

*Government Orders*

view, then I would ask Your Honour to strike the royal recommendation from this bill as being irregular, or, alternatively, have the minister stand in the House and explain to the House that if this is to remain on the bill why it is there. If it does represent an increase in taxes the Canadian people have a right to know. Indeed they should have been told about the taxes that they are having imposed on them through this budget, which the minister covered up when he presented the budget a few weeks ago.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to my hon. colleague from Kingston and the Islands point out once again an inconsistency in terms of what the government is doing with the royal recommendations.

The hon. member has raised some interesting questions. Why do you have royal recommendations attached to legislation? It is primarily because you are going to increase taxes. We see that there is a royal recommendation attached, and that is why you attach royal recommendations, so one assumes there must be a tax increase in this legislation some place although we have not found it yet. Or, the government has simply erred and has proceeded in using the royal recommendation in an inappropriate fashion.

I would be curious to listen to the government explain why it has done this. Although the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands has been persistent in raising this question in the House, the government either fails to listen or fails to understand the point that he is making.

I wonder if it would not be appropriate to stay deliberations on Bill C-69 until the Speaker makes a ruling. That will settle it because again the point is that it is inconsistent with practices of this House. It does not make sense in terms of the traditions that we have followed over the years.

I notice the minister plans to intervene in this discussion. May I offer the suggestion that if the minister is unable to explain why this unusual use of the rules has been pursued, Your Honour in fact stay deliberations on Bill C-69 until a ruling has been made by yourself.

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in your wisdom and knowledge you have already realized that both the member for Kingston and the Islands and the member for Kamloops

are totally wrong. They are imputing to us very dark motives. No minister on this side of the House would even think of such dark actions.

Not being hindered by any legal knowledge, maybe I can explain in very simple and clear terms why there is a royal recommendation in Bill C-69. There is indeed a royal recommendation on Page 1a of Bill C-69. It is there not because of the desire or request of the government or ministers but on the advice of the Office of the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel because it felt that Bill C-69 and some provisions in it widen existing conditions.

According to Beauchesne's sixth edition to which the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands has referred, when such things occur a royal recommendation is necessary. These changes in the bill take place among other areas in article 2.5 (1) where conditions of previous bills are being changed. This is the very simple, clear reason why there is a royal recommendation in Bill C-69.

**Mr. Douglas Young (Gloucester):** I rise on just a very brief point of order, Mr. Speaker. In listening to my friend I was surprised that the government did not explain why there was a royal recommendation on the basis of increased taxation and increased revenues.

I am sure when there is a review done of the interventions made by my friend from Kingston and the Islands and the NDP House leader, the member for Kamloops, it will become clear to the Chair that not having a royal recommendation on this bill, because we all know what the government's motives are here, would be like asking a pickpocket to walk around with mittens on.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I want to thank the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands for his well researched intervention, the hon. member for Kamloops, the Minister of State for Finance and the hon. member for Gloucester.

I will reserve my decision, but until I rule I will allow the debate to proceed.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (minister of State Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to move second reading of Bill C-69, the Government Expenditures Restraint Act. In opening debate on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is important that Parliamentarians have a clear under-