

*Government Orders*

these clauses if we look at the budget presented by the Minister of Finance. Page 77 of "the Budget" states:

Based on projections, this measure—

That is the cap on the Canada Assistance Plan,

—is expected to contribute \$155 million to expenditure restraint over the next two fiscal years. The actual savings will, of course, depend on actual growth rates in the provinces affected by the 5 per cent ceiling.

That is one statement and on page 78, he states:

For 1990-91 and 1991-92, the per capita EPF transfer will be held to the 1989-90 level. This means it will grow with the population increase of each province, or about 1 per cent nationally. Federal cash expenditures will be reduced by about \$870 million in 1990-91 and \$1,540 million in 1991-92. In 1992-93, EPF growth will resume at the rate of growth of GNP less 3 percentage points, consistent with the announcement in the April 1989 budget. The growth of the total EPF transfer, beginning 1992-93, will not fall below the rate of inflation.

I realize that even reading this budget is a lot of economic gobbledegook, but we have said that in respect of the minister's statements before. We realize that the budget documents are an attempt to cover up the slashing and cutting that this government has indulged in with this budget, but even reading that it is possible to glean from this that these provisions in the budget, and contained now in Bill C-69 which is before us, which is the budget implementation bill in part, are reductions in the charges on the public revenue of Canada, not increases.

The minister has trumpeted in this document his savings to Canadian taxpayers by reason of the wonderful changes he is proposing in this bill. And yet this bill has attached to it, in spite of those savings and reductions, a royal recommendation. It is that that I object to. I have some authority in my submission for suggesting that this royal recommendation is, in fact, unnecessary.

I would like to turn to May's twenty-first edition at page 716 where it reads as follows, and this of course is the English authority on this point. The learned author writes:

No special form of procedure applies to proposals to reduce existing charges, and they may be moved in the House or in Committee without the royal recommendation.

A proposed reduction of a charge may consist in reducing its amount, or restricting its objects, or inserting limiting conditions, or shortening the period of its operation. The transference of a charge from the Consolidated Fund to 'moneys to be provided by Parliament', ie its transformation from an indefinitely continuing to an annually renewable charge—may be regarded as an instance of reducing the duration of a charge.

The same principle applies in the case of amendments moved to a bill which abolishes or reduces a charge authorized by existing law. Amendments to such a bill, which are designed to restore a portion or the whole of the charge which the bill proposes to reduce or abolish, are in order without the need of a preliminary financial resolution.

That last paragraph was illustrated in the debate on Bill C-21 on the Senate amendments to Bill C-21 which simply reinstated a charge on an existing bill. I do not need to go into that one again but the fact is that May supports the proposition that a royal recommendation is not required for bills that propose a reduction in the charge. In other words, a private member in this House could have introduced this bill quite properly in this House without a royal recommendation. I suggest that if it was in order for a private member to introduce such a bill then a royal recommendation is not required on that bill simply because a minister of the Crown has chosen to introduce it in this House.

Further, Beauchesne's sixth edition at page 185 confirms May's statements and states:

608. The previous recommendation of the Crown is not required for the introduction of a bill consolidating or amending revenue laws when the imposition of new burdens is not contemplated.

Again we have the support for this proposition in all of the authorities. Indeed, Beauchesne's refers to a decision cited in the Journals in 1908 and I have before me the ruling of the Speaker of the day on a question concerning the amendment of certain acts and clauses in a bill which reduced charges on the public expenditure. Page 608 of the Journals for July 8, 1908 states:

A question has arisen as to whether, in view of certain clauses in the Bill, a previous sanction of the Governor General should not have been obtained and announced to the House, before its introduction, and such introduction preceded by a resolution.

Having regard to the precedents in the House, I find that this has not been considered necessary. In the year 1883 a similar Bill was passed, and which now appears in the statutes for that year as Chapter 17, intituled: 'An Act further to amend and consolidate, as so amended, the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion therein mentioned.' This Bill was introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald. No