

Energy Security Act

in future instances. However, we are confronted here with an existing situation, with four brand-new bills in four schedules, which we would ordinarily have expected to go to committee.

My question was really with respect to these four. Am I correct that as a result of Your Honour's ruling, notwithstanding the Standing Orders in that regard, because these four bills now appear as schedules to this legislation the ordinary procedures which would have them off to standing committees do not apply? Are we now confined with these new pieces of legislation to Committee of the Whole? Is my understanding of the effect of your ruling correct?

Madam Speaker: That is correct.

Mr. Andre: Madam Speaker, I would again repeat what the hon. member for Yukon, our House leader, has indicated. I am not questioning the ruling; I am asking for clarification because of the seriousness of the six points raised during the point of order. There were six very important principles based on precedents by previous Speakers, some which were so enshrined as to become part of our parliamentary authorities, referred to in several places, such as this question of second reading being a vote on principle.

I would ask the Chair to clarify, if she can, the dilemma that I face as one hon. member, and the dilemma that I am sure other hon. members in this House face. Let me quote Mr. Speaker Jerome, who remarked on May 11, 1977, as found on page 5523 of *Hansard*:

I think an hon. member of the House ought to have the right to compel the House to vote on each separate question.

He felt that the requirement that an hon. member be able to compel the House to vote on each separate principle was fundamental. Indeed, it is so fundamental that it shows up on numerous occasions in our parliamentary authorities.

The question that I put to the House concerns the opportunity for myself and other hon. members, given the way this bill is treated, to request a vote of the House, for example on Part A, petroleum incentives and Canadian ownership and control, which, generally speaking, we would approve, and a vote of the House on Part C, petroleum administration, which, generally speaking, we would oppose. How can that happen?

I also wonder about the future. Are we now establishing a precedent that it will indeed be possible to create a law, as it were, upon which the House of Commons, supposedly the supreme law-making body in this country, has not had an opportunity to divide? That is a precedent of enormous consequences, so much so as to render this institution absolutely meaningless, so much so as to give effect to the often made accusation that we have a four-year or five-year dictatorship. That is the impact.

I, for one member, must re-examine my reasons for being here if, in fact, I am unable to vote on something as fundamentally important as that. I am not asking for the ability to influence; I am just asking to vote, that is all. The ability to vote is the last right of a Member of Parliament. We are not even asking to have the ability to legislate, but just to vote on

principle. I would like to ask, Madam Speaker, how in this circumstance, as a result of this situation, how this bill is proceeding and so on, I as an hon. member will be able to fulfil my responsibilities and obligation to stand up and be counted on the various distinct principles that are brought forward in this piece of legislation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Very briefly, Madam Speaker, the consequences mentioned by the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) are not new. Rulings handed down by your predecessors had the same results, and I am thinking of one particular instance when a bill was introduced to amend several aspects of the Criminal Code. I am sure that many members would have preferred to vote on individual provisions of the omnibus bill that was debated, although supporting debate on the entire bill. However, because of the Standing Orders and parliamentary procedure, that was not possible.

Today, the hon. member is critical of the fact that a number of different aspects are contained in the omnibus bill, which, and I shall repeat this once again, is admissible according to our procedure and precedents. He is saying that he would like to be able to vote in favour of certain aspects of the bill and against others, and that now he is in a position where he will probably be obliged to vote against the bill, although he is in favour of some parts of it. This is true on both sides of the House, Madam Speaker, and our Standing Orders affect the government side the same way where an opposition motion is concerned. The House will recall that before the Christmas holidays, the opposition, on an opposition day, introduced a motion on capital punishment. Many members on this side of the House would have liked to be able to vote for or against capital punishment, without at the same time having to vote on a motion of no-confidence in the government and thus having to decide whether an election would have to be called.

We, on this side of the House, also would have liked to say:

[*English*]

"We want to be able to divide, we want to be able to divide on an election, or on the death penalty".

[*Translation*]

Therefore, Madam Speaker, the Standing Orders of the House apply on both sides, in all kinds of situations, and that is why—

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Calgary Centre and myself have been very careful to put questions to the Chair by way of clarification for us, as a result of the ruling that you gave today to the submission made by the hon. member for Calgary Centre. The government House leader has been allowed to do that which he, in my submission, should not be allowed to do. He is not asking for clarification, he is not asking for guidance from the Chair as a result of your ruling. He is presenting further substantive arguments today that he did not make yesterday. In my