

*Adjournment Motion*

one thing all of us can agree on, is that we did not want to cut medicare. Some of those who now support medicare did not support it initially, or they had reservations about it or some alternative. But the point is that there is really no opposition today to the medicare program in this country. There may be criticism of it, as there always will be on some specifics, but as far as the general value of the program is concerned, and apart from the fact that the federal government should live up to its responsibilities, there is no serious criticism of medicare; and this was true even during the election campaign.

In view of the fact that, of all the programs we have, medicare is one of the most universally accepted programs by all sections of society, this is sufficient and good reason for the government to listen to the views of members of the House, to think again about what it is doing and to wait until the federal-provincial conference takes place before passing this bill. If the government does this, I am sure it will appear to be more sensitive than is the general impression at the moment—and it can use all the good impressions it can garner. As far as this point is concerned, the government is certainly not in the best position at the moment.

May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave)—National Defence—Possible opening of Suffield range for grazing; the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay)—Consumer Affairs—Request for report on investigation of duty-free shops—Reason for warning to consumers about purchases at duty-free shops; the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) National Defence—Request for redeployment of air and sea rescue forces in Atlantic region.

It being five o'clock p.m., pursuant to the order made last Friday, February 27, 1976, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills, notices of motions.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

### CANADA-ALASKA AND MAINE CORRIDORS AUTHORITY ACT

MEASURE RESPECTING RESPONSIBILITY AS BETWEEN CANADIAN AND U.S. GOVERNMENTS.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my understanding that there is agreement on the bill with which we are to proceed at the present time.

**Mr. Goodale:** Mr. Speaker, I understand it has been agreed to proceed with Bill C-272 at this time.

**Mr. Paproski:** That is agreed, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** D'accord.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it agreed that all other bills preceding this bill on the order paper be stood and that we proceed with consideration of Bill C-272, appearing in the name of the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Waisson)?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Before proceeding with consideration of Bill C-272, I feel I should inform hon. members that the Chair has some hesitation about the procedural acceptability of the bill. Although the mover, the hon. member for Laprairie, might argue that the proposal is more permissive than mandatory or compulsory, I feel that this type of proposal should better be put in the form of a notice of motion than a bill.

● (1700)

It is the opinion of the Chair that if the full purpose of Bill C-272 were achieved, which is to create an authority to advise the government to reach an agreement with the government of the United States, and if such an agreement came about, in the end it would involve an expenditure of millions of dollars. So, indirectly, the bill, although it does not do so directly, could create the need for a substantial expenditure of money and thus be a burden on the Crown.

Because of the agreement hon. members have reached so far as proceeding with this bill is concerned, and also because similar bills have been debated in this House in the past, I am prepared at this time to let the House proceed with the consideration of this bill, but not without registering a caveat about border line bills of this type which to my mind should be in the form of notices of motions rather than bills.

I do not want these proceedings to be taken as a precedent for the future to be used by hon. members for the presentation of similar bills. I think the Chair must become more meticulous in looking at such bills, especially bills which would allow the government, advise, permit or suggest but which at the same time indirectly would have some money implications. This being said, I shall put the motion to the House for debate.

**Mr. Corbin:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I tend to agree with the reservations you have expressed concerning the content and purpose of this bill. I