

problem is more than disagreement over tax law. The problem is the attitude of the Government that small agricultural land holdings are not valuable and somehow do not make their own kind of significant contribution to agricultural productivity and the environment.

Mr. Collette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Clearly there are members on this side of the House who want to contribute to the debate. To have recognized the original proponent of the motion at this stage is clearly out of order. I understand that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Niagara Falls (Mr. MacBain), is about to speak on this matter, as are other members. Surely you must recognize him before putting any question. I suggest that it is clearly out of order to have the original member who proposed the motion speak at this stage.

Mr. Jarvis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I clearly heard you call the order of the day. I was in the House and no one from the government side rose to speak. I can absolutely assure the House of that. I hope that Hon. Members opposite, particularly the Minister, will accept my word that no one from the government benches rose to speak.

You recognized the Hon. Member in whose name the motion stands. As I understand the Standing Orders, once having recognized legitimately the member in whose name the Bill stands, because no other member was standing, I think it is quite clear that on the completion of his remarks the debate is closed. If there is to be a division, which I do not expect in this matter in view of the previous interventions, then the debate automatically closes on the cessation of the remarks of the member who now has the floor.

Mr. Collette: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Jarvis) may be making a valid point. However, notwithstanding that case, it frequently occurs that members are otherwise occupied. For instance, there was some confusion before five o'clock when the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) stood up at the wrong moment and the Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) then finished the debate. There was some confusion.

However, when there is an element of confusion in the House, one always defers to the continuity of the debate for those members who have not spoken. That is how we operate traditionally in the House. I would submit that you have no other recourse but to recognize my hon. friend from Niagara Falls who is most willing to take part in the debate.

Mr. Wenman: Mr. Speaker, the point of order I wish to make is that we are now in Private Members' hour. In Private Members' hour it is very important that the will of a private member not only be allowed to be heard in this place, but be brought to a vote, continued or brought to another committee. Perhaps it can be brought to completion so that these ideas of people that come through Private Members' are heard.

By calling this motion a second time, the House of Commons clearly intended that we should have further debate and perhaps conclusion in this area. Therefore, I insist that I

maintain my place in debate, as recognized procedurally and correctly in procedure by yourself and other members, by the fact that there was no one standing. I insist that I conclude my speech in concluding the debate and that we have an agreement on this measure.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order. The Chair believes that it has enough information from various members from all sides of the House. First, the Chair did not recognize originally that the Hon. Member had spoken. I was just brought the list and I see his name on the list as having spoken.

This being said, I will read Standing Order 41(2):

A reply shall be allowed to a Member who has moved a substantive motion, but not to the mover of an amendment, the previous question or an instruction to a committee.

Standing Order 41(3) reads:

In all cases the Speaker shall inform the House that the reply of the mover of the original motion closes the debate.

In other words, the floor is always offered to others who want to speak before someone closes the debate. With all due respect to the hon. gentleman, I would ask if someone else wants to speak—

Mr. Wenman: Point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Will the hon. gentleman resume his seat for a moment. To correct its own mistake in not having seen the list before the Hon. Member rose, the Chair proposes to ask other Hon. Members if they want the floor. If not, the hon. gentleman can speak right away.

Mr. Wenman: Mr. Speaker, you did not err in any way, shape or form. I did not err in my response. I opened my debate with the words "in closing debate". Furthermore, there was no one speaking and I insist on my place on the floor.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): I believe that the hon. gentleman is now trying to comment on a ruling. Debate. The Hon. Member for Niagara Falls (Mr. MacBain).

Mr. Al MacBain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the effect of the motion by the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) is that the Government should consider the advisability of repealing Section 31 of the Income Tax Act. Admittedly, this is a controversial section. There are two sides to the argument about whether there should be an amendment repealing Section 31 of the Act. This section, which is commonly referred to as the hobby farmer section, limits the expenditures which certain farmers can deduct in a year for income tax purposes.

The danger of simply advocating the removal of this section from the Act is that it may interfere with the integrity of the Act if it is removed. As well, it deals with tax expenditures that are sometimes known as loopholes. There is a difference of opinion even among farmers and certainly among others as