

be a disgrace if all members of Parliament did not support this motion later today.

#### RIGHT TO LIFE

**Mr. Ross Reid (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the duty to present a petition on behalf of people from all across my province of Newfoundland and Labrador calling upon this House to enact legislation that will make deliberate abortion, at any time during pregnancy for any reason whatever, an offence.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of commons):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES RESTRAINT ACT

##### MEASURE TO AMEND

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance)** moved that Bill C-69, an act to amend certain statutes to enable restraint of government expenditures, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, when this bill was introduced at first reading, I gave notice of my intention to rise on a point of order before the bill was called again to argue with Your Honour concerning the procedural admissibility of the royal recommendation that is contained in this particular bill. I would like to do that now, before Your Honour puts the question on second reading of the bill.

I am concerned, Sir, that this bill contains a royal recommendation and that such is not required and

#### Government Orders

should be struck out of the bill as being unnecessary. I suggest to Your Honour that we perhaps ought to use the opportunity to take a look at the propriety of using these royal recommendations because in my submission, they are included in these bills in an attempt by the government to stifle amendment by members of the opposition, amendments which members, in my respectful submission, are entitled to put.

The basis for the principles which apply to royal recommendations is to be found on page 183 of Beauchesne's, Sixth Edition, citation 596, which states:

596. The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the Royal Recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down *once for all* (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of the charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. In relation to the standard thereby fixed, an amendment infringes the financial initiative of the Crown not only if it increases the amount but also if it extends the objects and purposes, or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a charge. This standard is binding not only on private Members but also on Ministers whose only advantage is that, as advisors of the Crown, they can present new or supplementary estimates or secure the Royal Recommendation to new or supplementary resolutions.

• (1120)

The requirement for royal recommendations for bills that involve a charge on the public revenue is not in question. It is included in Section 54 of the Constitution Act, and I am not disputing that.

I am disputing the requirement for a royal recommendation to Bill C-69, and I believe there is good reason to doubt that a royal recommendation was in fact required on this bill.

I am not going to take Your Honour through each of the clauses. Not only are they tedious reading, but I suggest that they are very difficult reading. There appear to be all kinds of formulae that I do not understand in these clauses, and I have had some legal training. I do not know how a non-lawyer is supposed to understand these either. I suppose some economists might.

As my colleague from Gloucester says, the provisions of this bill are not meant for comprehension, they are meant to confuse and I am inclined to agree with him. In any event, we can glean something of the meaning of