

respect to income tax, is not capable of being extended to the subject matter now being discussed by the hon. member.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is, the packers' and ranchers' position.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, the packers' and ranchers' position.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But monetary reform is.

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes; I allowed the discussion on monetary reform. My ruling is that the reference to packers is not relevant to the resolution now before the committee.

Mr. O'NEILL: I have not been able to get a copy of these resolutions because enough of them have not been printed. I had one in my desk, and somebody took it and substituted a French one. We should have an opportunity somewhere, I believe, of discussing matters of this kind. When and where will that opportunity be given?

Mr. ILSLEY: There was a budget debate, and that was concluded. There was a request that some latitude be given on the resolutions, and much has been given, but last night it seemed to be the wish of hon. members pretty generally that we confine our discussion strictly to each resolution as it came up. That is what I hoped we would do. Certainly that was the feeling of the committee last night. Now the hon. gentleman asks where there will be an opportunity to discuss the beef question or the price-ceiling policy. I cannot think of any at the moment.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Under the war appropriation bill there was ample opportunity.

Mr. ILSLEY: On the war appropriation bill we had a long discussion, and I do not think there is anything unreasonable about adopting the principle that some discussions in a session have to end. The session will go on forever if that is not the case. There have been several opportunities of discussing the wartime prices and trade board and the price ceiling, and I do not know of any more.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The hon. member was in order in discussing under resolution 1 any question of financial policy, although I personally had hoped that that discussion would be over last night. On this question of the exemptions, the hon. member is quite in order in discussing the reduction from \$750 to \$660 and from \$1,500 to \$1,200.

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, certainly.

Mr. O'NEILL: I do not want to violate the rules, but there are several questions which

I thought could be properly discussed at this time. One of them is the price ceiling. I am quite in agreement with the principle of a price ceiling, but certainly if there is a price ceiling there should be a price floor. There is not, and these fellows can pay as little as they like to the cattle raiser, who is not permitted to sell his cattle over a certain price.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must raise the point of order myself. I agree with the chairman. This committee of the whole is discussing the income tax resolutions. We are on resolution 1, which sets out the scheme of income taxation, with rates, and so forth. I cannot see any connection whatever between a discussion of the price of beef and that resolution, and I think I shall have to take that position.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: May I speak to the point of order? The hon. member for Macleod stated to the Minister of Finance, with the concurrence of probably 95 per cent of us, that we would not speak on the budget, in order to facilitate it. But to hon. members from British Columbia, one of the most important things is the price of beef in so far as the wartime prices and trade board is concerned, and I think, under the pledge given the hon. member for Macleod, any hon. member from British Columbia should have the right to discuss the wartime prices and trade board.

Mr. FAIR: I do not think that applies solely to British Columbia. The hon. member for Macleod is from Alberta, as are a number of us, and I think we should have every right to speak on these questions now, because they affect directly and indirectly the incomes of a number of those who will be compelled to pay income tax.

The CHAIRMAN: Standing order 58, paragraph 2, is quite clear. The Chairman, when an objection is raised, and there was one in this case, is bound by the rules of the house. I must now confine the discussion to resolution 1, Income War Tax Act.

With respect to questions which were raised on currency, I have been able to connect them somewhat with resolution 1. The government proposes certain ways and means of raising money by way of income tax, and certain hon. members suggested other ways and means of providing the same revenue, that is, by the issue of currency. There is a certain connection between the two. But the fixing of a ceiling price on beef is certainly irrelevant.