

Mr. Lewis: He can go home and tell the people that. I await his speech with interest, Mr. Speaker.

We regret very much these delaying tactics. This is not a single instance. By tomorrow morning the Senate will have 24 Bills from the House of Commons on hold, 24 pieces of legislation with which the Senate is dilly-dallying and on which it is not going forward. These include the multiculturalism Bill, the official languages Bill, a new immigration Bill, and emergency refugee legislation.

We returned here here on August 12 last year to proceed with emergency refugee legislation, which the House of Commons passed on September 14, 1987. We sent the Bill back to the Senate once again just recently because the Senate has been delaying, delaying and delaying on that important legislation. When Canadians ask what happens when a ship lands with illegal refugees on it and why airplanes can land at Pearson International with people on them eating their passports, Hon. Members opposite can tell them that it is because the Senate has refused to move. That is where the legislation is, and everybody ought to know that. That is the kind of delay we are getting from the Senate.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House that these efforts by the Liberal Senators to delay and derail our legislative package—this one in particular—is an affront to democracy in all of its principles. It is an affront to Members of this House. It is an affront to Atlantic Canada, and it is an affront to the taxpayers of Canada. I ask all Members of Parliament to stand and be counted when this motion is put to the House. At that time my hon. friend will have to ask himself whether he is for the House of Commons and against the Senate for attempting to dictate important principles of democracy in this House. He is either for the House of Commons or for the Senate. My friend will have to ask himself whether he is for the taxpayers of Canada deciding who spends money or for the Liberally appointed Senate.

Mr. Robichaud: Let's have the election right now.

Mr. Lewis: That is the question. I want my friend to have a chance to put a few remarks on the record and we will all await those with interest.

Mr. Gauthier: He will and he has unlimited time.

Mr. Lewis: My hon. friend will have to ask himself in the final analysis whether he is for Atlantic Canada and the principle that people in Atlantic Canada should make their own decisions, or does he want them made on Wellington Street? We say that Atlantic Canada should have the opportunity to make its own decisions as to its future as expressed in ACOA legislation. My friend says, "No, we like it the way it was going under Ottawa's rule".

● (1130)

In conclusion, I say that I hope all Members of the House will put aside partisan interests and get behind this motion

Canadian Organization Act, Atlantic Canada, 1987

which says, first, that we want to do something for Atlantic Canada and, second, we defend the principle that the elected representatives of the House of Commons should decide how taxpayers' money is spent.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to quarrel with the Speaker's decision on this matter. It speaks for itself. Nor, as the Hon. Minister said, am I going to say that I am not in favour of the rights of the House of Commons. I do not think that is the major question here. The question before us is the motion presented by the Government.

It was interesting to listen to the speech of the Hon. Minister. He did not once mention the people of Cape Breton or the main objection of the Liberal Party, which I will get to in my speech.

I have unlimited time, so if the Hon. Member for Dartmouth—Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) continues to interrupt because of the insecurity he feels about his Party's position, then I will just wait him out. This is far too important a subject to let it go by without putting the proper points across.

We can, of course, signal the position of this House with respect to its privileges without sending back to the Senate that portion of the Bill it has sent to us. The two things are not connected at all. In saying that I want to refer to a couple of things which have been misinterpreted by my friends opposite in their discussion of the Senate's action.

They say that the fact that the Speaker of the Senate was overruled indicates something important. Of course, the Speaker of the Senate is in an entirely different position than the Speaker of the House of Commons. The Senate Speaker is appointed by the Government. At the first sitting of the Senate he or she announces that he or she has received the appointment from the Governor General to be the Speaker, and that is unchallenged. The Speaker of the Senate remains so at the pleasure of the Government.

The reason that the Speaker's decision can be overruled is that he or she has a vote on all motions before the Senate. The reason for that is that all the regions of the country are to have equal representation in the Senate. The Senate was formed to protect the regions of the country. If the Speaker did not have a vote, then of course one of the four regions would be one vote short. It was decided that this would not be in the interests of any region.

I would like to now go on to what is a very important question and that is, what kind of a Bill do we have here? It has been stated that it is a money Bill. If this is a money Bill, then all Bills of the House of Commons are money Bills except perhaps amendments to the Criminal Code.

What is a money Bill? Do we have a definition? The only reference to the term in the Constitution Act is in Section 53 and Section 54. What do they say? Section 54 says: