

The question of closure is a very important one in this House and across this land. It is important because it means the shutting off of debate by Members of Parliament who are here to represent the views of all their constituents—not just those who happen to have cast a vote in their favour in the last election, but every man, woman and child in their individual ridings. It is ironic that this Government has put closure on a Bill which decides how those people will be represented, how many people will have to come together in a riding to elect a member and to be served by him or her. That is what Bill C-74 is all about.

The Government has seen fit to bring forth closure to reduce the amount of time we have to debate this Bill, which I believe is not of sufficient urgency that it must be passed by Christmas. I think, in fairness, we could have had further debate, we could have talked more about the question of representation in northern Ontario, as well as representation in the northern parts of all the provinces, so that we could ensure that all Canadians have the same value of service whether they live within a mile of the constituency office of their Member of Parliament or whether they live a thousand miles away. So I believe it is important that this Government should allow the debate to continue. It is very inappropriate that it has cut off the discussion.

I listened with interest to the comments made by the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) in contributing to this debate and in the discussion on the point of order regarding the word “hypocrisy”. He made the argument that the people of Canada no longer trust a Government that uses closure. I think he might want to reflect on his own comments. As we see by the number of Liberals who were returned to this House after his Party formed the Government, it is true that Canadians do not trust a Party which uses closure. But the Government opposite is using closure far more often than did the previous Government. It uses closure far more often than is necessary.

We have three years to go in our legislative timetable. We know that Governments cannot change the world during their term, but what we do ask is for a process which allows us to think matters through, to have an exchange in this House which allows us to share points of view, to question proposals by the Government and to offer alternative approaches. That is how the people of Canada want to see this Parliament work. They do not see us as three Parties in a particular room. They see us as a group which has been elected collectively to make laws for this country and to ensure that these laws not only reflect the wishes of the majority while protecting the interests of the minority, but that they are workable and make common sense. By bringing in closure on this Bill, the people of Canada have been told by the Government that that is not how this Parliament works. They are telling the Canadian people: “The Conservative Party is the Government and we are going to darn well do what we please regardless of how the Opposition feels and regardless of the long-term impact”.

When the commissioners have gone out and drawn the boundaries, the hearings have been held and Bill C-74 comes

back to Parliament, it will be in place for quite some time. So it is extremely important that we have the opportunity for a full debate in order to ensure that all of our concerns, not just the concerns of those on the opposition benches, but the concerns of Government members who represent some far-flung areas of the country, are properly debated and considered. We should have some flexibility so that we can come up with a Bill which works for all of Canada and which will protect the interests of all Canadians, no matter where they live in this country.

I see you are about to rise, Mr. Speaker, and I will complete my speech after the statements this afternoon.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** As vigilant as I am, I notice that it is getting awfully close to one o'clock. The Hon. Member will have six minutes and perhaps 15 seconds remaining—the Table Officer informs me it is four minutes and about 12 seconds.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock today.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There has been consultation between the Parties and it has been agreed that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) will make a statement at this time. I believe if you ask for unanimous consent, it will be given.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall I take it, therefore, that there is a request for unanimous consent to go to Statements by Ministers at this time?

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I have discussed this with the House Leaders of the opposition Parties and the agreement which we have made is that, by unanimous consent, a statement will be made by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) which will be responded to by representatives from each of the Parties. The time used by these statements will not affect the full time allowed for Statements Pursuant to Standing Order 22. In the way in which we have in the past, we will move everything back and have a full Question Period. This will be at the expense of government time, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** This is understood?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Therefore, by unanimous consent, I recognize the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski).