

### Government Orders

By passing Bill C-18 we would condone the waste of five million dollars, the shelving of another government study and the sweeping under the carpet of conclusions that do not seem to please the government.

Why should we start from scratch all the time? Even if we proceed with new studies, I can assure the House that the future ridings will be very similar to the ones proposed under the present Act. Why? Because the base will be the same, it will be the census of 1991. Regions and cities will be the same. The framework for analysis and apportionment will remain the population of each county, and the number of voters per riding in each province will not change. Geographical areas, population densities, community of interest and cultural identity do not change overnight, and this means, according to me, that the conclusions will be similar.

Being based on the same given quantities and qualities, the conclusions of the second exercise cannot differ markedly from those arrived at under the present Act. One thing only would produce noticeably different results, that is if the density of population in one specific riding could diverge by more than 25 per cent from the provincial ratio; that could be advantageous for rural communities. If that percentage were closer to 10 or 15 per cent, it would benefit urban areas and would increase considerably the surface of rural areas.

• (1310)

However, identical premises will only give us more or less identical results. Is it worth it to start this exercise all over again if we are to get similar results in the end? What is the government's intention? Do they want to save time or please the caucus members who want to be reelected whatever the cost to taxpayers?

In conclusion, what is important for Bloc Quebecois members is that all Quebec constituents are well represented in this House, whatever the distribution of the federal electoral boundaries for the province. As for the next federal election, the Bloc now hopes above all that the Parti Quebecois will be elected in Quebec in 1994 and that the referendum which will follow in 1995 will lead to sovereignty. Since the redistribution of the federal electoral map will be implemented only at a later date in Canadian provinces, it could very well never apply in Quebec.

Finally, I would like to add that I also agree with my colleague, the member for Bellechasse who said in this House earlier this morning that Quebec lost its sovereignty in 1867. In fact, the link that existed between Upper Canada and Lower Canada before 1867 was really a sovereignty-association type of relationship very similar to the one the Bloc Quebecois is advocating today.

**Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario):** Madam Speaker, once again, I welcome this opportunity to say a few more words regarding the redistribution of seats in Canada.

[English]

I need no lesson in what redistribution will mean for this member of Parliament. The Ontario riding is one of the largest, most populace ridings in the country. It has approximately 205,000 people. If projected census information is correct, by the turn of this century, the time at which I will reach the ripe age of 37 years, my riding will be in excess of 300,000 people.

However, I want to point out that my reasons for supporting the government in this initiative are many. Why do we need new seats? It seems to me that we have just gone through a long election process in which we described to people unequivocally the need to look after our financial House. We took the message from Canadians that we must work with that which they have provided us.

The cost associated with adding new seats to the House of Commons is estimated to be in excess of one million dollars per year. At a time when all of us are looking for opportunities to make sure that we keep our fiscal house in order, it seems to me that proceeding with the addition of new seats without regard to better distribution of the resources that we already have flies in the face of the hard earned tax money that Canadians tell us is so hard to come by.

I want to point out that in my riding of Ontario, and I do not want to speak from a parochial point of view of what it does to me, but given the significance and the load which I take in my riding of some 205,000 constituents it seems to me that is a threshold that I think is manageable. We should be looking at a process here—and this is certainly something that the committee can assign to itself—to look at a better distribution of the seats that we already have. I note some of my colleagues here from the other parties from around Ontario. We have a tremendous opportunity at this point to perhaps look at where ridings are relative to mine.

In the riding of Oshawa next door there are 95,000 constituents. In the riding to the north of me there are 130,000 constituents. In my riding there are 205,000 constituents. Rather than adding a new seat why do we not simply redistribute some of the regions within those three ridings so that we have a platform of some 120,000 or 130,000 on average? We can do the job. We have the resources to do the job. We really do not need any new seats.

I want to point out some of the flaws I saw in the electoral districts supplement to the *Canada Gazette* proposals for the province of Ontario.

• (1315)

On reading the section dealing with Durham region it seems patently unclear for a committee that has spent a lot of time on this what they really mean in terms of distribution. It indicates that for the regional municipality of Durham the population is expected to be some 401,000. They are proposing that the district of Durham remains the same except for the inclusion of