

*Government Orders*

the chairmen of these committees and the members of government on those committees feel like they are making a contribution.

If that continues we can do some good for Canada and Canadians. However, if they do not do it, that is where I say increasing the size is just a waste of time and money. We have to reduce the cost of doing business in Parliament. We have to reduce the cost of doing business for government. We have to set the example.

When the Minister of National Revenue proposed Bill C-2 he indicated that he wanted to amalgamate two deputy ministers into one. It was an effort to streamline and lower the cost of doing business yet increase the efficiency and the effectiveness of government. We will be watching to see if the new super deputy minister of national revenue, taxation, customs and excise lowers the cost of the department, improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the services within the department and achieves the aims and objectives of the bill. We will be watching. Hopefully that will come about.

I would like to get back to representation by population. There are two ways to continue the principle of equal representation. We are not really on representation by population. We know that on the principle of what was guaranteed to Prince Edward Island in joining Confederation. It was guaranteed a minimum of four seats no matter what its population became.

• (1200)

Therefore what we are trying to do is come as close to representation by population as possible and emulate that principle in theory. Right now there are two options available to us.

The first option is to continue on the present course. Every eight years when there is a redistribution calculation we would look at the population shift and then increase the number of seats. That is representation by population and we would be giving everybody what they want. Consequently that is what increases the cost and size of government and we wish to diminish and reduce that.

The second option is to stray away from that philosophy, that principle and that theory which is flawed. Let us try to improve and accept a new theory that would look at redistribution and the formula for both urban and rural areas.

Whether the size of the House of Commons is the current 295 or it goes back to 260 or in the range the Minister of National Revenue recommended of between 220 and 260, whatever that number becomes, the size would be capped. Then future redistributions and future principles of following equal representation or representation by population could be accommodated in both rural and urban areas by simply reallocating the ministers in those areas and changing the boundaries to reflect the shift in population rather than adding the number of people.

Let me repeat for the purposes of the committee and for the purposes of my contribution to this debate. I am suggesting if the size of the House of Commons were set at a fixed number we could still be a democratic institution and still respect redistribution on the basis of shifting the boundaries but not increasing the number of people. That is something I hope the committee looks at.

The other point is the problem with the Senate which has to be addressed. We have to some day very soon look at this institution which can be elected, equal and effective. We can work together rather than always degrading that other House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The question is on the amendment.

**Mrs. Ablonczy:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I had understood the amendment to read "including the possibility of a formula or cap to reduce". Are those words not in the amendment? That is what I had understood.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I thank the hon. member for Calgary North for her intervention. If she will give me a moment, I will consult with the table officers and do a verification of the amendment.

The amendment was correct in its first form. The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Call in the members.

• (1205)

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order. Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), I have been requested by the chief government whip to defer the division until a later time. Accordingly,