session. That would be an omnibus bill with a capital "O" and a capital "B". But would it be acceptable legislation? There must be a point where we go beyond what is acceptable from a strictly parliamentary standpoint.

Mr. Lamoureux then went on to say that having reached second reading—and that was the time at which this point of order was raised to which he was referring—it was basically too late to take such drastic action suggested by the point of order, namely, that the bill be split up, and he said that in future such questions should be raised at first reading.

This is what I am doing today. Mr. Lamoureux then went on to say:

—it is much easier for the government to go back to the legislative mill to where bills are prepared, to the judicial luminaries of the Department of Justice for the consideration of Parliament.

If I may say so, I think that even those very learned gentlemen should take into account that this is an aspect of a matter that is of interest to all honourable members, of interest I am sure to the government, and certainly of interest to the Chair, namely that there must be a point where an omnibus bill becomes more than an omnibus bill and is not acceptable from a procedural standpoint.

Mr. Lamoureux, in order to emphasize this point a third time in his ruling, stated:

Having said this, I would have to rule—if I must rule—that the government has followed the practice that has been accepted in the past, rightly or wrongly, but that we may have reached the point where we are going too far and that omnibus bills seek to take in too much. All honourable members should be alerted to this difficulty of which the Chair is fully conscious.

My colleagues and I will show the Chair that this bill, in the words of Mr. Speaker Lamoureux, "goes too far" and, therefore, it is unacceptable "from a procedural standpoint." Mr. Speaker Lamoureux suggested in his ruling that when another omnibus bill is proposed to the House it should be scrutinized at first reading, when all hon. members would be given an opportunity to express their views, and the Chair could express its view as to whether the bill goes too far or is acceptable from a procedural point of view. This, Madam Speaker, is what I am doing.

To establish the omnific and disparate nature of Bill C-94, one need go no further than to the press backgrounder supplied by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) last Friday after tabling the energy security bill here in the House. While this bill contains eight parts plus six schedules and would amend 11 existing acts and create five new acts, the press backgrounder supplied by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources divides the contents of this bill into seven separate stand-alone, independent subject matters. From the minister's statements these are, first:

A. Petroleum Incentives and Canadian Ownership and Control.

This part "A" is made up of the new petroleum incentives program act; the new Canadian Ownership and Control Determination Act; amendments to the Canada Business Corporations Act, as well as amendments to the Foreign Investment Review Act.

This group of two amendments to existing acts plus the creation of two brand new acts, although spread throughout the bill, do in fact stand alone as a single item. The principle involved here, in the words of the minister is:

To implement and support the new incentives system for the oil and gas industry envisaged in the National Energy Program.

There is nothing else in Bill C-94 dependent upon these provisions, nor do these provisions depend on any other cautions or parts of the energy security bill. Those two new acts and two new amendments are in fact a stand-alone part that in no way are related to the rest of the bill or depend on the rest of the bill. Nor does the rest of the bill depend upon these parts.

Part B of the bill is energy monitoring. In the words of the minister this involves:

The new energy monitoring act replaces the Petroleum Corporations Monitoring Act and will enable the federal government to obtain on a regular basis complete information on the activities and financial performance of enterprises that have more than $10 million in oil and gas annual revenue or $10 million in assets.

Here again, Madam Speaker, these provisions stand absolutely alone. The principle involved here is to require oil and gas companies to supply the government with certain information about their activities. This has nothing to do with Part A of the bill, and no other part of the act depends on this. This is a stand alone provision. Whether it is desirable or not is something which this House should have the right to decide. It is in no way connected to other parts of the bill.

Part C deals with energy administration. This portion, which the minister has called energy administration, includes the oil export charge; the transportsation fuel compensation recovery charge; the petroleum compensation charge; the special compensation charge; the Canadian ownership special charge; the Canadian ownership account; the role of Petro-Canada and new energy corporations.

I would argue that these provisions, grouped by the minister in something called energy administration, are themselves an omnibus, omnific or omnifarious collection of disparate items that perhaps ought not to be included under one heading or one bill.

For example, the oil export charge has to do with the fact that Canadian crude oil is priced by government rather than by market considerations. An oil export charge is provided to collect the difference between that which is charged by foreign purchasers of Canadian oil and that charged Canadian purchasers. The ownership special charge, on the other hand, is moneys collected from the consumers of gasoline and heating oil to be used by Petro-Canada for the purchase of Petrofina. As such, they have no relationship with each other. It has nothing whatsoever to do with export charges or Canadian oil pricing regimes. Also, Madam Speaker, the amendments to the Petro-Canada Act and the provision for the creation of new Crown corporations are quite separate and distinct from other parts or this part of the energy security bill.

• (1550)

Most certainly those eight items, Madam Speaker, which the minister has called energy administration, are totally distinct, separate and in no way connected to other parts of the