

*Government Orders*

Reformers saying that they would like to know what the rules are before the game starts.

• (1235)

We have to look at the issue and say that we cannot strike a committee in the government and tell it what its conclusions are to be. If the committee is to investigate redistribution and the reasons for redistribution it has to go in with a clear mandate. It cannot be something that is driven by politics. It has to be something that is driven by economics and the times we live in. It is not just the drawing of lines on maps that eliminate Brock township and add Ennismore. I will speak on Ennismore also. Ennismore being added to my riding makes less sense than taking Brock away.

My riding now runs across the eastern end to above the village of Norwood, which makes absolutely no sense. Once again it is a large geographic riding and very difficult to cover. Ennismore is above the city of Peterborough. Redistribution takes the city of Peterborough, makes a doughnut out of it and gives the rest of the area around it to the surrounding ridings. Adding Ennismore, which is steeped in Irish Catholic history, should obviously be an advantage to me.

I am not speaking strictly on partisan terms. The fact of the matter is that Ennismore is being added to the centre of Victoria—Haliburton where my constituency office and the town of Lindsay are located. Ennismore is above the city of Peterborough. Most people in Ennismore gravitate to the city of Peterborough to work. All government services are in the city of Peterborough. As these areas are added to ridings like Victoria—Haliburton and as Brock township is taken away and added to something else, the whole boondoggle, as I call it, makes absolutely no sense. I oppose it. Also I am not comfortable with closure. I must say that I do not find closure to be a comfortable way to do government. I say that quite heartily.

I have looked at the problem. Maybe it is minuscule; maybe it is not. The commission is out right now. Besides the \$5 million it has already spent or wasted, as I would put it, it is going to waste more money in booking rooms, hiring staff, holding meetings, putting me and my constituents into a position where I am preparing on one side to oppose redistribution of my riding and on the other side supporting closure so that I do not have to go to the meetings and waste more taxpayers' money.

I talked to some Reform members and when I was through the comment one of them made was that I was more Reform than they were. I must agree with that because money and the spending of taxpayers' money are close to my heart. I came out of municipal politics where I instituted a system in my municipality that stopped debenturing and started reserves. Now I see that the municipalities in my area that have followed the

procedure are able to take advantage of the infrastructure program because of planning they started in the past.

We all realize there are no more taxpayers' dollars to try to get. We have to save at every opportunity. Besides the process that is ongoing, a way of saving taxpayers' dollars would be by stopping the process. April 14 will be the first date under the process we could actually see the bill go through, cut off the hearings and bring redistribution to a halt. Then it should be restudied and looked at along the lines of Canada as a whole.

When I talk about my geographic area being the same size as Prince Edward Island, I do not mean to talk about four members from Prince Edward Island handling the same area that I handle as one member. Obviously I am already saving money under the program. The fact of the matter is that redistribution for my riding does not make sense. It will not benefit the voters of Victoria—Haliburton whom I represent. I hope other members represent their voters in the same way. I worry about that interim period where a huge amount of voting power is taken away from one riding and put into another. Does the member then spend less time there and more in the one that is being added? Those are questions I have not been able to answer.

• (1240)

I know my 10 minutes is coming to an end, but I hope members realize that stopping the hearings saves money. Five million dollars has been wasted; let us not waste any more. Let us look at the ridings that are adversely affected like mine and the damage it does to the system I have to work in. Let us stop in any way we can and take a hard look at redistribution and its effects on my riding and on other ridings in Canada.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster):** Mr. Speaker, I will try to condense a 20-minute speech into 10 minutes to conform with the time allocation motion which restricts the time I have to address the House.

It is a sad day to be speaking, about two months into a new Parliament.

**Mr. Robichaud:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member who has just risen referred to the time allocation motion limiting his speech to 10 minutes. It has nothing to do with that. According to the rules, after a certain amount of debate speeches are reduced to 10 minutes. It has nothing to do with time allocation.

**Mr. Hermanson:** Mr. Speaker, I heard debate on Jimmy Swaggart, codes of conduct and a number of irrelevant issues. I did not sense that they related at all to the motion today. I would appreciate if the Chair would be fair in its application of those sorts of matters.

This act would suspend the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act. Why should we suspend an act that is currently in place and the process it enables is halfway through being completed? Certainly there are some things that would justify suspending the act. If we could find some illegal activities by Elections Canada or if illegal activities were being undertaken