

*Government Orders*

Why do we not smarten up in the House and get ourselves doing things better and differently? This system has to change. While the Liberals are politically selling a lean, mean government, their rhetoric I guess, they are trying to increase the size of the House of Commons, which will cost a lot of money.

The cutbacks we are talking about do not affect the people in the ivory towers. With Bill C-68 the ivory tower is still hiring. The ivory tower is the government. The cabinet and the Prime Minister have the opportunity to fix what is wrong in the country but party discipline is the same old way.

There was a newspaper article today about what was said in caucus. Whether it is true or not there has to be some smoke and fire because these journalists received from one of the backbenchers what was told to them by the Prime Minister. It is pretty bad when a Prime Minister has been alleged to have said to his caucus members that if they do not toe the party line their nomination papers will not be renewed. If they do not toe the party line they will not be back in the House. If they do not vote the party line they will be kicked off the committees and will not be allowed to travel. That is not leadership, that is dictatorship.

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.):** Madam Speaker The comparison between California and Canada is really unnecessary. It does not apply. Canada is a much larger country, the second largest country in the world, whereas California is a state and is not as large.

My riding is in an urban area and I represent a great diversity of wants and needs of over 110,000 constituents. They want me to speak on their behalf. I imagine that a member who comes from a rural area has a much tougher time serving constituents because they live far away from each other.

• (1115)

I also find my colleague's tone offensive. We are not here doing nothing. I work very hard and I hope he does too. I know that most of my colleagues work very hard. Apart from the travelling which we have to do from the west, there is a large amount of work to do both here and in our ridings.

I am a backbencher. I have no post nor am I a parliamentary secretary. I do not want to be any more than an effective, efficient member representing the constituents of my riding. I have as much voice in all of this as anyone else. The ministers are here for a purpose and have the experience.

I have done a lot of volunteer work in the last 20 years. I have my integrity and my reputation and I feel offended when I am told that I am not doing anything in this job except keeping the seat warm. I do much more than that, as do my colleagues.

I also want to comment on the gun bill. There are rural areas where the bill is not acceptable but the majority of people live in

urban areas. There are two big boxes of letters in support of the gun bill in my office. Those letters came from my constituents. I received very few letters against the bill. I received letters in support of the bill. We all know how much more vocal people are when they are against something, but the surveys showed support for the gun bill.

I also want to remind my hon. colleague that we have a democratic system. Again, I say that the Prime Minister has been misquoted, unfortunately. It is not what he said. It is not up to me to tell my hon. colleague what to say. They are in caucus and know that caucus is the place where we can discuss our differences and our opinions. I want to set the record straight that the Prime Minister never said that. The Prime Minister is a very credible person and a great leader.

**Mr. Silye:** Madam Speaker, it is too bad the hon. member feels offended. I must have struck a nerve. I sense a lot of guilt, as if she were trying to justify the fact that the way she works as an MP is doing a lot of good in her constituency.

I know we all work hard. I do not question whether she works hard. That is not the question. The question is: What are the results she is achieving? What has she accomplished? That can be a matter of opinion. She works hard. At what? What impact has she had in her constituency? What has she done better than the person she replaced or is she just doing the same old thing?

I know what I do in my riding. I know the job I have to do administratively. I know what we have to do to help constituents solve their problems. However, there must be other reasons for being here.

She cannot understand my point about the fact that we freely elected a dictatorship over there. She chooses to kowtow to it and praise it and deny that the Prime Minister said something, when everyone in Canada knows he did. Everyone in Canada knows that the party discipline which is represented by a 30-year politician like the Prime Minister is a habit that cannot be broken. The situation is that they are trying to defend something which is not in the best interests of the country.

If she had her ear to the ground in her constituency she would know that there are differences of opinion between rural and urban ridings. She knows that not everyone in this room, even if we are in the same party, can vote the same way on every issue.

• (1120)

Also on a non-partisan basis she should be willing to discuss an issue like free votes in the House of Commons. On what basis could she vote against the so-called party line? That is not even being considered by this government, whereas this party made that an election campaign promise.