

● (1520)

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, we all know how very important Bill C-24 is to the development of energy conservation. We have seen in proceedings in this House that there are events which take great precedence over this particular matter. Therefore, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray):

That the House do now adjourn in protest against the lack of opportunity to debate the critical—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Such a motion under the comment or question procedure is entirely out of order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Resuming debate.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With the utmost respect, Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order concerning the matter that just transpired.

Mr. Speaker: I have already ruled. With great respect to the Hon. Member, I have ruled.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, with great respect to you, the basic principle of Canadian and British justice is to hear the other side, and it is time for you to do so.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: May I ask the Hon. Member to resume his seat.

I have indicated to the Member clearly, as is my obligation when a motion is moved before the House, whether such a motion is in order. Hon. Members must move that motion—I think the Opposition House Leader knows that full well—when in possession of the floor for debate.

I think that matter is well known. If the Hon. Member would like me now to back up and give the Opposition House Leader a chance to indicate why he believes such a different matter would be appropriate, in this one case I will do so. But the Opposition House Leader knows full well what my initial view is. On that basis, since the Hon. Member seems to think that by knowing the rules I am somehow being unfair to the Opposition, I will now let the Opposition House Leader indicate his case.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, it is the understanding of myself and my colleagues about the rules that a motion to adjourn the House is in order when there is a question before the House. There is a question before the House, and that is whether this Bill should receive second reading. The rule does not say that the Member must have the floor for debate. It says simply that there has to be a question before the House. I invite you, Mr. Speaker, to look at *Beauchesne* and I would be happy to send forward the reference.

Oil Substitution Act

There is a question before the House for debate. My hon. friend, the Member from Fort Garry, had the floor. Therefore, I submit with the upmost respect that this motion is fully in order and it is something that is capable of being accepted and should be accepted.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I think I want to make just a couple of observations with respect to the point put forward and in support of what I anticipate will be your judgment, which I think is correct.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): What does that mean?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The Speaker has indicated preliminarily he believes that on questions and comments, which is a procedure which was developed under the provisional rules under which we now operate, a motion to adjourn the House is not appropriate. I simply say I can understand that in terms of logic. I want to put forward on the basis of the rules and the element of logic and fairness that the provisional rules do provide for this part of our debate, but the debate is in addition to what is a traditional debate in the House of Commons.

I think you would probably be inclined to agree, Mr. Speaker, that if a Member has the floor in the course of debate itself, clearly at that time I suppose the motion would be receivable. But when we have a question and answer period, an analogous situation, it is clear you cannot use the period of questions and comments as an opportunity to move a motion to adjourn the House. It is not contemplated. It is not part of our particular procedure and rulings. I would say to the Hon. Member that if he would have a little patience and if the Liberal caucus would mind staying around, eventually I suppose in the course of this debate they will get the floor. I do not agree with anything the Liberals say—

Mr. Gauthier: Neither do we with what you say.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: —with respect to the legitimacy of the motion they made nor with their attempt to disrupt the House, which I think is regrettable. I ask them to observe the rules, and if they are going to use diversionary and obstructive tactics, I say to them at least have patience and wait until they get the floor legitimately.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, in providing my contribution to this point, I would like to bring to the attention of Your Honour Citation 283(1) of *Beauchesne*. This citation is found on page 91 of the Fifth Edition. It reads:

(1) A motion "That the House do now adjourn" is always in order but no second motion to the same effect may be made until some intermediate proceeding has taken place.

(2) A Member may not use a point of order to secure the floor in order to move the adjournment of the House.

This is a specific case where a motion to adjourn is not in order. As *Beauchesne* does not enumerate any other situation or conditions where a motion would not be in order, I suggest