

*Point of Order*

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.

• (1510)

I would then refer the Speaker to Beauchesne's sixth edition, page 185, citation 604, which states:

Amendments to bills are out of order if they attempt to substitute an alternative scheme to that proposed with the Royal Recommendation.

I would also refer you, Mr. Speaker, to rulings by past speakers on this issue, in particular *The Selected Decisions of Speaker Lamoureux*, published in 1985, which contains a number of references in this area on pages 457, 459, 463-64, 466, 469, 473-74, 477-481, and 483. Specifically, I draw your attention to page 479—

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier on a point of order.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the minister is trying to do here, but we are trying to keep track of his statement.

I wonder if he would agree to tabling that statement so that we could all read it correctly, or slow down his delivery so we can receive the translation and the quotations that he is giving us today.

We had no notice of this, Mr. Speaker, and we take exception to him reading it into the record as fast as he can.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has heard the comment from the other side of the House. I am not so sure that it is up to the Chair to say how fast or slow a member might speak. I take it as a courteous request to make it easier for the opposition to follow the argument, and of course I am in the minister's hands. I am sure that he would want to comply.

**Mr. Andre:** Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if I were speaking too rapidly it was only so as not to take up too much time of the House. Of course I will table the document. The hon. member knew that. He did not have to stand to make that known.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I did not know anything about it. Keep to the truth.

**Mr. Andre:** Well, Mr. Speaker, he knew as much about it as I knew about his point of order yesterday, to which I listened for 45 minutes.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Here we are again mixing apples and oranges.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps I can help the House. The minister is giving a detailed and careful argument on a matter of some considerable importance to this place. I would like him to continue because I am listening as carefully as I can.

**Mr. Andre:** Mr. Speaker, I draw attention to page 479 of this publication which deals with the Speaker's ruling on February 5, 1973 concerning amendments proposed to Bill C-124, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act.

During that procedural discussion the Speaker was asked to rule on whether amendments were acceptable if they have as their effect an alteration of the royal recommendation or if they constitute a rejection of the bill.

The Speaker ruled that the motions in question are out of order because they change the objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications of the royal recommendation. He said that amendments are only in order if they fall within terms of the resolution.

I would also draw the Speaker's attention to the publication, *Selective Decisions of Speaker James Jerome*, published in 1983. I would draw your attention to pages 114, 118, 119, 120-121, and 123. Specifically, pages 119 and 120 deal with amendments proposed to Bill C-69, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Speaker's ruling on December 15, 1975. The issues discussed concern whether amendments can be made that involve the expenditure of money not sanctioned by the royal recommendation. In the ruling Speaker Jerome ruled these amendments out of order because they infringed on the financial initiative of the Crown and because the expenditures proposed were not provided for in the royal recommendation.

Before I proceed to explain why amendments 5(a) and (b), 7 and 9 relate to these rulings, I would like to point out that several initiatives in Bill C-21 were provided for in the budget speech and papers presented by the Minister of Finance, as I have indicated. In my speech of March 12, 1990 I referred directly to the budget speech so I will not quote from it now. However, again Beauchesne's and Erskine May state that the most important parts of ways and means is the budget speech.