Erskine May devotes a separate chapter to the question of voting aids and supplies; the question of passing the bill to make good the aids and supplies granted. We know, as Erskine May says is true at Westminster, that when such a bill comes to this place it is for Royal Assent. It comes decorated with a green ribbon and is presented separately by the Speaker of the House of Commons for Royal Assent. That is a bill of aids and supplies, and that is the kind of appropriation to which the House of Commons, by its Standing Order 80(1), lays exclusive claim.

That is not the kind of bill we now have before us. We have a bill before us which is designed to change a statutory expenditure. In *Erskine May* a separate chapter, Chapter XXX, deals with this second type of appropriation. We do not even need to go to *Erskine May* to discover the distinction. If the people in the House of Commons would read their own standing orders they would see that not all appropriations deal with aids and supplies.

● (1500)

Standing Order 79(2) states:

> The message and recommendation of the Governor General in relation to any bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax or impost shall be printed on the *Notice Paper* and in the *Votes and Proceedings* when any such measure is to be introduced and the text of such recommendation shall be printed with or annexed to every such bill.

That was done in the case of Bill C-21. The next standing order, 79(3), states:

> When estimates are brought in, the message from the Governor General shall be presented to and read by the Speaker in the House.

That is the technique by which the royal recommendation is put before the House in the case of a request for aids and supplies. These are quite different kinds of appropriations, and I cannot understand why the people in the other place seem to assume, when their own rules make the distinction, that their claim with regard to one form of appropriation, whether or not it is valid there, applies also to the other form of appropriation.

We are not dealing with aids and supplies here. We can put that aside. We do not need to get into the constitutional argument that some would like to make on that. Some people take what I call the Ontario view, which is that the House of Commons controls all so-called "money bills". Well, I tell you that nobody in 1867 from Quebec or Nova Scotia or New Brunswick would ever have accepted that. But, as I say, I do not need to get up this afternoon to assert the rights of Nova Scotia or Quebec or New Brunswick against that old Ontario view, I hope now abandoned even there—

Senator Frith: Speaking for Ontario, we have abandoned it.

Senator Stewart: —that the House of Commons, in which Ontario was supposed to have a majority, controls all money bills.

Let us go to the kind of appropriation bill we really have before us. We have an appropriation bill designed to reduce certain expenditures that are now authorized by statute. It is Senator Beaudoin's contention today that six of the amendments made by the special committee appropriate money beyond the term of the royal recommendation of June 1, 1989.

As Senator MacEachen has said, what Senator Beaudoin has failed to take into account is that Bill C-21 is a bill to amend an existing law. Bill C-21 does not initiate a new program. Rather, its purpose is to change the unemployment insurance system—an established system. Some of the sections in the basic act authorize payments for particular purposes. When we examine the amendments made by the special committee we find that none of those amendments changes a clause of Bill C-21 in a way that makes a new appropriation. All of those clauses of Bill C-21 reduce payments from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purposes defined in the parent acts. Indeed, it would have been in order in 1971, when those parent acts were being made, to have moved all the clauses of Bill C-21 as amendments to the bill then before Parliament. That being true, it is in order to move the amendments made by the committee.

Let us look, for example, at one of the clauses, which has been referred to several times this afternoon, clause 52 of Bill C-21. It would have been in order to have moved to drop section 118 from the parent bill in 1971. Any private member of either house could have done that. No royal recommendation would have been necessary to refuse to authorize a payment. It follows that the royal recommendation of June 1, 1989, does not apply to clause 52 of Bill C-21. It affords it no protection whatsoever. That being true, it follows that amendment 7, which deals with clause 52, does not need a royal recommendation. That amendment decreases the amount of the existing appropriation.

Let me summarize. I have three points. I suggest that all those clauses of Bill C-21 amended by the special committee are clauses that reduce the appropriation made in the parent acts. Consequently, the royal recommendation of June 1, 1989, was unnecessary insofar as those clauses are concerned. It adds nothing so far as those clauses are concerned. Indeed, we can well understand why we were told in the committee that neither the sponsoring department nor the Department of Justice had made a formal analysis to discover what appropriation was being sought in Bill C-21. It is the kind of situation which, we have been told, happens again and again. Someone says, "Well, this deals with payments, whether it increases or decreases them, so we will stamp on it a royal recommendation." That is one point.

The second is that all of the amendments made by the special committee make changes to sections of the parent acts—sections which were opened up and thus put before Parliament by Bill C-21. They are relevant to the purposes of Bill C-21 and cannot be ruled out of order on the ground of being irrelevant to the purposes of Bill C-21.

Third, all amendments made by the special committee would have been in order in 1971, in that, first, they are constistent with the purposes of the sections with which they deal and, second, they do not increase any appropriation