



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

BILLS

**Clean Energy Legislation (Carbon Tax Repeal)
Bill 2013, Ozone Protection and Synthetic
Greenhouse Gas (Import Levy) Amendment
(Carbon Tax Repeal) Bill 2013, Ozone Protection
and Synthetic Greenhouse Gas (Import Levy)
(Transitional Provisions) Bill 2013, Ozone
Protection and Synthetic Greenhouse Gas
(Manufacture Levy) Amendment (Carbon
Tax Repeal) Bill 2013, True-up Shortfall Levy
(General) (Carbon Tax Repeal) Bill 2013,
True-up Shortfall Levy (Excise) (Carbon
Tax Repeal) Bill 2013, Climate Change
Authority (Abolition) Bill 2013, Customs Tariff
Amendment (Carbon Tax Repeal) Bill 2013,**

**Excise Tariff Amendment (Carbon Tax Repeal)
Bill 2013, Clean Energy (Income Tax Rates and
Other Amendments) Bill 2013, Clean Energy
Finance Corporation (Abolition) Bill 2013**

Second Reading

SPEECH

Thursday, 21 November 2013

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SPEECH

Date	Thursday, 21 November 2013	Source	House
Page	1017	Proof	No
Questioner		Responder	
Speaker	Pyne, Christopher, MP	Question No.	

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House, Minister for Education) (12:35): on indulgence—I understand there is no motion before the chair in respect of your ruling. Can I just say very briefly: the Senate and the House of Representatives have long had different views about these matters—and you would be familiar with both, Madam Speaker, having served in both. In the House of Representatives it is very clear that the House cannot capably consider the amendment as suggested by the member for Port Adelaide with regard to revenue or appropriation matters. Such amendments can only be moved by a minister from the executive government. We had this debate several times in the last parliament, with the Leader of the House and the Manager of Opposition Business on different sides of the argument.

Speaker Jenkins, Speaker Burke and other speakers have all ruled in exactly the same way as you have ruled today. That is the precedent. Unfortunately, the House is not capable of considering this amendment. But as you pointed out in your ruling, you said that you would not allow this amendment to go forward in its current form. If the member for Port Adelaide is capable of amending his amendment, changing his amendment, and resubmitting it, you might well make a different ruling.