

*National Energy Board Act (No. 3)*

completed that consultation, I will determine whether the motion is in order or not.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. La Salle:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted my position to be known and I am sure it is shared by the Opposition members as well, because I think that by asking the government for a six-month postponement, I am also going along with the comments made earlier by the minister when he again asked Quebec and Newfoundland to return to the negotiation table. As the minister is well aware, if his bill were to be passed quickly, it would place his own province in a difficult position with respect to the development of its hydro-electric resources and sales abroad. Of course, this should not be interpreted as meaning that I am opposed to Newfoundland developing its resources, quite the opposite. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and in the hope that all the members of this House will realize the relevancy and also the dangers of this bill, and I know that my Quebec colleagues are aware of the original objection, not only of the provincial government but also of thousands of Quebecers concerning the interpretation of this bill, and also of the position Quebec would be in if this bill were approved before an agreement is negotiated with the province of Newfoundland—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle), but the hon. member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier) is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Olivier:** I rise on a point of order and apologize to my colleague for Joliette for interrupting him, but this is not at all my purpose. I simply want a clarification, Mr. Speaker. Have we now gone on to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Joliette or are we still discussing the bill now under consideration in accordance with the House order?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I shall inform the House presently of the decision made concerning the motion introduced by the hon. member for Joliette. For the time being, I am accepting generally that the hon. member should deal both with the bill and the motion. However, the hon. member for Longueuil is quite right. Until the Chair has decided whether or not the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Joliette is in order or not, technically, it cannot be discussed. With the understanding of the House, I shall continue to recognize the hon. member for Joliette.

**Mr. La Salle:** Mr. Speaker, to help you out, I shall go on asking my friends opposite to realize the need for a postponement instead of provoking an obstinate stance and even a kind of revolt in our own province concerning legislation which would not be shared by the Quebec government or the government of Newfoundland. The same could also apply to any other province. The minister in charge stressed that the Newfoundland-Quebec problem does not date back to 1976 but goes back several years earlier. It is therefore my view that

it can be referred to quite objectively, Mr. Speaker, and I have no intention of branding anyone as a traitor on the occasion of this debate. But I would like my Quebec colleagues to take this opportunity to accept a six-month hoist on second reading, because of the consequences it could have on a province such as mine. And it is my hope that if such a proposal was accepted, and this goes for Newfoundland as much as Quebec, with the awareness of the governments' intentions, I feel there could be a resumption of negotiations and there might be a new urgency to negotiate and agree on the importance of a mutual settlement.

If I understood right, you are nodding that my amendment is accepted—

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I regret that I persist in interrupting the hon. member. Perhaps we may deal with the motion now before us. I have read the motion to hon. members and have indicated that it is, in fact, a six-month hoist on the present bill.

Hon. members will notice that I have had an opportunity to consult with the Table officers. The motion is found to be in order. Accordingly, I think it is worth commenting briefly on the procedures which will take place shortly so that hon. members will feel comfortable about how we proceed.

The motion will come up for a vote at the same time as the present bill under debate comes up for a vote. According to the terms of the House order, that could be no later than 8.07 o'clock tonight. It could, of course, be earlier if no hon. members seek to have the floor in order to continue debate I would first have to put the question on the six-month hoist motion. Depending on whether that motion fails or succeeds, we would either proceed or not proceed with putting the motion on the second reading of the bill.

I am making some comment because the hon. member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier) has quite validly pointed out on a point of order that once a motion is before the House it ought to be debated. Indeed, that is technically correct. The six-month hoist motion which is now before the House is the subject matter of debate.

However, the tradition of the House has been that because it is a technical motion, nonetheless, in the debate on such a motion the Chair has not called hon. members out of order if, at the same time, they want to continue discussing the bill which was under debate as well. Unless otherwise instructed by hon. members, the Chair will be very flexible in permitting debate, whether on the motion or on the bill itself.

I trust, then, that hon. members are now fully informed as to the procedures we will be following.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Olivier:** Mr. Speaker, there is no intention on this side of the House to interrupt the honorable member for Joliette