The fact that we treat most bills by sending them to a standing committee is a very valuable part of the scrutiny that the House of Commons gives legislation. By and large it is budget bills that come through Committee of the Whole—amendments to income tax, to the excise tax. There are annual kinds of changes that come here and it is not necessary to go through the same kind of detailed discussion.

Furthermore, most of the time they are preceded by a six-day budget debate. They are also preceded by Ways and Means resolutions which also provide the House with an opportunity for examination. So the treatment of bills based on ways and means motions should not be confused, united and joined with bills that most properly are treated by a standing committee because of the two different intents and purposes of the types of procedures.

Moreover, Madam Speaker, there is no reason for us to have this uniting of Ways and Means motions with the rest of the bill, because the Ways and Means part stands alone and does not depend on the rest of the bill. The fact of the matter is that the non-Ways and Means portion of this bill are quite separate. It can go to standing committee. The Ways and Means portions are in no way related to the non-Ways and Means portion. There is absolutely no reason for them to be attached. There is no hindrance to the discussion and debate on the bill that would occur as a result of these being separated. So there is that fourth reason for ruling this legislation out of order, namely, that it is an inappropriate mixing of Ways and Means and non-Ways and Means.

The fifth reason I believe this bill should be ruled out of order has to do with the schedules. Citation 708 of Beauchesne states:

> At the end of many bills there is found a set of schedules which contain matters of detail dependent on the provisions of the bill. A schedule is part of the bill and is dependent on one or more of the preceding clauses, by means of which the provisions of the schedule are carried into effect.

Schedules I and II of the Energy Security Act are schedules of the regular, ordinary type in that they contain detailed amounts respecting the oil export tax and the transportation fuel recovery tax.

Schedules III, IV, V and VI, however, are separate, distinct acts. Their connection with the main body of the bill is essentially nil. For example, Schedule III is claimed to be dependent on Section 113 of the main body of the bill. Section 113 states:

> The Petroleum Incentives Program Act set out in Schedule III or any provision thereof shall come into force on a day or days to be fixed by proclamation.

It would be a perversion in the extreme to suggest that Schedule III, a complete act, is simply a matter of detail dependent on the provisions of Section 113 in the main body of the bill.

Similarly, Schedules IV, V and VI are each separate and distinct, completely new acts and connected to the main body of the bill by Clauses 114, 115 and 116 respectively, each of which merely states that the schedule shall come into effect on a date to be set by proclamation. To suggest that these clauses, stating that the acts shall come into effect on a date set by proclamation, legitimize the connection of the four separate, brand-new acts to this bill is quite frankly a perversion of the proper form of a bill.

I would bring your attention, Madam Speaker, to another practice where we have this kind of perverse behaviour. It arises out of Citation 777 of Beauchesne, which states:

> Schedules to a bill are treated in the same manner as the clauses. They are considered, as a rule, after new clauses are disposed of. If a schedule is disagreed to, another cannot be offered to replace it, until the remaining schedules have been disposed of.

In other words, Madam Speaker, each schedule is treated in committee as if it were a single clause. To treat a whole new act as if it were a single clause is a total violation of our traditions and practices.

Erskine May at page 465 defines a bill as a draft statute. He says:

> A public bill is in the form of a draft statute, and contains the following parts—

He then talks about the various parts. Beauchesne at Citation 703(2) states:

> Some of the constituent parts of a bill are essential; some are optional. The title is an essential part; the preamble is not.

Since we know that amending bills do not have short titles, we know that a long title is an essential part of the bill. Indeed, Erskine May says that:

> When the term "title" is used without qualification it usually refers to the long title.

In other words, the requirement in Beauchesne that the bill must have a title is a requirement that there must be a long title to the bill.

If we look at the Energy Security Act, Schedules III, IV, V and VI, we see that each of these is a separate act. Presumably, as separate acts they could have been brought in under separate bills. That is the definition of a bill. A bill is the draft statute or act. So we could presumably, if we were passing an act that is properly constituted, bring in a bill and pass that act. If we did that with these schedules, each of these bills would be out of order, for the simple reason that there is no long title. There is no long title for the petroleum incentives program act. There is no long title to the energy monitoring act and no long title to the Canadian ownership and control determination act. If we allow this bill to stay as presently constituted, we will be creating an act unlike any other in the Statutes of Canada in that it would be an act without a long title.

• (1620)

I have looked through the Statutes of Canada and I can find no example of an act or statute that does not have a long title. I asked the Library of Parliament where this practice came from. They said that, as far as they knew, it was some 500 or 600 years ago. Acts have long titles. They are filed for reasonableness in alphabetical order of long titles.