

The Hon. Member from Westmorland—Kent—and this I cannot believe—has one of the poorest counties in all of Canada, but yet he is here applauding the Senators who are infringing on the privileges of this House.

[*Translation*]

Mostly Acadiens, Mr. Speaker! And what does the Hon. Member for Westmorland—Kent (Mr. Robichaud) do? He applauds the efforts of Senators who are trying to frustrate the will of the elected representatives of the people. In his riding, which is perhaps the second poorest in Canada, the passage of and Royal Assent to this Bill would make possible, for example, to designate certain parts of New Brunswick, such as the region of Kent, a special region. But to do that, we need legislative authority, and that legislative authority is being denied to us by the Senators. That is the issue.

[*English*]

These Members of Parliament will have to explain to the Member for Westmorland—Kent why he is preventing the adoption of this Bill as it is. That area could be designated a special area under the enabling legislation of Bill C-103. I cannot stress enough the importance of this Bill and the approach of this Government to regional economic development. I am a product of Atlantic Canada. I come from northern New Brunswick. The people who are represented here have been subjected to regional economic development policies of the previous Government for 16 to 20 years.

In 1984, when the people across Canada and Atlantic Canada decided that they wanted to do away with this approach of throwing money at the problem they have spoken loud and clear and we have answered. That is why we have brought in the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. Bill C-103 addresses every problem that they have. Everything is in the Bill. The integrity of the mandate of the Industrial Development Division is protected and it is in the Bill. Instead of reporting to Ottawa it will report to the Minister who is responsible for all of Atlantic Canada's economic development. That is the only difference. I guess I know why the Senators acted as they did. They used to be here making laws.

[*Translation*]

It's pathetic to see that. Imagine the poor Senators over there, who can't come up with any solutions, who can only watch what the government does and try to frustrate the will of the elected representatives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Liberal Party just have today to wake up and stand up for the House of Commons!

[*English*]

The issue is the powers of the House of Commons versus the prerogatives of the Senators. The Speaker has ruled that this is a money Bill, that they have infringed upon the privileges of each and every Member of the House. I want to see those Liberal Members of Parliament stand up for the right of Canadians who elect their representatives, not the Senators who are not elected.

*Canadian Organization Act, Atlantic Canada, 1987*

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to address myself to this particular issue before us today on the floor of the House of Commons. It is a great opportunity to follow the Minister of State for Small Businesses and Tourism (Mr. Valcourt), who has made some suggestions and comments with regard to what is taking place in another Chamber and, in particular, what is taking place here in the House of Commons. I failed to hear from Members opposite. Perhaps, as the day progresses, we may hear from them. I failed to hear nor did I receive any specific indications from them as to what parts of this particular Bill they would deem to be a money Bill.

In the motion it says:

... because this House believes that in dividing the Bill, the Senate has altered the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of the grants of aid and supplies set out in the Bill, contrary to Standing Order 87.

I would hope that in the course of our debate Members opposite would clearly spell out, for Members on this side, where that has been a bridge. It is passing strange that government Members have not themselves alluded to their support of the somewhat ill-founded substantive portions here before us today, with any reference to those sections of the Bill.

There is a fundamental problem which members on the government side and, to a lesser extent, my colleagues to the left, the New Democratic Party, do not wish to acknowledge or to address in any substantive way. All of them knew in their hearts that Part I of Bill C-103, notwithstanding the shortcomings and numerous amendments which my colleague, the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate (Mr. Baker), made in committee and in the House, would be passed by the House of Commons. But when it comes to the second part they know in their hearts, that what they are doing is fundamentally wrong.

• (1240)

This is a piece of legislation which, by the Government's own admission, and I say to you, Sir, respectfully and sincerely, ought to be treated as two separate and distinct pieces of legislation. Why? First, not I, not members of the New Democratic Party, but government Members in introducing Bill C-103, in referring to it by its short title, said it is the Government Organization Act, Atlantic Canada Act, 1987. The short title in Part II reads Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation Act. There are two distinct, different elements, yet the Government attempts to lob them in as if they were one.

It is interesting to note that when the Bill was introduced in this House, a great deal of time, a great deal of rhetoric was given by the then Minister of Transport, the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), with regard to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. In checking through *Hansard* it became clearer and clearer that the second part was a throw-