

*Point of Order—Mr. Andre*

since the abolition of capital punishment was the principle of that bill. I continue to insist that was not so. There were pages and pages of amendments dealing with all other types of crime from A to Z, and the same problem faces the presiding officers in this case, whoever they may be.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that if he wishes to criticize decisions of former Speakers, that is not very relevant to the debate we are having now. I would very much appreciate it and it would be very helpful to the Chair—this is the reason the Chair has recognized several speakers—if the question itself were not debated but the point of order were discussed.

**Mr. Lambert:** Madam Speaker, with the greatest respect, I am discussing the point of order, and it is by showing the error in relation to a previous omnibus bill that one shows the error that is easily led into with this type of bill. It is wrong. After all, this House must be given an issue on which it can declare itself. Hon. members of this House might be strongly disposed to voting against certain features of this bill—let us assume taxation—yet they find that they are fully supportive of some of the many other features of the bill. How are they going to vote? That is something about which the Chair has to concern itself. How is the House going to proceed with this type of bill?

• (1650)

What we are talking about are the great omnibus bills that have been put forward. This is a highly complicated and very extensive bill, one of the most important to come before the House in years. Yet we seem to dismiss it because it concerns energy. The government wishes to tidy things up, and therefore the House will have to deal with all these matters in one bill.

One could as readily say that we could deal with the problems of agriculture—the price of beef, the price of pork, support prices, the foreign market—in one bill. In a sense, that is wrong. It is impossible to do so and that is what I wish to underline.

My colleague has covered the subject very carefully and the minister has presented the case for the government. I wish to emphasize the particular difficulty the House may have in coming to a resolution of particular points when the bill is referred to the committee that deals with energy. What about the rule that Ways and Means motions should go to Committee of the Whole?

Those are the points that present difficulty when we encounter them in an omnibus bill.

**Mr. John Thomson (Calgary South):** Madam Speaker, I rise on the same point of order but I shall be as brief as I can. I think my colleagues, the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), have covered the arguments very well. There are a few points that I want to reinforce, however, which are covered in Citation 703 of Beauchesne regarding the umbrella caused by the terminology in the long title of the bill. Citation 703 also deals with the point of relevancy among the contents and

Citation 734 deals with the principle at stake. After that, Madam Speaker, I have a few general remarks to make.

The minister said that the single theme of this bill was energy security. That simply is not the case, Madam Speaker; it deals with a whole range of subjects that have nothing to do with energy security. He also said that the bill is the main legislative element of the National Energy Program. That is not the case either. There are 18 different parts in the bill, of which five sections and one part relate to the National Energy Program while 12 sections and part of one other section are not mentioned anywhere in the National Energy Program. The bill does not constitute the main legislative element of the National Energy Program nor does it deal with energy security.

Citation 703 of Beauchesne reads in part as follows:

They must be relevant to and subject to the umbrella which is raised by the terminology of the long title of the bill.

The operative word is “umbrella”, Madam Speaker. There is no umbrella in this bill. How can there be an umbrella when it deals with 15 different acts in a wide range of legislation? How can the Foreign Investment Review Act and the motor vehicle fuel consumption standards act be said to fall under the same umbrella, for example? Citation 703 also deals with the theme of relevancy amongst the contents of a bill. How are hydro transmission corridors relevant to the motor vehicle fuel consumption standards act?

The point that the minister was trying to make—and I do not think he succeeded—was that each part of the bill is interdependent on the others. That is simply not true. Most parts of the bill stand on their own. How can the Canada Business Corporations Act be relevant to the transportation fuel compensation recovery charge? How can the Energy Supplies Emergency Act, 1979, relate to the Canadian ownership and control determination act? They are poles apart.

I will not go further in demonstrating my point under Citation 703, Madam Speaker. Citation 704 of Beauchesne deals with the question of the whole principle at stake. The hon. member for Calgary Centre dealt with that at some length. There are seven different principles at stake in this bill and the minister admitted that in his press release. Is energy security the whole principle that is at stake here? It is not at issue at all. Many other subjects are dealt with in the bill that have no bearing on energy security. I have made the point that they do not relate to the National Energy Program either.

Let me conclude with some general observations, Madam Speaker. I have spent a good part of my life in the oil and gas business. This is the most comprehensive and complex document that I have ever seen. It makes Mr. Benson's white paper look like child's play. It is a gross abuse of a member's ability to perform well for his constituents. I am not trying to argue a question of privilege, Madam Speaker, but I say to you in all sincerity that I do not think six members of this House can debate this bill intelligently. I cannot, and I have been in the industry for 20 years. I will have to get some help. I will need expert witnesses if I am to serve my constituents and I believe