

recorded vote. That right has, in the hon. member's submission, been removed. That point has not been dealt with by the Chair.

The clarification we seek is genuine. The question outstanding, Madam Speaker, is: does your ruling mean that in future, legislation can be introduced by means of a schedule, as it has in this case, thereby changing our existing practices under the Standing Orders and sidetracking new legislation away from the standing committees into this House in Committee of the Whole? Is that the result of the Chair's ruling?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pinard:** The ruling just made by the Chair has not added any new elements, since the same situation occurred not long ago. The House is aware that when the government introduces a bill seeking authority to borrow money, commonly called a borrowing authority bill, if the sole object of the bill were to seek borrowing authority, we would not go before the Committee of the Whole, and the bill would be referred to a standing committee of the House. However, since tax measures are included in this bill, our motion must include a request that the bill be considered in Committee of the Whole, and that includes the provisions concerning borrowing authority.

The example I just gave was in fact a very recent precedent, namely Bill C-93, on which the Chair made a ruling. There have been other precedents as well, however. It is, therefore, not something new. The hon. member claims that the opposition is frustrated because it will not have an opportunity to consider certain aspects of the bill in the standing committee, as opposed to what it will be able to do in Committee of the Whole. I may answer the hon. member that first of all, this is not a precedent, that it is a consequence of the Chair's ruling on Bill C-93, and that previous Speakers have handed down similar rulings on far more complex bills. When the hon. member says that they are penalized, I doubt that is really the case, because when we go into Committee of the Whole, as a rule each clause of the bill is debated and may be discussed or amended. In fact, the bill is given far more thorough scrutiny than it would ever receive in a standing committee of the House. Now we may or may not agree on this comparison between the work done in Committee of the Whole as opposed to a standing committee of the House, but the fact remains that the precedents are established and clear-cut, and when a bill contains measures that entail the levying of taxes on Canadian citizens, we have no choice but to go into Committee of the Whole. Bills containing provisions that are solely concerned with taxation do not contain tax provisions in every single clause, but that does not mean that only the clauses in which taxes are levied are referred to the Committee of the Whole and other clauses of the same bill that do not are referred to a standing committee of the House. Thus, there are many precedents, the Chair's ruling does not have any new consequences, and unlike what the hon. members said, we are not setting new precedents or taking new directions. The Chair

*Energy Security Act*

has served the House, as is its role, by interpreting the Standing Orders, precedents and parliamentary practice and if this practice is not satisfactory to members on both sides of the House, the way to make changes is to agree to changes in the Standing Orders, and my hon. colleagues know perfectly well that we are prepared to discuss such changes. In the short term, however, we are still governed by the existing Standing Orders and the Chair's ruling merely confirms past practice.

• (1550)

[*English*]

**Madam Speaker:** I will answer the hon. member who has put a question to me concerning what this means for the future. I will tell the hon. member that I will not decide the future now. When future procedural problems present themselves, I will study them on their merits and try to rule on them to the best of my judgment.

The hon. member has referred to the fact that he felt I had not dealt with some of the arguments point by point. Yes, perhaps I did not answer each and every one of the arguments which were presented to me during perhaps more than one hour and a half in which hon. members spoke on this particular subject. However, I can assure the hon. member, as I did in my ruling, that they were fully considered. My practice is not always to answer every argument that hon. members put forward point by point, because there is a certain approach to rulings and to the way in which the Speaker must deal with the House where the Speaker does not necessarily want to knock down every possible argument that she feels was not particularly pertinent to the situation. However, what I do, I believe, in all of my rulings, is to give hon. members the basis for my decision by stating which arguments were compelling and on which I have based that decision.

At any rate, if hon. members wish me to make very, very long statements, I can always do that; but I rather thought that my role was to try to leave the time of the House to hon. members rather than to take too much for myself. I can oblige hon. members by systematically referring to all of the arguments which have been brought forward, but it does not seem to me that that is an absolute necessity.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Madam Speaker, I am certainly not suggesting to the Chair, as a generality, that in every single instance verbose rulings be made. I would not be so presumptuous, nor so silly, as to suggest that. I was not present to hear all of the matter, but I have read and studied the submissions of the hon. member for Calgary Centre. Because of the far-reaching and serious implications of the arguments of the hon. member—and there were only six arguments with that kind of serious implication—and because of the serious consequences of Your Honour's ruling, I am simply saying that I would have anticipated, in this particular rare instance where some detail is expected, that it might have been forthcoming so as to assist us in resolving our present dilemma of where we are to go. I am certainly not asking Your Honour to get out your crystal ball to gaze into the future with respect to what you might do