

Oil Substitution Act

to Your Honour that this would be the only case where a motion to adjourn the House would not be in order.

Citation 283(4) reads:

There must be some question before the House for a Member to move a motion to adjourn the House.

I respectfully suggest that there was a question before the House. That appears to be clear. I do not think it has to be demonstrated. Your Honour was in the House and able to ascertain that there was a question before the House. I specifically draw the attention of Your Honour to the fact that Beauchesne says that a motion "that the House do now adjourn" is always in order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I admire the creativity of the argument. I am sorry, I thought the Hon. Member had concluded.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): I wanted also to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 29 which is found on page 20 and reads:

A motion to adjourn, unless otherwise prohibited in these Standing Orders, shall always be in order—

I will not read the last half of the paragraph which is irrelevant to what we are discussing.

With all due respect, I would ask Your Honour to reconsider the motion moved by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) and to allow the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: That is creative but it has not changed my mind. I will make it simple. The Hon. Member reads Standing Order 29 which supersedes the citation in Beauchesne because it refers to leave to move the adjournment of the House—the Hon. Member made this point himself—"unless otherwise prohibited in these Standing Orders". The prohibition in the Standing Orders relates to what is appropriate during the ten-minute question and answer period after a debate is concluded. That was brought into our rules on an experimental basis in order to allow not debate but specifically, if one wants to go back as far as the original committee report, questions and comments. It specifically says "for no other purpose".

Therefore, while the Hon. Member may seek the floor under debate when it is the Hon. Member's turn to speak on the matter, a motion to adjourn would be in order at that time. But a motion to adjourn during the comment and question period, specified in the rules because Standing Order 29 says that a motion to adjourn is in order unless the Standing Orders specify otherwise.

On that basis, I rule the motion out of order.

Questions and comments being concluded, debate.

Mr. Axworthy: Can I be recognized for debate, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: No. The first Member who rose for debate was the Hon. Member for Duvernay (Mr. Della Noce).

• (1530)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent Della Noce (Duvernay): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to take part in the debate on Bill C-24 dealing with oil substitution and conservation and also with the Canadian Home Insulation Program. I have a few specific remarks to make in support of this Bill.

I would like first to briefly outline the thrust of this Bill, which actually has two distinctive aspects, so that its practical impact once it is passed and enacted may be better understood.

First I would therefore like to stress the fact that this legislation, to amend to Oil Substitution and Conservation Act and the Canadian Home Insulation Program Act, relates to the Conservation and non-petroleum sector.

Cutting down on the use of oil and energy generally in Canada remains a major national objective for this Government. The Conservation and non petroleum sector—GNPS as we call it—effectively contributes to the security of supply sought by the National Energy Policy, by improving efficiency in the use of all energy sources, by developing these sources and by turning to energy sources other than oil.

It was under the guidance of the Energy Conservation and Oil Substitution Branch that those two specific programs were implemented for the purpose of helping Canadian homeowners reduce their heating costs by having their homes adequately insulated as provided for by the Canadian Home Insulation Program (CHIP), promoting alternative fuels, and the Canadian Oil Substitution Program (COSP).

Implemented in 1980, the COSP program provided for the payment of taxable amounts of up to \$800 for the conversion of any oil heating equipment to natural gas, electricity, propane, wood or any other renewable energy. We should remember that under the existing act, the program will come to an end on December 31, 1990. On the other hand, the CHIP program, implemented in 1977, provides for the payment of taxable amounts of up to \$500 for the insulation and draught-proofing of existing houses.

After an exhaustive review of the operation of those programs, it is readily obvious that the time has come to change them, in view of the new energy and economic context that now prevails in this country.

As announced in the economic and financial statement of November 8, 1984, basic changes are called for in the operation of those two programs. The proposals included in the legislation now before the House would provide for the program expiration date to be changed from December 31, 1980, to March 31, 1985. As far as the CHIP program is concerned, it is to be phased out in two operations. That program will therefore end on March 31, 1986, rather than on December 31, 1987. Let me add that these proposals now before the House will be implemented progressively because in both cases the Minister, further to recommendations made by the officials