

Government Orders

one so its fingerprints will not be all over it as the author of perhaps what might be its own demise.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo): Madam Speaker, I want to make sure the preachers on that side of the House have the benefit of what I have to say. Unlike the last two occasions I certainly hope they will actually ask me some questions.

Just to touch on the comments of the member for Beaver River, she said she was amused and saddened. She wants a guarantee that whatever the government comes up with will be better. That is what the bill embarks on.

Let me say to the member that the reason we have to deal with the issue this week given our recess is that if we do not do so we will put in place a very costly process of having reviews on boundaries that will not decrease the number of seats in the House or maintain the number of seats in the House but will increase the number of seats in the House by a total of six. I say that because much is being said by the big R Reformers about this bill being rammed through. What we have is a filibuster. The local media in my community was very upset by what was to transpire even though under the present situation Ontario would gain four more seats. We want to look at the number of seats in this Chamber. I can tell members that we should have the opportunity to do that.

• (1130)

We do not get the light every day on this side of the House. Therefore we are unable to take a complex issue such as this and give the members from the big R Reform Party assurance that we can do it that speedily. We will send the bill to committee where the members of the Reform Party can come forward as well as every other member in every party in the House. They will be able to bring us the reaction of their constituents. They will be able to ask some of their constituents to be witnesses and over a period of time we will come up with something better.

As I was looking at making a presentation today, I took the opportunity to review what all members who spoke on the issue had to say this past Monday. I can tell members that I feel somewhat amused on the one hand and saddened on the other.

It never ceases to amaze me how the members of the big R Reform Party, the ones that always preach free votes go ahead and do the opposite and vote as a block. One would think they were tied together with Krazy glue. Perhaps when they go through the exercise of coming up with a code of conduct, one of the things they will definitely do is use Krazy glue.

Watching them in the House, I am very much reminded of another great neo-Conservative, Margaret Thatcher, who is passé now. I am reminded of another person. The Reform Party members very much have a soulmate in the former President of the United States, Ronald Reagan. He got elected promising to

cut the deficit and the debt. Of course the United States of America became the biggest lender nation in the world when the new right took control as the Reform dream about. He took the country from the biggest lender to the biggest debtor. However something that Ronald Reagan said is applicable here. It is that phrase he always used so well, "there they go again".

Any time I review debates by the Reform Party that certainly is the impression I get, there they go again. Let them preach. Let them be sanctimonious. Do not give credit on any of the initiatives.

When I reviewed the debates one of the things I found was that for the most part they admitted they do not want to change the size of the House of Commons.

Interestingly enough, there was not one person who would support it because if we stay with the status quo, we will definitely change the House of Commons by six members which will cost us a million dollars a member. If one starts multiplying \$6 million by 10 years one has \$60 million. Then one continues on and keeps adding members to the House of Commons.

Certainly that was not what my constituents told me they wanted to see done. My constituents told me they want us to do more with less and to make the House operate more effectively.

• (1135)

Let us be very clear we are talking about ramrodding a bill, and we are talking about that. If we did not use time allocation on the bill, we would not have the opportunity to change those costly hearings that are going to take so much time and energy on the part of Canadians. I think that is an important point to know.

The suggestion has been made that the bill by the government came through the back rooms of the Liberal caucus, that it did not see the light of day with constituents, that somehow it was all politically manipulated.

As soon as the electoral boundaries readjustment proposal for the province of Ontario was put in place I received numerous calls from constituents. I have had discussions with people representing local governments. I was in the process of drafting a private member's bill on this issue which called for representations by members of the House of Commons without increasing the total number of members. I was reflecting what my constituents were telling me which was restricting the number to at least the present size.

We also wanted to talk about making sure that the community of interest represented by ridings was maintained. When I read through the debates, I noted that the member for Beaver River said that her riding would disappear and it only had the opportunity to go through two elections.