

since then very careful consideration has been given to his submissions. But even after taking into account the hon. member's argument it does seem to the Chair that the bill proposed by him would create a new and a direct charge upon the treasury.

The hon. member suggests that additional money will not be required since sufficient funds have been provided for this purpose in the statutory vote created pursuant to the parent act in 1964. That, of course, is a very interesting argument which gave me cause to ponder and reflect. It is after, as I said, serious reflection that I saw the flaw in the hon. member's argument.

The Chair appreciates that the recommendation which accompanied the parent statute in 1964 was stated in general terms and might not have precluded on that occasion an amendment such as that which is now being proposed. I do not think it can be contended that a financial proposal that might have been permissible as an amendment in 1964 when the original parent statute was introduced can now be put forward under the provisions of a recommendation which had effect only in relation to the initial student loans plan.

I refer the hon. member to section one of Standing Order 62, which says:

This House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to the House by a message from the Governor General in the session—

These are the operative words.

—in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

In other words, it is suggested that the recommendation which was presented to the House in 1964 had force and effect for that session only. It would not be procedurally acceptable to suggest that the same recommendation could be valid a decade later for a proposition which would create a new and what I consider to be a direct and a substantial charge on the treasury. It is suggested that even the government would be required to bring in another recommendation to support a bill such as that which is now being proposed by the hon. member.

As I said yesterday, the bill is an interesting one which the House might want to look at and study. If the hon. member could find a way to obtain the required recommendation from His Excellency, I would be pleased on his behalf to put the motion to the House.

Order discharged and bill withdrawn.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Order Paper Questions

[Text]

LIP FUNDS ALLOCATED TO FEDERAL CONSTITUENCIES REPRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CABINET, 1972-73

Question No. 46—Mr. Cossitt:

1. What was the total amount of LIP funds allocated in 1972-73 to constituencies represented in the House of Commons by members of the cabinet?

2. (a) What is the name of each constituency that is represented by a cabinet minister (b) what is the name of the minister (c) what was the specific total of LIP funds allocated to each such constituency in 1972-73?

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. \$26,879,633.

2. (a) Constituency	(b) Cabinet Minister	(c) Total funds allocated \$
Mount Royal, Québec	The Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau	615, 102
Eglinton, Ontario	The Hon. Mitchell Sharp	298, 838
Cape Breton Highlands-Canso, Nova Scotia	The Hon. Allan J. MacEachen	2, 823, 987
Westmount, Québec	The Hon. C. M. Drury	2, 646, 315
Langelier, Québec	The Hon. Jean Marchand	1, 710, 761
Ottawa-Carleton	The Hon. John N. Turner	205, 883
Saint-Maurice, Québec	The Hon. Jean Chrétien	1, 782, 918
Rosedale, Ontario	The Hon. Donald S. Macdonald	1, 669, 213
Hamilton East, Ontario	The Hon. John C. Munro	74, 924
Hochelaga, Montréal,	The Hon. Gérard Pelletier	689, 437
Capilano, British Columbia	The Hon. Jack Davis	834, 767
Restigouche, New Brunswick	The Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé	2, 134, 637
Vancouver Centre, British Columbia	The Hon. Ron Basford	3, 028, 982
Burin-Burgeo, Newfoundland	The Hon. Donald C. Jamieson	1, 483, 020
Port Arthur, Ontario	The Hon. Robert Andras	629, 067
Winnipeg South, Manitoba	The Hon. James Richardson	801, 342
Saskatoon-Humboldt, Saskatchewan	The Hon. Otto E. Lang	776, 040
Windsor West, Ontario	The Hon. Herb Gray	486, 621
York-Scarborough, Ontario	The Hon. Robert Stanbury	115, 551
Dollard, Québec	The Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer	688, 751
Etobicoke, Ontario	The Hon. Alastair Gillespie	51, 246
Parkdale, Ontario	The Hon. Stanley Haidasz	176, 719
Essex-Windsor, Ontario	The Hon. E. F. Whelan	186, 054
Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Québec	The Hon. Warren Allmand	331, 379
Peterborough, Ontario	The Hon. James Hugh Faulkner	417, 162
Papineau, Québec	The Hon. André Ouellet	278, 437
Cardigan, Prince Edward Island	The Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald	713, 900
Outremont, Québec	The Hon. Marc Lalonde	971, 643
Ahuntsic, Québec	The Hon. Jeanne Sauvé	256, 937

LIP FUNDS ALLOCATED TO CONSTITUENCIES REPRESENTED BY LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS DURING 1972-73

Question No. 47—Mr. Cossitt:

What was the total amount of LIP funds allocated in 1972-73 to constituencies represented in the House of Commons by (a) members