

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to the Governor General's recommendation attached to this bill, the text of which appears on the order paper. As your Honour is aware, there are a great many citations in Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, and many more in May's various editions, concerning the importance of the Governor General's recommendation in this parliament or the Queen's recommendation in the parliament in Westminster. We learn of this importance usually when we get into committee on a bill and seek to make amendments. At that time we have read to us various citations that tell us that the House cannot go beyond the terms and the exact wording of a royal recommendation. I remember one occasion a few years ago when the present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) was piloting through the House a bill having to do with medicare. We wanted certain changes made in that bill and we persuaded the minister, who was then minister of national health and welfare, to accept those changes, but he had to halt the proceedings while he got an amended recommendation from the Governor General.

My contention is that there is a defect in this recommendation—I could, of course, claim that the whole recommendation is a mistake, but I will not go into that today—that would put us in an impossible position if we tried to carry out its terms in a bill. I said there are a great many references to the Governor General's recommendations in the authorities. May I just read two or three of them. In Beauchesne's Fourth Edition at page 207, Citation 246 reads in part as follows:

● (1430)

The guiding principle determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the royal demand of recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down *once for all* (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

It is clear that we have to follow the wording of the royal recommendation with exactitude.

Over on page 216 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition in Citation 250, paragraph (3), the same stricture appears once again in these words:

No amendment affecting the purposes for which the grant is recommended by the Crown can be allowed.

Further down on the same page in Citation 250, paragraph (4), it states:

The fundamental terms of a money resolution submitted to the House with the Governor-General's recommendation upon which a Committee of the Whole is set up cannot be amended.

I think the language is crystal clear. Once we have the wording of the Governor General's recommendation we have to stay with it, no matter what happens.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder if I could just interrupt the hon. member as I am having trouble with one point. As I understand the hon. member's point, which may be well taken and well established, and if I grasp his point correctly, the problem in effect is that the bill which the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) seeks leave to introduce must in some way differ from the recommendation, and therefore either the bill or the

#### *Member's Salaries*

recommendation is wrong. At this point, since leave has not been given to introduce the bill, the bill has not been introduced, and I wonder how it is that the hon. member can question a recommendation that stands on its own as being in any way different from the bill which as yet we do not have.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I hope no one will accuse me of having told you what I was going to do and having prompted you to ask that question at this precise point, because it fits perfectly into my argument.

If hon. members will look at this resolution, and I suspect that most members have read it, they will find in paragraph 1(n) this phrase:

to increase the expense allowance paid to Members of the Senate from \$3,000 to \$6,000 per annum;

It is true that I have not seen the bill, but I do have available the present Statutes of Canada. According to paragraph (a) of sub-section (3) of Section 44 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Section 1 of Chapter 45 of the statutes of 1970-71-72, the amount of expense allowance being paid to the senators at the present time is \$4,000. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, for the Governor General to give us a recommendation of which he approves raising the allowances paid to the senators from \$3,000 to \$6,000 when in fact they are now receiving \$4,000 puts us, I suggest, in an impossible position.

**An hon. Member:** A typographical error.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Someone suggests that it is a typographical error. First of all, as a member of the International Typographical Union, Winnipeg Local 191, I object to this abuse that occurs when something is wrong and it is said it is because there is a typographical error. No printer misspells the word "three", and it is there spelled out as "three". Unless I can be given evidence that proves to the contrary, printers put down what is put in front of them.

Hon. members may say this is a technicality, but technicalities are pretty important around here. I suggest that if that is what the Governor General's recommendation says and the bill is brought in and says something else then there is a conflict, and the government has no right to ask for the introduction of this bill today.

There is a citation somewhere else in the book, though I was not able to find it in the time I have been looking at this. It is to the effect that in such circumstances an amended resolution can be introduced in 24 hours rather than 48. However, I submit that if we are going to found a bill on a Governor General's recommendation that recommendation should conform with the facts.

What this recommendation seems to mean is that we are going to increase the senators' allowances by \$3,000 because it goes from \$3,000 to \$6,000. How can we change the figure three to six when at the moment the figure is four?

This is a defective and imperfect recommendation that has been placed before us. My point is that it should be sent back to His Excellency so he can correct it and it can