

Nor can the Minister of Veterans Affairs extend such benefits unless a royal recommendation is attached to the Appropriation Act which would approve such funds.

The answer then to the question identified above is clearly no. The passage of this bill does not necessarily result in an expenditure of funds. No funds could be spent pursuant to this bill without a royal recommendation supporting the expenditure of those funds.

Thus I submit that the bill does not require a royal recommendation.

This point of order raises a secondary important consideration concerning our Standing Order 79(1). That Standing Order requires that no vote be taken in this House on any tax or expenditure bill without a recommendation, but all bills, once introduced, are given an automatic vote at first reading. In other words, it is left entirely up to The Speaker to decide whether or not a bill is in conformity with the provisions of Standing Order 79(1).

The Speaker has, it is clear, found Bill C-251 to be in order. He permitted it to be introduced, to be given first reading and to be printed. To suggest now that Bill C-251 is out of order is to implicitly criticize the earlier decision of the Chair to permit introduction of the bill.

I do not suggest that the hon. member for Peace River was challenging the Chair's ruling that C-251 was in order, but all members are in a difficult position when all such rulings are made and resolutions adopted before a bill is actually printed.

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, I will speak simply to your request for some input on the procedural aspect of this.

I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to Standing Order 79(1):

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

The reason for that, and it is a Standing Order of long standing, is that in our system of government, the Queen as represented by the Governor General in Canadian

terms is responsible for paying the bills and he must have the concurrence of the bill payer to pay the bills. That is where it begins. If we expect the Queen, through the Governor General, to pay the bills then we must have some notification from the Queen, Governor General, royal proclamation it is called, that there is a willingness to pay the bills.

If you go to citation 599 of Beauchesne's, it reads:

(1) If any motion, whether in the House or in a committee, requires, but fails to receive, the recommendation of the Crown, it is the duty of the Speaker to announce that no question can be proposed upon the motion, or declare the bill out of order, or to say that the problem may be rectified by the proposer obtaining a Royal Recommendation.

It goes on to say:

(2) In like manner after the question has been proposed on an amendment—

Right down to the level of an amendment.

—and it has appeared that the amendment would vary the incidence of taxation or increase the charge upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Speaker has declined to put the question.

Speakers have followed that principle through to another level. We have established that it is against the rules to propose something to spend money and that it is the duty, not a decision for the Speaker to make but simply a duty of the Speaker to impose on the House not to take it further.

To bring just two precedents to your attention, Mr. Speaker, one going back 12 years to February 1979 when Speaker Jerome was in the chair. One short paragraph is germane because it speaks not to the wording of a bill but to the objectives of a bill. He said:

It is also difficult to believe that the objectives of the bill can be achieved without some substantial expenditures, at least for an initial period. Of course, this could only be of indirect consequence to the public purse and it could be corrected through the voting of a subsidy or a grant through Estimates.

In a case not as pronounced as this Speaker Jerome did move that the motion was not in order because of the achievement of the objectives. The objectives of this bill are compassionate. They are ones which most members of the House could support. However if those objectives are to be achieved, if money is to end up in the hands of the merchant seamen, then we must have the royal prerogative and it is the duty of the Speaker to indicate that the bill is not in order.