

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I hear the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) muttering that it is out of order. I suggest that I can discuss any grievance on the motion to go into committee of ways and means. If I am out of order, I shall stop, but until I am stopped I intend to continue. I had just reached the conclusion of my remarks. I do not know why the Minister of Pensions and National Health is always trying to rule discussions out of order.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I have not said a single word, but now that my hon. friend has raised the question may I suggest to him that it is not within the competence of the hon. gentleman to discuss income tax matters when there are many specific resolutions in connection with income tax before the house in committee of ways and means.

Mr. RALSTON: May I refer my hon. friend to a passage in Beuchesne which I think is to the point. He has invited us to point out whether he is in order. Citation 488 of Beuchesne reads:

Whenever an order of the day has been read for the house to resolve itself into the committee of supply or the committee of ways and means, the motion "that the Speaker do now leave the chair" must be proposed, except in cases provided by standing order 28.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is the motion.

Mr. RALSTON: That is the motion, to go into committee of ways and means. I continue:

When such motion is proposed, it shall be permissible to discuss any public matter within the powers of the federal parliament or to ask for the redress of any grievance, and it is not necessary to move an amendment for that purpose; provided that the discussion and the amendment, if one is moved, shall not relate to any decision of the house during the current session, nor to any item of the estimates, nor to any resolution to be proposed to the committee of ways and means, nor to any matter placed on or whereof notice has been given in the order paper.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): None of these resolutions affects the matter I am discussing. This is the only chance I have.

Mr. RALSTON: The income tax resolutions certainly are concerned with the matter my hon. friend wishes to discuss.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The income tax resolutions before the house, with great deference, Mr. Speaker, do not refer to the matters I have raised. This subject matter is not within the resolutions. If it were, I should have hoped to discuss it then.

Mr. RALSTON: The first question my hon. friend discussed was the right of the Minister of Finance or the Minister of National Revenue to make deductions from the pay of pensioners. Surely deductions are a part of the income tax resolutions.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Which one?

Mr. RALSTON: That matter comes within the income tax resolutions.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Which resolution?

Mr. RALSTON: I have not read them all in detail.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is not there. The minister had better read the resolutions before he makes such a statement. I have read them many times, and that is why I bring the matter up now.

Mr. RALSTON: I take it that where the Income War Tax Act itself provides for deductions that matter relates to the income tax resolutions. My hon. friend is really arguing that there shall be no income tax in respect of pensioners.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should like to know under which of the income tax resolutions this matter could be brought up. The income tax act is before the house in certain specific phases covered by the resolutions, but not one of the resolutions refers to deductions from pensioners or to the allowance for children. Where then can I under income tax at any stage of the proceedings of this house discuss the two grievances I have brought up this afternoon?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend can discuss either of these matters on the income tax resolutions which are before the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Citation 488 is very clear. The hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) at the beginning of his remarks did say that there was no opportunity on the income tax resolutions before the house to discuss the matters he wished to bring up, and on that basis he made his argument. It is a question whether the matters already referred to come within citation 488. But if nothing more specific is submitted to the Chair I would say that the hon. member for York-Sunbury is entirely within his rights and may proceed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to discuss the point of order further, and I suppose I do not have to. But I would ask the Minister of Pensions and National Health and others to be a little more considerate of private members and not try to rule them out on technicalities. It is not charitable, at least, and