

act. They neither depend on other parts, nor are other parts dependent on them.

The other four separate parts of the bill as identified by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources are amendments to the National Energy Board Act to broaden the board's jurisdiction with respect to power lines, allocation of oil and gas, and to redefine the board's jurisdiction in relation to oil and gas exports. Another part is amendments to the Energy Supplies Emergency Act, which again is separate, distinct and has nothing to do with the rest of the act. There are also amendments to the Oil Substitution and Conservation Act, enacted last year, and here again these amendments have nothing to do with the rest of the energy security bill.

Finally, there is the creation of the motor vehicle fuel consumption standards bill, which would empower the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) to establish a voluntary fuel consumption program. Thus, Madam Speaker, even using the minister's groupings—and as I have indicated one of his groupings is in my view all too inclusive—there are seven distinct, separate and stand-alone subjects dealt with under this one bill.

Citation 703 of Beauséne reads in part, and I quote:

Although there is no specific set of rules or guidelines governing the content of a bill, there should be a theme of relevancy amongst the contents of a bill.

Now, that citation is attributable to a ruling by the Chair on May 6, 1971, as reported in *Journals*, page 532, in which the Chair said:

It follows, of course, there should be a theme of relevancy between the contents of a bill. They must be relevant to the subject of the umbrella which is raised by the terminology of the long title. It is of course a matter of judgment in each case as to when a bill offends to the point that it should be ruled as unacceptable because it contains disparate matters in the same bill.

The Speaker went on to say that in the case of the bill under consideration he did not think there were disparate matters being considered. However, Madam Speaker, I think it is clear from the minister's own press release that in this case there certainly are disparate matters being considered, and there is no umbrella and no theme of relevancy. The Oxford Concise Dictionary defines "relevant" as "bearing upon or pertaining to". So if there is some theme of relevancy, then one part of the bill must bear upon another. Yet we know from the minister's own comments that there are at least seven parts to this bill, each of which has no bearing upon any of the others.

The government might argue, Madam Speaker, that this bill flows from the National Energy Program and that provides the necessary relevancy. To begin with, that would not strictly be true. While most of the items were mentioned in the National Energy Program, there are parts of this bill which do not flow from the National Energy Program. They are separate.

Secondly, and more importantly, if that argument is to be given any weight then one clearly would have to accept the principle that a single bill could be brought in covering all intended legislation for a session, rationalized on the basis that all its component parts flow from the throne speech which commenced the session. As Mr. Speaker Lamoureux pointed out, that obviously would be going too far.

Point of Order—Mr. Andre

Presumably the government will also argue that the component parts have to do with energy and thus that provides the theme of relevancy to the bill. Well, Madam Speaker, to begin with, all the component parts do not deal with energy. However, if that argument were put I would only say that to accept it would be to accept that it would be satisfactory to bring in a single bill covering income tax, excise tax, appropriations, borrowing authority, and for that matter unemployment insurance, since all of these deal with money. If that is the theme, then we could have that kind of grouping.

As I pointed out, Madam Speaker, the bill includes more than just energy items. As one example, the amendments to the Canada Business Corporations Act do not deal with energy companies exclusively. The bill has consequences for the entire capital markets of this country, and is not restricted in any way to energy.

When I first received a draft copy of this bill, Madam Speaker, I had the Library of Parliament undertake a study on the rationale for House of Commons procedures. They prepared the study and I would just like to read one short passage from it. It says:

The passage of a bill has only one objective in procedural terms: the making of a new law or the amendment of a law already existing. This implicit rule will sometimes lead to the division of a bill in two or more bills—for the sake of precision—on the other hand it may also lead to the fusion of two or three connected bills if they refer to the same principle. This process can happen at committee stage upon recommendation from the House. This implicit rule will also forbid the existence of omnibus bills dealing with separate matters referring to different principles—by definition a law is a statement on the application of a principle—not a hodge-podge of intentions.

So to conclude my first point, Madam Speaker, based on the evidence supplied by the minister himself as to the components of the bill, based on Citation 703 of Beauséne, plus the excellent ruling of your predecessor, the Hon. Lucien Lamoureux, I submit that the Chair has no choice but to send this bill back to the draftsman so that it might be broken up into more appropriate parts for proper consideration by Parliament.

The second point I would raise, Madam Speaker, is the difficulty, indeed the impossibility, of having a coherent and proper second reading debate and vote on this bill as presently structured. Citation 734 of Beauséne states, and I quote:

The second reading is the most important stage through which the bill is required to pass; for its whole principle is then at issue and is affirmed or denied by a vote of the House.

I think it goes without saying, Madam Speaker, that it is impossible to have a vote on the principle of a bill which, on evidence presented by the minister himself, contains at least seven different principles. And I would argue there are perhaps ten different principles involved in this bill. It is surely reasonable to anticipate, Madam Speaker, that some members of this House might be in favour of the petroleum incentives program to provide grants to companies primarily Canadian-owned for the capital costs involved in drilling exploratory wells but, on the other hand, to be opposed to a special tax which goes directly to the account of a Crown corporation; or to be in