

*Government Orders*

destroy our communities and rob many of our youth of their lives and if not their lives, their usefulness in life.

This bill should be soundly debated in the House on the facts. The time to raise the concerns the Bloc Quebecois have had, and they are legitimate concerns I might say, about too much regulation without notification of this Parliament is when it gets to committee. We did that in opposition.

Pharmacists and people who legitimately have to use controlled substances in their legal work should be heard from, but the place to do that is at committee.

I ask members on all sides to see this piece of legislation for what it is. It is not a big piece of legislation. I think there should be unanimous consent on the intent of the legislation. Let us work if there is a problem through the committee structure to make it a better piece of legislation so that our streets are a little safer after it is passed.

• (1315)

**Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the member has dulled his partisan tongue. If he had not dulled it I expect we might need an ambulance over here.

I would like to ask the member, since he spoke so eloquently about non-partisan comments on this specific bill, would he reflect back to the 34th Parliament upon the comments made by the Liberal members of the committee when they were reviewing this bill. I am sure he will know about that.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly do know about it. I want to say that the member is very fortunate, as are you, Mr. Speaker, to have lived through the last Parliament.

In the last Parliament things did work differently here. I think one of the reasons that the Reform Party has been so successful across this country is that it was a negative response to the way things were done here. One of the reasons the Liberals so successful in the last campaign is that we recognized that the Canadian public no longer would allow Parliament to work basically by fiat, by a small number of individuals and mandarins to make all the decisions, that consultation was not real, that it was phoney, and that bad legislation and special interest legislation got passed.

I think the member opposite and even you and I, Mr. Speaker, have benefited by the past government's excessive partisanship and lack of consultation when it came to legislative process. Some of us did try to make this a better place. I can say that in the last Parliament one of the few committees that did work effectively was the government ops committee led by Mr.

Holtmann, who is no longer a member here, and John Rodriguez, a New Democrat who was the NDP critic. We worked together with the groups there to try to come up with better legislation. I think we were a bit of a model in the way we were trying to do things.

The hon. member is right, there may have been some members in the past. We participated in the venue that was drawn for us by the government. We have drawn a different venue. We have put different rules forward. We allow members of this place to have their say.

I would urge the member not to live in the past, to look at the future, to look at reality. He will see that there is plenty of opportunity without falling into old patterns to allow members of all sides to have their say when it comes to formulating legislation.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to see the member who just spoke try to do a psychological analysis of the opposition's intentions, in particular regarding Bill C-7. However, I would like to remind him that when the Liberals were in opposition, they did exactly what we are doing.

As long as we think that a bill fails to reach its goal or is poorly written and is unclear and ambiguous, we will oppose it regardless of what the government says. I believe it is our responsibility, as the official opposition, to do so not only for Quebecers but for all Canadians. This bill is unclear and we oppose it in many respects. I will have later on the opportunity to dwell on a particular point.

But I am concerned by some statements made by the government members opposite regarding this bill. On February 15, the Solicitor General of Canada stated to the press that it was important to amend the Narcotic Control Act as well as some parts of the Food and Drugs Act in order to be in a better position to fight the cocaine traffic organized by the Warriors on the aboriginal reserves.

I would like to know if the member agrees with this statement and, if so, if it means that the present Narcotic Control Act does not provide any means to control that traffic? Does the member agree with this statement and, if so, could he explain why?

[English]

**Mr. MacDonald:** Mr. Speaker, it is the first time I have had an opportunity to respond to a question which is so specific that it deals with not just one region of Canada but actually with a very special people in Canada, the native community.