the bill to identify appropriations. I believe that the reason is that there are no appropriations in Bill C-21 and that, therefore, they did not need a royal recommendation, and that the law officers in the House of Commons attached a royal recommendation in accordance with the practice which has been analyzed so carefully in the report of the National Finance Committee.

In any event, I do not find any appropriations in Bill C-21. I invite honourable senators opposite to tell us where the appropriations are.

What is contained in Bill C-21 is reductions in existing appropriations—charges or amounts that are contained in the existing statute. I would agree with the argument that has been advanced on the other side, if we were not dealing here with an amending bill, which deals with a parent statute in which is contained the appropriations. It is on that simple point that I rest my case. We did not embark on these amendments without carefully considering the procedural situation.

My argument will apply to all the amendments which have been objected to by Senator Beaudoin and Senator Roblin, with the exception of the fishermen's regulation amendment, to which Senator Beaudoin referred but on which I am not sure he has raised a serious objection. We will know about that later.

My argument applies to amendment No. 7 on page 5 of the report. It is amendment No. 7 in the appendix, but it is referred to on page 5 of the report. That is an amendment to which Senator Roblin took objection. My argument will apply to that. He also took exception to amendment No. 9 on page 15.

Senator Roblin: I did not refer to that one. The next one is page 19.

Senator Frith: Senator Beaudoin objected to No. 9.

Senator MacEachen: I understood that, on page 16 of the report, amendment No. 10 was objected to. Objection also was taken to amendment No. 5, which has to do with penalties. The argument that I will apply to the amendment relating to government contributions will apply to these other amendments.

Bill C-21 is an amending bill that amends the parent statute of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Our amendment in the text proposes that we strike out clause 52 on page 32 of Bill C-21. Honourable senators, the effect of clause 52, if adopted, would be to remove entirely section 118 of the existing Unemployment Insurance Act.

This is clearly an amending bill. Clause 52 would eliminate entirely the existing provision in the parent act for funding regionally extended benefits.

Concerning that point, I do not think that either the government or a member of the House of Commons or the Senate needs a royal recommendation to eliminate a charge on an existing statute. With the exception that money bills, under the Constitution, cannot originate in the Senate, it is my view that members of the Senate have precisely the same opportunities to amend bills as members of the House of Commons who are not ministers. So we have the same status, with the exception I have stated, as a non-ministerial member of the House of Commons.

The description of the orginal act is "An Act respecting unemployment insurance in Canada."

• (1420)

Senator Roblin: This one?

Senator MacEachen: No, the statute, the original act. If I moved this amendment, either in the House of Commons or in the Senate, when the bill came forward, it would be completely in order because it would be reducing or eliminating a charge. That is the simple principle. It makes sense, because once the government decided to repeal section 118 of the parent act it provided the entry for amendments to that section. If we attempted to amend another section that was not contained in the amending bill, of course, we would be clearly out of order. The point I am making is that the government in its amendment eliminated the existing charge. What we are trying to do is eliminate a portion of the existing charge. Honourable senators must bear in mind that Bill C-21 is not a statute. It is a series of proposals. The parent statute contains the appropriations, and it is those appropriations we are reducing. We are not increasing appropriations in the existing statute. That is my reasoning.

Do I have any authority for that reasoning? I shall try to provide solid authority, and I can take no greater authority than the one quoted by Senator Ottenheimer yesterday, that being Erskine May. In the 21st edition, published in 1989, at page 716, there is a passage entitled "Matters Involving Money which do not require the Queen's recommendation". It begins:

> (a) Provisions involving the reduction of charges. No special form of procedure applies to proposals to reduce existing charges—

The existing charges are in the statute.

> —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.

They are talking about the proposed reduction of existing charges. The passage goes on in the final paragraph to hit on the very case we are dealing with.

> 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 is the form in which royal recommendations used to be launched.