

raised if and when members transgress and speak about another bill instead of the motion.

In my view, the hon. member for York South was not doing this. If any member does so, then the minister can raise a point of order and object. I suggest that the Chair has already put the motion—I am now speaking about the first of what I think were two points of order—so it is before the House and therefore no point of order is appropriate at this time. If hypothetically hon. members do transgress and veer from the subject before the House, then it is up to the Chair at that time to ask members to speak to the motion before the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is the minister rising on the point of order?

Mr. Lang: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The point raised by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture is very pertinent, particularly in view of the manner in which the leader of the New Democratic Party framed his remarks in dealing with the \$100 million. The hon. member for York South suggested that his motion was very carefully drafted, and presumably he meant to have it both ways. On the one hand, he drafted the motion in terms that would allow it to be put; on the other hand, it was also drafted in terms that would allow him to discuss matters which, if they were actually put in the motion, would not have permitted debate. It is clear that the \$100 million is exactly the same as the \$100 million in the other bill in view of the fact that that pay-out would also be \$100 million without conditions, unless of course we regard the manner of paying, the acreage base and so on, as conditions, which I submit would not be ordinarily construed to be such.

I submit that the two amounts are in effect the same and in that sense the motives for the motion were clouded. These motives have now been clarified by the hon. member in whose name the motion stands, and it seems to me that the defect relates back to the beginning.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on the point of order that has been raised. I have followed the debate extensively on Bill C-244 and I was listening behind the curtain to a great deal of what the leader of the New Democratic Party said when he put this motion forward. I suggest there is a similarity. I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that the motion before the House condemns the agricultural policies of the government which have severely reduced the incomes of western farmers and threaten the future of the entire rural community in Canada.

This aspect is not dealt with in Bill C-244. At the present time discussions are going on between the Minister of Agriculture and the provincial Ministers of Agriculture regarding government action that would drastically reduce the farm population of Canada from 480,000 farmers to 150,000, which is the goal of the government. The minister's department has issued a 20-page document dealing with how that program can be achieved with the co-operation of the provinces.

This is the heart and soul of the motion before the House: Are we going to eliminate the farmers? If we do,

24107—59½

Suggested Payment to Western Farmers

will we also do away with the rural communities as we understand them? If this is the case, then can urban society as we now know it accept another 300,000 farmers who are untrained for other work, unprepared, and who do not want to live within an urban society? I repeat, this is the heart and soul of the motion. I suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that it is a very worthwhile motion and that the minister should take heart and listen to it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Chair appreciates the remarks made by all hon. members on the point of order raised by the Minister of Agriculture. Some of the remarks bring us right to the problem itself, namely, that it is not permissible to allow speeches in one debate to relate to another piece of legislation already before the House or before a standing committee of the House. The Chair is also aware of that fact but, as mentioned by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the motion was already put and it is before the House at this time. The Chair feels there was ample time to raise the point of order and that it should have been raised at the first opportunity.

● (12:40 p.m.)

On the other hand, in looking at the motion it appears that the main point is not directly related to the \$100 million. In the opinion of the Chair it is related to the situation facing the farmers of Canada. This situation could perhaps be solved in many ways by spending money. In addition, the Chair did not find it difficult to accept the presentation by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). I feel that his remarks were within the confines of the motion and did not impinge on the rules of the House, nor did they relate to Bill C-244 which is at present before the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

In the circumstances the Chair feels the motion is acceptable and will allow the debate to continue.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to participate in this debate. To some extent I am glad the motion as drafted was challenged because we will now have an opportunity to clear the air and find out what is at the heart of government policies as they have affected western Canada. I find it rather strange that the New Democratic Party would introduce a motion of this sort prior to an election with the hope that the government's policy for the payment of \$100 million might somehow save them. That is rather awkward reasoning, to say the least. If anyone had anything to gain, it would be those who would be inclined to support the government in this regard.

Mr. Lang: Would the hon. member permit a question? I am wondering whether he might agree that the explanation for them moving this motion is perhaps because of their embarrassment over the fact it is well known in Saskatchewan they are blocking the other piece of legislation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is hardly a question.