

Government Orders

I have a great deal of respect for him. I could not quite understand what happened to him that he was a Reform candidate. Certainly some of the things he said did not make a great deal of sense.

However he has supported the infrastructure program for the city of Waterloo. He found good reasons to support it because he saw that the work being done was good for the community and good for the country.

Let me share this with you. It was moved by Councillor Connolly, seconded by Councillor Hoddle at the February 21 meeting of council in Waterloo, that the present recommendations of the Federal Elections Boundary Commission for Ontario, of boundary changes to ridings in the Waterloo region be redrawn and new boundaries be discussed with all Waterloo regional municipalities and its members of Parliament to arrive at a solution that keeps our region in tact. It was passed unanimously.

Therefore there is a great deal of support for what this government is doing. If we did not have to forever listen to and argue with members on the preaching of sanctimony versus reason we could have a committee composed of members of the House of Commons. In the period of two years we could certainly come up with something better. In that way this House would work much, much better.

I am supporting this bill because not to do so would mean supporting the status quo. That is why I call them big *R* Reformers; they do not act like reformers even though they call themselves Reformers.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena): Madam Speaker, I heard the hon. member casting disparaging remarks about the Reform Party. He likens us to Ronald Reagan who was elected as President of the United States on the promise of reducing the deficit and trying to get the massive debt under control.

There is a different system of government in Canada from what the Americans have in the United States. In Canada the executive branch and the legislative branch sit together whereas Mr. Reagan had to contend with the Democrats who dominated the Congress. In this government and in this Parliament the executive and the legislative branches are one and the same. Therefore they have much more power and ability to deal with deficits and debt than Mr. Reagan did.

Does the member recognize and acknowledge that fact?

I listened to the hon. member's remarks on fighting redistribution and heard that there was an uproar in his constituency over this proposed redistribution. I do not hear that uproar in my riding nor do I hear it in Canada. I do not see it on the front pages of the newspapers; I do not hear it being discussed. I continue to

believe mightily it is an issue for members of Parliament much more so than it is an issue for Canadians.

• (1150)

I agree that one issue which is important to Canadians is the expenditure of money. The almost \$5 million which has been spent to date will be lost if this government motion succeeds.

Furthermore, if the government is serious about capping the number of seats then why is it not clearly stated in the bill that the number of seats will be capped? If that were stated, the bill would probably have the support of the Reform Party but it is not. There is just a vague acknowledgement that the steadily increasing number of MPs will be looked at, but there is no commitment to stop it.

I ask the member for his comments on that.

Mr. Telegdi: Madam Speaker, I certainly know of the separation of powers in the United States of America. I also have had the good fortune to read the book by the leader of the Reform Party. I certainly understand there is a close attachment to the new conservatism that has died out in Great Britain and the United States. Certainly the president had a great deal of monetary policies to do with the incredible increase in the debt of the United States. Let us be very clear on that.

The other point raised suggests that I cast aspersions that were demeaning to the Reformers. I get *Quorum* like everybody else and I see reference to their code of conduct. There is a member of Parliament who refuses to dine alone with a woman even on a professional basis. Another columnist talks about the pious Reform caucus with a score of MPs more righteous and apt at sermonising than Preston Manning. Another columnist writes that now some holier than thou Reformers are putting together their own code of behaviour. Who am I to say? I just read it and some of it must be correct.

I have nothing against Reformers personally. Mr. Connolly was a candidate against me in the last election. We got along great on many issues and personally we get along very well, but something does happen when they get into that group, close the doors and decide on debate.

The member also raised the matter of money. He said that \$5 million had already been spent. That is correct, but if we continue with this process we are going to spend \$3 million more. If we put in six new members of Parliament we are going to spend \$6 million more every year.

If we continue with the process in the longer term we are going to keep adding members to the House of Commons. We would be knocking out those walls and the Reformers would need binoculars to see the Speaker. Therefore time is of the essence. We have to deal with this issue very quickly. However I will be fighting very strongly to maintain the number of members of Parliament at 295.