

receive the hearty support of the House. Let it not be regarded as a contentious political matter. Let us deal with it as something that affects the state as a whole and therefore commends itself to the judgment of every hon. member whether Liberal or Conservative or affiliated with any of the other groups.

Miss MACPHAIL: I am opposed to any further reduction in the income tax. I do not think for one moment that the sacrifice of the man who is striving to send three boys to university is to be compared with the sacrifice of the fathers and mothers who are struggling to give their children decent food and clothing. One is almost afraid to mention the name of mother here since men preen themselves so much on having large families.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Miss MACPHAIL: I am deeply angered—not for myself, but for the sake of motherhood. This is a masculine House, so masculine that sometimes I resent it from the very depths of my soul. The size of the family is not something for men to boast of. No woman should be asked to bear very large families. It is the men and women who have moderate families and who try to give them decent food and clothing and some education on very slender incomes that I represent here and that I am concerned with. I must take exception to the statement made by the man who has just taken his seat—whom I respect very much personally—that people of great wealth are necessarily good citizens. Very often they are anti-social in all their tendencies and actions, and they are the people responsible for conditions that make it impossible for many boys and girls to ever get a university education. They are the people who will benefit by a reduction in the income tax. So I stand in my place once more to say that I oppose any reduction of the income tax with all my strength. Supposing all our boys and girls go to university and become doctors and lawyers, under heaven what kind of country would we have! Sometimes the intellectual snobbishness of people who have received a university training makes me thankful that I have never been able to attend university, much as I have wanted to. If a boy has reached twenty-six or twenty-seven years of age, and has never supported himself, he will not be as good a citizen as if he had at least assisted his parents part of the time in maintaining him. Therefore I repeat, we should not further reduce the income tax. We must have revenue, and if

[Mr. Bennett.]

we do not take it from the people who are able to pay we will have to take it in increasing measure from the people who are not able to pay.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has moved in amendment to the resolution now before the committee to insert after the word "tax" in the second line the words "on incomes under \$10,000." I regret that I must rule this amendment out of order because it interferes with the scope of the resolution, and no such amendment may be moved by other than a minister of the crown.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the Chairman state his authority?

The CHAIRMAN: I am quoting the same authority as that which I relied on in connection with the amendment moved by the hon. member for Labelle.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I point out that if this amendment is adopted, instead of decreasing it will increase the revenues of the country?

The CHAIRMAN: To that extent it interferes with the scope of the resolution.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I submit that this is an altogether new type of ruling. We have had the rule invoked in the past that a private member is not competent to introduce a resolution which would lessen the national revenues; but it has always been held that it is open to a private member to cut down estimates or to do anything else that would not reduce the revenues of the country. In this particular case the purpose of the amendment is to increase the revenue. If such a ruling as this is to prevail, why, we may as well leave this committee for it will be absolutely useless to remain here. I challenge the ruling of the chair.

Mr. BOURASSA: Mr. Chairman, while I have not consulted the authorities for some years, I still recall some of the rulings of old, and having received within the past two hours advice contradictory to your ruling, I am beginning to ask myself if the rules are to be interpreted according to the convenience of the government or not. I notice that Bourinot is quite clear on this point. For many years he was the respected Clerk of this House, and I think he is just as good an authority as any other that can be cited. I have noticed that at times Bourinot is invoked when his opinion coincides with the interests of the govern-