

Petroleum Incentives Program Act

speech and disappearing as does the minister every time he makes a speech. Perhaps we should bar him as well.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention the fact that if any member of any party were allowed to call for a quorum and then have his party vacate the House, it would certainly be possible to call for a quorum virtually any day of the week. Having vacated the House after calling for a quorum, it seems to me that he could thereby create no quorum, as did the hon. member—

Mr. Waddell: No, no!

Mr. McCain: If that is permissible, the chaos which would result in the House as a result of this procedure would be absolutely unbearable and intolerable for his or any other party in the House.

Mr. Blais: It is nearly as bad as not showing up for your own vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair has sought any and all assistance from hon. members. All members present will recognize that no hon. member rising on this point of order quoted any precedent which might be of assistance to the Chair. I would like to think that the essence of the problem faced by hon. members and by the Chair is that when the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) has the floor and chooses to call a quorum, he has every right under the Standing Orders to do so. I would think once the motion for quorum has been called and the Chair has followed proper procedures that we would return to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway who had the floor. My problem, and this is why I made reference to that immediately, is that I think normally when an hon. member calls the quorum, his concern for the presence of members in the House would indicate that he himself would also remain to contribute to the quorum. The difficulty the Chair faces is that the Chair did observe that the hon. member first called the quorum and then left the chamber. Once the hon. member left the chamber the Chair is in a difficult position to decide whether or not his return constitutes an unbroken right to continue with the debate.

● (2000)

A proceeding intervened, a motion for a quorum, and during that proceeding the hon. member was not present. I have sought consultation and I have yet to find a precedent that covers the matter.

Some hon. Members: Make one.

Mr. Kempling: The House is with you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The inclination of the Chair is to say that the motion for the Chair is to see whether or not there is a quorum is a right of any hon. member at any time, and whether he may or may not be present during the quorum call, I think, should leave matters undisturbed. At the end of that intervening proceeding, which is a very special proceeding, the Chair would return to wherever matters were previously. I am not content with the idea that there can be a

call for a quorum, that the hon. member can leave and then can come back and take the floor again. However, to me, the logic is that if we are going to return to the state of proceedings where we were prior to the motion for a quorum, then I have no choice but to recognize the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, without prolonging the debate, I think that your ruling is very just. I hesitate to apologize that I put Your Honor in a difficult position but I did. I do think that perhaps the onus was on my hon. friends who took the other view to bring the proper precedent, and no doubt they may do that next time. Before I continue I would point out that there are many more members in the House and there is even someone in the press gallery.

I would like to continue and discuss the matter of the petroleum incentives program.

[Translation]

Some hon. Members: Hypocrite! Hypocrite, with a capital H!

Mr. Waddell: All right, just a few words in French.

[English]

I would like to deal with the petroleum incentives aspect of the energy bill because this is the most crucial part of the Liberal Canadianization program. This is what consumers are being asked to pay for every time they go to the pump. If there were an election called today this may be one of the main issues in the election and may very well be an issue in a future election. The government has said that it wants to Canadianize. The Canadian people want the government to Canadianize and, in my view, they are even prepared to forgive the government for not starting Canadianization in the years past.

As the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) said a moment ago, the government permitted the oil industry to be more foreign-controlled than did any other OECD nation. Canadians are prepared to forgive them for that.

But are they prepared to pay money at the pump to give \$6.5 billion more to the oil companies? That is the case that the government must make and it is a case which I do not think Canadians will accept.

The minister talked about energy security. He said that it is necessary to introduce these PIP programs to provide energy security for Canadians. Those were the words of the minister. My question is, energy security for whom? It is not for the consumer and not for the taxpayer because I believe that we are continuing to get hosed for this. What the government is proposing is to give money to its friends in the oil industry whose history it has been in the past to say that there is an energy crisis, "give us a tax break." The minister said, "No, we will not give you a tax break but we will give you a grant." The industry agreed to take a grant which it was supposed to use for exploration for oil. It then said that it had to export oil,