

15. If there is unanimous consent, I will be very happy to move that this be done.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, it would be interesting for all of us to know how this conversion on the road to Damascus took place overnight. As far as my party is concerned, we still think that 30 members for a negative motion is excessive. It is far in excess of those required in the Petroleum Administration Act. We do not like the idea of a negative motion at all. We know about the introduction of Bill C-102. It can be debated, but the exact numbers involves another discussion which I think can take place during the debate.

On behalf of the New Democratic Party, we would be very pleased to accept the suggestion from the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). But if the minister is prepared to withdraw his bill of last evening and ask for unanimous consent for introduction of today's bill. We would certainly try to accommodate him.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent would have to be obtained for both stages, namely the withdrawal of the existing bill as tabled and the introduction of the bill that is apparently now in possession of members. We would certainly be prepared, since it was our suggestion, to give that kind of consent, particularly in light of this amazing conversion to humility by the hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde).

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is discovering qualities that have always been there. I am happy they are becoming more and more perceptible to him. On the basis of this suggestion, if it is understood that we are proceeding at the same stage with the text that members have in their possession, I move, that the bill which is on the table be replaced by Bill C-102, which members have in their hands.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Hon. members have heard the motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, and that the bill be replaced by the one as presently distributed to members.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Moved by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde):

That Bill C-102, as tabled yesterday, be removed from consideration before the House of Commons and be replaced by the one presently distributed to members.

Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, the Chair should also note that as a consequential result of the order of business of the House as just transacted, it will be understood that the times applicable to the House order which was passed with respect to the energy bills will be adjusted by the time used by the minister

Energy, Mines and Resources

and also the time used by the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty) on Bill C-102 to date.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): This leaves the Chair in a somewhat difficult position. I believe the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is referring to the block debate time which was allotted to the discussion of the several bills. I am not certain how long ago the debate began. Perhaps we can agree that the time used on that edition of Bill C-102, which no longer exists, is 20 minutes?

Mr. Nielsen: The table is keeping a record.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The hon. member has suggested that the record will indicate the amount of time and that it will be added to the block time under the previous House order. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nielsen: I am even more reasonable than that, Mr. Speaker. I am suggesting that the time already used in discussing the bogus bill be applied to the real bill.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, since we are not going anywhere anyway, I think it pertinent to point out to the Chair that the ultimate disposition of this bill on June 30 will take place no matter what we do in the meantime.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The House has heard the proposal by the hon. member for Yukon. Is there unanimous consent thereto?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, now that we have been able to clean up the minister's mistake, I want to leave no misunderstanding on the part of the minister or members of the House on any side that members of my party were opposed to the bill as it was introduced by the minister and we are opposed to the bill as it stands today. We believe it is a dangerous bill, that it is one which does not deserve the support of Canadians, and that it is a bill which does not deserve the support of members of this House of Commons.

I think it important to note what the minister has been trying to do. A further comparison could be made. The bill introduced yesterday in the House of Commons was a draft dated March 26. Sometime between March 26 and today the government changed its mind on this question of a negative resolution. The government decided to attempt to make the threshold lower before a negative resolution could be put down.

It is worth comparing this bill to the energy security bill which divided Parliament for two weeks and prevented Members of Parliament from doing their jobs. In that bill there was no provision whatever for a negative resolution on this issue to be put before either of the Houses of Parliament. Instead, there has been a succession of changes of mind on the part of this minister who recognized that if he left this bill the way it