

*Government Orders*

However when it is brought with a soup full of other things, one does not get concurrence. Referring to that one issue in this bill does not make the soup palatable because the soup contains the strychnine of closure. That is not correct. I repeat: Bring to us a bill that says Parliament will not need to grow. Bring to us a bill that says Parliament can shrink and support will be immediate and forthcoming.

This brand new Parliament gives us the opportunity to change the way Parliament functions. We have the opportunity in this Parliament to say no to things like time allocation. We have an opportunity in this Parliament to say no to party meddling in boundary changes. We have an opportunity in this Parliament to say no to wasting \$5 million of taxpayers' money on an exercise that need not be stopped completely. It could be modified. We have an opportunity with new parliamentarians to say no to this type of politics.

In my riding there are problems with the boundary adjustments which are fairly major. However I would rather lose the next election because of boundary changes that were not proper. I would rather lose that election than be saddled with a parliamentary process like this one.

I take this opportunity to express these things in the strongest way I can. If the issue of closure and time allocation was right when they were on this side of the House then it is right when they are on that side. You cannot change the colour of your underwear when you cross the floor. You have to have some basic principles. You cannot change the colour of your hat because you have gone from this side to that side. You have to have basic principles. It is not good enough to just espouse vocally from this side of the House to that side of the House. There must be some principle. We cannot have it both ways.

I speak against this bill, this closure and this process and I do it as strongly as I can.

**Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this important debate on the motion for second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs of Bill C-18, an act to suspend the operation of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act. It is for several reasons that I have a special interest in the process of redistribution of electoral districts in our country which is now under way.

First, the electoral district of Bramalea—Gore—Malton which I have the honour to represent in this House lies within the cities of Mississauga and Brampton in the regional municipality of Peel, one of the fastest growing areas in Ontario between the 1981 and 1991 census.

• (1715)

Second, on the basis of the 1991 census, the combined cities of Mississauga and Brampton are entitled to two of the four electoral districts which are to be added to the total for Ontario, raising that number from 99 to 103.

Third, Bramalea—Gore—Malton would, in my view, be changed without good reason by the current proposals of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario.

As all hon. members are aware, the Constitution Act of 1867 requires that there be a readjustment in the number of members of the House of Commons after every 10 year census. The procedure for calculating the number of members of the House of Commons to which each province or territory is entitled is set out in sections 51, 51(a) and 52 of the Constitution Act of 1867. The procedure for establishing the boundaries of the electoral districts which will be represented in the House of Commons is set out in the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.

I will not go into details of the procedures to be followed but would refer hon. members to the clear summary of those procedures provided by the hon. government House leader in his speech on Monday, March 21, 1994 which opened the debate on second reading and reference stage of Bill C-18. I would also refer hon. members to the excellent booklet entitled *Representation in the Federal Parliament* which has been prepared by and is available from Elections Canada.

For the purpose of clarity of debate, it should be emphasized that the calculation of the number of members of the House of Commons and the establishment of the boundaries of electoral districts are based on the number of people in a given area, never on the basis of the number of voters.

I would now like to turn from the general to the particular and describe how the electoral district of Bramalea—Gore—Malton would be affected by the current proposals of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario.

Let us start with the facts that as a consequence of the 1991 10 year census it has been determined that the province of Ontario is entitled to 103 members of the House of Commons and that the electoral quota for Ontario is 97,912, the ideal population for each of the 103 electoral districts assigned to the province.

The population of the cities of Mississauga and of Brampton have increased dramatically in the 10 year period between the 1981 and the 1991 census. In 1981, the population of Mississauga was 315,056 and that of Brampton was 149,030 for a total population of 464,086 for the two cities. That population entitled the two cities to the five electoral districts established under the 1987 representation order, namely Mississauga East, Mississauga West, Mississauga South, Brampton and Brampton—Malton. The name Brampton—Malton was changed to Bramalea—Gore—Malton in 1990. The 1987 representation