

Government Orders

I cannot in any way support a bill like this. I have had probably in excess of 15,000 pieces of mail from my riding all saying: "You are our member of Parliament for Prince George—Bulkley Valley. We implore you to vote against Bill C-41 particularly against section 718.2" which attempts to categorize certain types of crime based on the categories that the Liberal Party wants there.

In response to the people who sent me here to represent them I will most assuredly vote against Bill C-41 and comply with the wishes of my constituents, something that the party opposite is not able to do.

Let me rephrase that. In all fairness there are members of the party opposite, and I apologize to them publicly now, who have had the guts to stand up and say, I am going to represent my constituency. That is what I was sent here to do. That is what I am going to do. I congratulate them and I condemn the whip. I condemn the Prime Minister for the things he has said about the people who have had the guts to stand up and vote in a democratic fashion representing their constituents.

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a lawyer. They may have taken the bounty off lawyers in the Reform Party but I have to rise to debate the comments that my hon. friend has made. I want to make three or four comments. I ask my friend to have a pen and paper handy to copy down some sections. Then perhaps he would make a comment or two.

I have a great interest in this bill, having studied it in the justice committee. I have been watching the debate. I note that the debate is going back and forth. Where is Her Majesty's loyal opposition in this debate?

The last person I saw speak was from the Reform Party, then back to my own party, then back over to the Reform Party and back to my own party. I do not see the Bloc Quebecois members standing up and talking about what they think is right, whether they are supporting this bill or whether they are not.

The justice critic stood up and said a few words. One Bloc member addressed one of the many sections of this bill. I say shame on a party that does not take its responsibility seriously as Her Majesty's loyal opposition.

I want to say something about the witnesses that appeared before the justice committee. I was a member of the justice committee that studied this bill. It is very true that what we would call the ordinary citizen, in other words, the person who might live on Grenoble Street in my riding did not have an opportunity to come.

The groups that appeared before the justice committee and gave evidence were in my view representative of all of the interests that were concerned with this bill and in my judgment at least put forward the arguments for and against various sections of the bill.

I do not think the Canadian people were deprived because each and every one of the members on that committee of all the parties took a certain approach at the justice committee and were able to ask the questions they felt were required based on how they want to represent their constituents.

• (2100)

I know a lot of the debate has centred on section 718.2. However, this bill has a lot of interesting principles in it and it deals with a number of things. We have had history lessons about Prime Minister Trudeau and who was the justice minister here and there. Let us find out a little bit about the Reform Party.

Section 730 deals with absolute and conditional discharges, which may be granted by the courts in certain circumstances. Does the Reform Party support absolute and conditional discharges, yes or no?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Wappel: Section 731 deals with probation. Does the Reform Party support section 731 and the concept of probation?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Wappel: Section 734 deals with fines. Does the Reform Party support the concept of fines as outlined in section 734?

What about section 738, dealing with restitution to victims of crime and in particular a proposal made that people who abuse their spouses should be ordered to make restitution?

I would like to know what the Reform Party's policies are in response to the very things that are in this bill on these points.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the hon. member. The answer to his last questions are yes, yes, yes, and yes.

However, here we have a bill that has a lot of similarities to Bill C-68 where it has some perfectly good legislation in it. At the same time, because of the way the Liberals operate, it has some terribly bad legislation in it.

This is just like Bill C-68, when we said: "Listen, why do you not split the bill. We will be glad to support you on the part dealing with stiffer penalties, but we cannot support you on the registration". We made amendments to this bill to try to delete some of the bad legislation that we thought was going to cause a lot of problems. It is interesting that so did some of the members over here. The government whip and the justice minister said no, it has to go through.

What is happening is that we are permitted to try to take out bad legislation here, which we have done. The member for Crowfoot made a ton of amendments to try to get this thing so it was acceptable by leaving the good parts and getting rid of the bad parts. I know the hon. member made a lot of amendments himself trying to do exactly the same thing.