

second reading on such a bill. I must remind him that this is the case with almost every bill introduced in the House. I think there must be few bills about which certain opposition members do not say: For my part, I would be willing to agree to such a clause, but I find other clauses inadequate. Such bills are still debated, and no one argues that they should be divided simply because the opposition is willing to accept some parts of them and opposes others.

In addition, my colleague stated that he would readily agree that the provisions of the bill which involve payments to companies be passed very quickly by the House. However, he noted that some provisions involving taxes should be debated at length, that his party is not sure to agree, and so on. This also is too easy, Madam Speaker. The implication would be that the House could easily provide for expenditures but when it came to collect funds for those expenditures, it would be another matter altogether. As I said, what is involved here is a total package. This bill includes proposals for significant expenditures and grants to corporations, but it also includes significant and most varied taxation features to finance those expenditures. I submit that my colleague has no valid point when he suggests that the bill should be divided to allow easy passage of the expenditures, but that all sorts of tactics will be resorted to in order to deny the government the means of paying for the proposed expenditures. Madam Speaker, I said my argument would be brief, because I feel it is valid and I see no need to review one by one the points made by my colleague at considerable length. I know that most of these points have already been covered during the week of February 16, when Bill C-93 was debated, and I see no need to delve unduly into the points made by my colleague.

I want to flatly reject the point made by my colleague that these provisions, the various chapters or parts of the bill are not connected. Quite the opposite, they are closely connected, closely interdependent. They have to do with that basic goal that we as a government have been putting forward since 1980, the goal of securing for Canadians energy security through a reasonable price structure, by acting on supply and demand and at the ownership level, in order that Canadians may have a share in that industry.

● (1640)

[English]

I will conclude with what might be the most telling argument. When I was a lawyer I learned that the best argument should be saved for the last.

Mr. Rose: And the loudest.

Mr. Blackburn: Is that why you are in politics?

Mr. Lalonde: My colleagues opposite are afraid. They should not worry; the arguments will come from themselves.

My colleague referred to a number of precedents and developed his argument in relation to them. I have said a few words about that, but I think the best argument, again in support of what we have been doing, has come not from my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary Centre, but from his

predecessor, the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson), when he was energy critic. On January 27, 1981, as recorded at page 6596 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre said that the House of Commons should be given the opportunity to consider the National Energy Program in, and I quote:

—one place, in one forum, not spread among five different forums as a result of the different pieces of legislation?

The hon. member for Etobicoke Centre thought this would result in a clearer understanding of the National Energy Program. I say amen to that, and I hope it will have the support of the opposition.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Madam Speaker, I do not want to add unduly to the length of deliberations on this particular point. There has been a repetition of some of the arguments in relation to Bill C-93. It is true that the Chair did find against us. We may have to accept the ruling, but we do not agree with it.

I come back to the charge that it is not right to mix Ways and Means motions with a number of other subjects. This time it is not just a case of borrowing authority with a few Ways and Means motions. The Ways and Means motions referred to in this bill number seven or eight, and then there are all the other matters referred to by my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre), and by the minister—the Petroleum Administration Act, the National Energy Board Act, the Foreign Investment Review Act, the Canada Business Corporations Act, the Petro-Canada Act, the Energy Supplies Emergency Act and the Oil Substitution and Conservation Act. Then there is the repeal of the Energy Supplies Emergency Act and then a further act to amend an amended act. There is also new legislation. What is the forum, Committee of the Whole or a standing committee? That is one of the points.

What the minister has done here again is to adhere to the well-known principle which seems to guide this administration, that the end justifies the means. We say this has to do with a particular plan dealing with an aspect of energy, but to say that it is an Energy Security Act is grandiose boasting because it does not secure energy for this country at all. All it touches is the petroleum part, and it has nothing to do with other forms of energy.

There is no way we can take all these references—acts here, acts there, the Canada Business Corporations Act, the Foreign Investment Review Act and all those I have cited—and say that there is one principle to this bill. All one can say—and perhaps this is what the Chair will come to—is that this is a bill and that the principle of the bill is to amend certain acts in relation to petroleum and the taxation and production thereof. That is all. However, should amendments be put forward, there will come a very difficult question, and that is the question in relation to which Mr. Speaker Jerome got into trouble. With respect to the criminal law bill which eliminated the death penalty, an amendment to vary the form of death penalty was deemed to be contrary to the principle of the bill