

In the present resolution, I think there is a consensus, however I noted the matter was hardly discussed.

Relating to the freedom of movement and of settlement I hope, Mr. Speaker, that all provinces will eventually agree to entrench all prerequisites of the economic union, even if it means qualifying them by some GATT regulations on the obligation to justify exceptions and to terminate them as soon as social and economic conditions improve, possibly with an arbitrator to decide on them.

While inclusion of the equalization principle does not seem to raise any problems, I noticed that some people are not logical in that they oppose some aspects of this resolution when they do not raise any objection when they seek recognition. They use those arguments when they do not agree but drop them the moment they do.

Mr. Speaker, on balance, having taken into account philosophy, law, convention, the art of the possible which is the government of the people, I think that this resolution is justified. But on balance is it not always how hard decisions are taken? Last resort measures are often the only workable solutions.

I hope we will resume within a short time the constitutional reform discussions concerning the political institutions and distribution of powers where we have so much to do. Meanwhile, I will keep on being interested in the constitutional change and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will live up to the spirit of federalism in the transport area.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. 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 Laval (Mr. Roy)—Canadian Pacific Railway—Abandonment of certain daily supplementary service; the hon. member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie)—Air Safety—Enforcement of regulations respecting aircraft and pilots; the hon. member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson)—Human rights—Inquiry as to date of implementation of commission's recommendations.

It being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills, and notices of motions.

Renewable Energy

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order No. 6, the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). Shall the order stand?

Some hon. Members: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Stand by unanimous consent.

* * *

RENEWABLE ENERGY ACT

MEASURE TO PROMOTE USE OF RENEWABLE ENERGY
RESOURCES

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin) moved that Bill C-210, to promote the use of renewable energy, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Before recognizing the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger), it may come as no surprise to him that the Chair thought it necessary to examine the terms of Bill C-210 before the House, because the bill proposes in clause 3 to create a Crown corporation to be known as the Renewable Energy Corporation.

● (1700)

There have been previous instances in which it has been the duty of the Chair to bring to the attention of members of the House that in some circumstances there may be a claim upon the public purse and such bills ought to be presented only in the name of a minister of the Crown. With the assistance of the Table officers I have reviewed the bill, and for those members who may seek to make reference to it, I find that in clauses 3 and 7, matters related to the financing of the corporation appear to be wholly outside the Crown's interests. For that reason the Chair is initially inclined to accept Bill C-210 as being in order. However, there is a tradition related to decisions on such bills whereby the Chair does enter a caveat so that, as debate continues, some hon. member may want to bring to the attention of the Chair some manner in which such a corporation might, in fact, be responsible for the expenditure of public funds. Accordingly, the Chair has taken the position it may have to intervene at some later stage in the proceedings if public funds were found to be involved. Subject to that caveat it is my view that the debate on Bill C-210 should proceed.

Mr. Schellenberger: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I accept your guidance and wisdom with regard to the bill. I am aware of the restrictions under which private members are placed in not having the ability to spend the moneys of the public purse and I attempted, when drafting this bill, to be very cautious in this respect.