

Government Orders

the executive, to make this institution of Parliament almost a joke.

If the government executive decides that it is time to finish debate, it is finished. If it decides that it is going to impose some new initiative on the legislative agenda, it can do that instantly.

This is a good example. Two or three weeks ago did people hear that a major pressing issue that would require some vote of closure was required in terms of the boundaries of our federal constituencies? It was not even discussed. I suspect most people in Canada are still shaking their heads wondering what this debate is all about. Here the government says: "This is so important and it is so critical that we are going to use closure".

I can understand the previous government doing something on the GST or the free trade agreement where there were vicious and deep divisions. Surely to goodness this is not the kind of thing that we ought to rush through this House.

I want to ask my friend who just spoke whether or not he saw the *Globe and Mail* this morning and noticed that the parts of Canada that would be most adversely impacted by not proceeding would be the far western part, Alberta and British Columbia, where their representation is so skewed because of population increases? Did he recognize that and does he realize that this initiative is really going to short change western Canadians?

[Translation]

Mr. Langlois: Madam Speaker, the comments made by the hon. member for Kamloops are quite relevant and, as I said earlier, I felt a little uncomfortable taking part in the debate since I am against the closure motion but for the substance of Bill C-18. I understood that he was in a rather similar situation because, in some regions of British Columbia, the people who drew up the electoral map visualized the Rockies as a vast plain, according to the speech he made in the House on Monday.

As for what he said about the increase in population, particularly in Western Canada and his province, British Columbia, we are, of course, aware of the data and hope to do the necessary work in time. That is part of the reason why the referral motion includes a deadline, so that the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs can hold hearings and table its report as soon as possible.

As you are indicating to me that I have very little time left, there is one thing I hope for, Madam Speaker: that we will be able to listen to people before electoral maps are tabled everywhere and that only minor changes are made.

• (1230)

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): We are resuming debate with 10-minute speeches and no questions or comments.

Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton): Madam Speaker, I am sorry I will not be able to get into the friendly banter back and forth. I did not want to speak on the political diversity of our parties but on the redistribution in Bill C-18 and how it affects my riding of Victoria—Haliburton, because that is really what we are here for.

I disagree there is no outcry against redistribution. My riding is one that is second in geographic size in southern Ontario. It is being torn apart by redistribution. My riding takes in Victoria county and Haliburton county. It also takes in the township of Brock, which is really in the region of Durham. It takes in the south end of Peterborough county and the north end of Peterborough county from beautiful Buckhorn all the way to Bancroft.

Geographically it is the same size as Prince Edward Island. It is a large area to cover and has a lot of people. My riding will be reduced in size which I should be applauding, but in the fashion that I feel is important to the House I went and consulted with the area that is being taken away and the area that is being added. Neither one of them wants to move.

Brock township is an area that would be well served by being added to Victoria—Haliburton. It would be taken and added to the top end of Newcastle or Clarington which has absolutely no geographic similarity other than they are both in Ontario. It would be taken away from the central region of Victoria—Haliburton, a populous area. Keeping in mind that I have a population of 101,000 according to the 1991 census, it would be reduced to somewhere around 94,000.

There are many reasons to support the redistribution or not support it. My reasons are strictly based on my own riding and the effect redistribution will have on it. I am heartened when I hear the member for Beaver River speaking because I also have a Beaver River in my riding. It runs through Brock township and Beaverton and into Lake Simcoe. On Monday of this week I went to Beaverton to meet with the Brock township council. We discussed among other things the redistribution aspect but also the rejuvenation of Beaverton harbour. Hopefully that harbour will be part of the government's beautification program and, in looking at the economic problems that exist, Brock township will be enhanced by having a good harbour in Beaverton.

When we talk about the press not coming to the fore on this matter, as I read the *Lindsay Daily Post* in my riding it starts out with an editorial that says: "John O'Reilly is right". For the press to say that in itself is something that strikes right at my heart, but I am opposed for two reasons: first, my riding is affected in a way that is not beneficial to it and, second, there is a great cost involved in redistribution.

The cost of adding six members of Parliament is something I think the Reform Party, and myself included, should look at very hard. Why would we want to add that kind of money? Why would we even think in these tough economic times of adding millions of dollars to taxpayers' expenses? I can understand