

INCOME WAR TAX ACT, 1917, AMENDMENT

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 15, consideration in committee of Bill No. 150, to amend the Income War Tax Act, 1917—Mr. Robb—Mr. Johnston in the chair

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. D. F. KELLNER (Athabaska): Mr. Speaker, I desire to move:

That Bill No. 150 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend it by inserting after the word "tax" in the second line the words "on incomes under (\$5,000) five thousand dollars".

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not consider the amendment in order. The House has already expressed its judgment on a similar question and by that judgment I am bound. Unless, therefore, any hon. member desires to speak to the point I must declare the amendment out of order.

Mr. IRVINE: When did the House decide on the question?

Mr. SPEAKER: On Tuesday last, on an amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), the House gave its judgment.

Mr. IRVINE: That amendment was ruled out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, in my recollection.

Mr. KELLNER: May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the decision of the House the other day had reference to a resolution, whereas the present motion relates to a bill—a different matter entirely. If it is not permissible for a member to move an amendment either to a resolution or to a bill of this character, then I submit there is no use in our considering these matters at all. This House, in that case, certainly would have no power to make any changes whatever. This, I submit, is entirely a different matter from that upon which the decision of the House was given the other day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The figure involved in the question before the House on the previous occasion was \$10,000; in this instance it is \$5,000. The Chairman of the committee ruled that amendment out of order, whereupon an appeal was taken, not to the Speaker, but to the House, and the House in its judgment confirmed the Chairman's ruling. That

stands, therefore, as the judgment of the House, and by it I am bound. Consequently I declare the present amendment out of order.

Mr. BOURASSA: Before you finally dispose of the question, Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the House is to understand that you are now rendering a decision the effect of which will be to deprive every member of the right to move any amendment to budget resolutions or to bills based upon such resolutions? If so, I suggest that the matter is very grave. If the present ruling is confined merely to its bearing upon a decision given by the House the other day upon one particular point, then I am prepared to let the matter pass. But I think the House will have to consider one of these days the very grave issue that might be raised if a new parliamentary jurisprudence were here established whereby private members were deprived of the right to move amendments to budget resolutions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not suggest that I differ from the hon. member; I am ruling on a specific case which has already been decided by the House, and as I have already said I am bound by that decision. Any decision given by the House is binding upon the Speaker, and in ruling the present amendment out of order I am merely giving expression to the judgment of the House as rendered on a similar question. It is the same with resolutions; they must be considered, if carried, as judgments of the House, and for that reason the House should carefully weigh any resolution or motion presented. I am not now passing judgment on the question as to how far a private member may go in moving amendments to tariff or budget resolutions. It is not necessary that I should read again the motion made the other day and the ruling of the Chair upon it. As I have already indicated, I am now merely ruling in conformity with the judgment of the House on that particular question.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Just for information, Mr. Speaker, do I understand that this ruling of yours to-day, following the decision of the House the other day, creates a precedent with regard to what may be done?

Mr. SPEAKER: That, of course, will depend upon the next Speaker. If any subsequent Speaker takes my ruling as a precedent, so much the better for me and for my reputation. But the House is all-powerful in these matters and can always reverse a ruling of the Speaker. As regards the present question, I have explained that the amend-