

accepted it will send Bill C-103 back to the Senate to be passed again, hopefully, and established as the law of Canada.

We recognized that this Bill is a flawed piece of legislation, as have many people in the Atlantic provinces and in the Official Opposition. During the period that the Bill was going through second reading and committee stage, our member on that committee made several attempts to rectify some of those flaws. Perhaps it is not so surprising that many of the reasons the Senate gave for splitting Bill C-103 were the same reasons that we had for putting in amendments during the period that the Bill was going through the House.

The idea that DEVCO would disappear in its present form and be replaced by the Enterprise Cape Breton was considered by ourselves and by the President designate of DEVCO, who was an appointee of the Government, as being a move in the wrong direction. It removes the Cape Breton Industrial Development Corporation from a position of independence and puts it directly under the Minister in charge. By the way, the Minister is not a member of the House, and consequently with a certain amount of cynicism I have to point to the position taken by the Government when it states that this is such a great democratic process. Then the Government makes the organization the responsibility of a member who is not elected, who is an appointee, and who resides in the other place.

Therefore, we felt that the legislation needed a considerable amount of work. We tried to make those changes. To some extent, we were happy to see that the Senate also recognizes those changes. The process is unacceptable to us. The Senate is not a democratically elected body and it does not have the authority or responsibility which it has taken unto itself. We do not want the Senate to develop that type of power in the legislative structure of Canada.

We have taken the position that we will support this motion to send the Bill back to the Senate with the request that it pass in its original form. I think that it is rather sanctimonious of the Government to suggest, as it does in this motion, that the Bill it sent to the Senate was so perfect that it should not have been changed in any way. The Government must recognize, as do the rest of us and many Canadians, that the Bill was anything but perfect, and that it could have used a good number of changes.

We will support the Bill. We will support democracy. We believe that the Senate does not have the authority or the power, and should not have the authority or the power to make the type of changes that it is suggesting in this particular Bill.

● (1600)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

*Canadian Exploration Incentive program Act*

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five Members having risen:*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I have been requested by the Acting Chief Government Whip to defer the vote until six o'clock tonight. Government Orders.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN EXPLORATION INCENTIVE PROGRAM  
ACT**

MEASURE TO AMEND—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE  
AMENDMENTS

**Hon. Doug Lewis (for the Minister of State (Forestry and Mines))** moved the second reading of, and concurrence in, amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-137, an Act to provide for incentives to assist in financing exploration for mineral resources and hydrocarbons in Canada and to amend the Canadian Exploration and Development Incentive Program Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that these are technical amendments which have come back from the Senate. It is not our intention to speak to them at great length, but I understand that other colleagues may have short speeches which they may wish to address to the House. We would then proceed to call the question and directly thereafter move to the first speech on Bill C-139.

**Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Government House Leader. I have indicated to him that I would appreciate it if this Bill was put back by a few minutes.

[*Translation*]

I would like to briefly comment the amendments and the issue of flow-through shares. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the amendments originating in the Senate are of a technical nature. This morning I had not had a chance to look at them and unfortunately, they were not in the order paper we have in our offices, but as I look at the amendments, I note that their purpose is essentially to ensure that the French version agrees with the English version, and so, generally speaking, we have no objection. But since this is the last opportunity we are going to have to discuss flow-through shares, Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to underline with regret the impact of the Conservatives Government's delays on investment in the mining