

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister say that non-energy pipelines are for gas, oil, coking coal, and chemicals? If that is so, what are the energy pipelines for?

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, coking coal is not energy. Other minerals are not energy. Non-petroleum based gases are not energy. These are the uses that non-energy pipelines can be put to.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege relates to statements made by the member for Cariboo—Chilcotin. They are rooted in citation 64 on reflections on members and citation 92 on interfering with—

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment, I wonder if the hon. member is here. I would say to the hon. member for Skeena it is customary on a question of privilege that involves another member to ensure that the other member is here when the point is being made. That is a courtesy which has been extended for many years across the Chamber.

I wonder if the hon. member could just perhaps quickly check to see whether the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin is here, and I will come back to the hon. member.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FORESTRY AND FISHERIES

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier this afternoon in Question Period the minister of fisheries, in response to a question by my colleague, the hon. member for Burin—St. George's, intimated in his answer that the Liberals were not in attendance at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Forestry and Fisheries on March 19 which discussed overfishing.

I wish to correct that by saying that the member for Cardigan, the member for South West Nova and myself were present at that meeting throughout those discussions. The meeting was called as a result of the efforts of the member for Burin—St. George's. He was unavoidably detained and made arrangements for us to represent him and his colleagues at the standing committee on fisheries.

I say this to correct the impression left by the minister of fisheries that we are not concerned with that very serious issue when indeed we are.

Speaker's Ruling

POINT OF ORDER

BILL C-63—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: On Monday, March 30, 1992, the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond rose on a point of order relating to the omnibus nature of Bill C-63, an act to dissolve or terminate certain corporations and other bodies. During consideration of this matter, the hon. members for Kamloops, North Island—Powell River, Ottawa—Vanier and the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader also made contributions. The Chair is grateful for their interventions. I have reviewed the matter and am now in a position to rule on the procedural arguments made against this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to wind down six government corporations or agencies: the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, the Economic Council of Canada, the International Centre for Ocean Development, the Law Reform Commission of Canada, and the Science Council of Canada. The hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond has objected to this bill because it is asking parliamentarians to pronounce themselves on several important issues in one single question. He has argued that the bill lacks relevancy in so far as its substance is not linked to its long title, and argues further that it would be extremely difficult to debate six principles at second reading or to move amendments at report stage.

Before addressing each of the issues raised by the hon. member, it would be useful to briefly review what an omnibus bill is. As I mentioned in my ruling of June 8, 1988, there is no precise definition for omnibus bills; the most exact definition the Chair could find and agree with is that given by the hon. member for Windsor West, which is found at page 15880 of *Hansard* for May 30, 1988:

The essential defence of an omnibus procedure is that the bill in question, although it may seem to create or to amend many disparate statutes, in effect has one basic principle or purpose which ties together all the proposed enactments and thereby renders the bill intelligible for parliamentary purposes.