

submission, it is quite inappropriate for him to be allowed to put forward further substantive arguments here today. If he is as confused as we are about the consequences of your ruling and wishes to seek clarification, as we are seeking clarification, that is one thing. But to be permitted to add to argument by this subterfuge, to allow him to fill in arguments that perhaps he overlooked filling in yesterday, in my submission is very inappropriate. If he wishes to seek clarification, that is fine, Madam Speaker, but I think that the course that he has been allowed to follow here in submitting substantive argument is most inappropriate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Then I apologize for having interrupted the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). I would like now to complete my comments because I did not interrupt him when he was arguing his point. I think he has some nerve to take me to task for refuting the point raised by the member for Calgary Centre. Indeed, they are clearly out of order when they challenge your ruling and put questions to you contrary to Beauchesne's Citation 117 (5) and (7) which I quoted a while ago. I think that they both should be ashamed of challenging a ruling, the consequences of which they deplore but which are nothing new, since they are similar to the consequences of rulings made by your predecessors and to which you referred in your ruling. When the hon. member for Calgary Centre states that he would like to be able to vote in a specific way on several elements of the bill and when I tell him that, if it is frustrating for the opposition, there have been other situations under the Standing Orders where the government has experienced the same frustrations, I think it is quite relevant, and if the hon. member for Yukon does not understand the substance of my argument, I cannot be blamed for his obtuseness under the circumstances. In conclusion, I point out that members opposite are complaining about the consequences of this ruling. But these consequences are nothing new. They are the same as those which flowed from your predecessors' rulings and they do not fly in the face of parliamentary practice. Quite the contrary, they do not fly in the face of our Standing Orders, and under the circumstances, I submit that members opposite are wrong in taking the time of the House in an indirect attempt to question your ruling which is quite clear and, I repeat, consistent with all previous rulings.

[*English*]

Madam Speaker: I think it is perhaps time we conclude this matter and I will try to answer the question of the hon. member so that he will feel that he can proceed with this bill in the usual manner. I feel that if members follow the usual process, there will be no confusion. The hon. member for Calgary Centre and other members know that in the process of the debate as it is outlined in our rules and regulations there are devices whereby they may present amendments on second and third reading and there will be an opportunity for a standing vote in Committee of the Whole.

Energy Security Act

All of these are things infinitely possible in the course of this debate. The proof of the matter would be, as I suggest that the House should commence the debate and we will see what amendments are acceptable in the course of that debate. Perhaps that would be the best proof that the process allows for all of the things which hon. members legitimately seek to do in studying this bill.

The process is not new. It simply follows the rules and procedures which have been followed in this House before. I think the hon. members, if they begin the debate, will see that it is entirely possible to do this to their satisfaction.

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Madam Speaker, this is not on the same point of order at all. Your ruling has been that this is an omnibus bill and perfectly proper for debate. Your ruling essentially is that it covers the same issue, presumably energy security. But I raise another issue with you that I think bears some immediate consideration.

Because of the format of the legislation before us, we have an Energy Security Act, 1982, which is to be the title of the bill when it becomes an act. As Your Honour knows, when a bill passes Parliament and receives the royal assent, it becomes an act of Parliament.

Our problem here is compounded by the fact that Schedules III to VI of this bill now before us pretend to be acts, but they are really schedules to an act. We therefore have a very difficult situation before Parliament.

When this bill is passed, as may well happen, it becomes an act. Then what have we got? Have we got five acts passed or have we got one act passed with four schedules to it claiming to be acts? I was wondering if Your Honour had directed herself to question the law officers of the Crown, the Attorney General or the Minister of Justice's Mr. Chrétien department with respect to how this bill we now have before us will become an act of this Parliament. Will it in fact become five acts of this Parliament? It strikes me that we have a serious problem.

May I suggest to Your Honour—

Madam Speaker: Order. The hon. member is again discussing the point of order which was discussed the other day. I did hear all the arguments. Now that I have made my ruling, I am afraid I cannot hear new arguments. That point has been covered in the ruling and I cannot entertain arguments on it.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The basic concept of democracy is that a member represents the thinking of the majority of the people who sent him here. When a bill has two principles, one that my people support and one that my people do not support, and I am required to vote "yes" or "no", I am misrepresenting the thinking of the majority.

● (1610)

Madam Speaker: Order. The hon. member is again discussing the point of order which was dealt within the ruling. I am afraid I cannot accept his argument.