (ii) Indian (iii) Metis (iv) Inuit?
3. What was the operational budget and/or the amount paid for salaries for staff in each of the above categories?

Return tabled.

#### MEDIAN WATER LEVELS FOR GREAT LAKES

#### Question No. 1,831—Mr. O'Sullivan:

1. For each year 1957 to 1977, what have been the (a) agreed-upon (b) actual median water levels for the Great Lakes as set by the International Joint Commission?
2. For each year in which the actual median water levels have been higher than the median water levels as recommended by IJC, what were the reasons for these higher levels?
3. Has IJC ever deliberately kept the actual water levels of the Great Lakes higher than the level recommended for any particular year by the IJC and, if so (a) for what reasons (b) by what authority (c) under whose direction?
4. Has IJC or the government ever received a request to maintain the water levels of the Great Lakes higher than the median levels recommended by the IJC and, if so (a) from whom and on what date (b) for what reasons (c) what was the response of the IJC in each case?

Return tabled.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

#### Order Paper Questions

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I raise the point at this time since by so doing the Chair will have more opportunity to consider the matter than would be the case if the point were raised at the end of the day on which this matter will become extremely relevant. My point of order has to do with supplementary estimates D for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977. I and others will contend, as has been contended in the past, that inasmuch as several of the items propose to amend bills other than the Appropriation Act, they are not in order. I shall be specific and indicate the particular items to which I refer. I am speaking of Energy, Mines and Resources, vote L62d; Industry, Trade and Commerce, vote 77d; Post Office, vote 1d; Public Works, vote 10d; Supply and Services, vote 27d; and Veterans Affairs, vote 45d.

If Your Honour examines each of these items you will find that in each case an attempt is made by means of a \$1 item either to amend or to provide an exception to existing legislation. I should like briefly to indicate how these items are legislative.

Energy, Mines and Resources, vote L62d, proposes to allow Eldorado Nuclear Limited to issue securities up to a value of \$40 million. This power does not exist under present legislation. Not only is a totally new authority being granted, but the issue will be decided "bearing such rates of interest and subject to such other terms and conditions as the governor in council may approve." Thus, we are to give the power to make more regulations outside parliament and would be basing it on a bill which parliament cannot discuss or amend.

● (1510)

The second one, Industry, Trade and Commerce, vote 77d, is even more blatant, in my respectful submission. It proposes to amend sections 26 and 28 of the Export Development Act to increase the amounts which may be guaranteed in the form of exports credit insurance by the Export Development Corporation. The original limits were set out in the act and have previously been amended by specific legislation. There was an amending statute in 1974, an act to amend the Export Development Act, chapter 17 of the statutes for the session 1974, 1975 and 1976. This was, and remains, the procedurally correct way to amend a statute. An increase in the guarantees available to exporters is important to our trade policy and should not be excluded from full discussion in this House.

Post Office vote 1d proposes to provide that, contrary to the Olympic Act, money from the Olympic stamps in philatelic packages will go to the Olympic account. This is a desirable and straightforward proposal, but the method is highly undesirable. We should be able to read the statutes to find what the law is, and not have to root around in scattered appropriation bills for "notwithstanding" provisions.

Supply and Services vote 27d will allow the minting of a \$100 gold coin, contrary to the provisions of the Currency and Exchange Act on two counts. First, gold coins may only be issued when the dollar is pegged, and then the coin must be worth its face value in gold content. This twofold exemption