

*Government Orders*

Over the last few weeks we have seen their types of reforms. They give back cars but take 75 cents on the dollar from taxpayers to pay for their leader's car, haircuts, shoe shines, all the things they condemned us for. However I want to put that aside.

The Reform Party has fallen into the old patterns they so easily condemned. I have not seen them come in and support a government motion, except for maybe on one or two occasions, but not many.

This is a major piece of legislation. Surely to goodness there is some consensus that the government must move forward. It must simplify for law enforcement agencies and for the public the laws dealing with health and safety in our community. In this case it is Bill C-7 dealing with controlled substances.

This bill was before the last Parliament but did not get through for whatever reasons. Our government is holding true to our promises in the red book of coming in with progressive legislation and the changes necessary to respond to what Canadians want. They want healthier, safer communities.

Therefore we have come forward in the first few months of our mandate with a bill that was worked on in the previous Parliament. We did not think the bill was all bad so we have changed some of the things. We have modernized it again. We have tried to put some order into how we deal with some sections that without this bill are currently under the Food and Drug Act and the Narcotic Control Act.

I cannot think of anything that should bring more easy support from the Reform Party and the Bloc Quebecois. If anybody out there is watching, the Reform Party is the one that said everybody had to vote their conscience in this place.

I am not prone to attacking the opposition. I am getting a little fed up with their positions on things like this though. Every day they come into this place and they vote like robots when the government says it is coming in with a piece of legislation. They automatically all have. I cannot believe the Reform Party whip tells them how to vote because they told us during the campaign that was corrupt and bad. They must all be struck by some stardust in that each and every one of them every time a bill comes in finds it bad and they all vote the same way.

I wonder how their constituents who are really concerned about law and order feel about the hoist motion. For those out there watching we debate legislation in this place. We try to make the regulatory and statutory environment society works in a little better. We constantly have to try to modernize our legislation because our own morality as a society changes with time. It is interesting.

• (1305)

The hoist motion just proposed by the Reform Party in the amendment by the hon. member for Surrey North effectively says it does not want the House of Commons to deal with this issue. That is what a hoist motion does. The Reform Party came in with an amendment which, if passed, would hoist the whole issue of drugs, safe streets, crime as it relates to illegal and illicit drugs in our communities. We would not deal with it. That is what the effect of her amendment would be.

If there are any Reform supporters left after the last few weeks of revelations about internal party conduct of that party, I think the hair on the back of their necks should be bristling. They sent their members here to show this place could work differently and that members should support good legislation when it came before the House. More important, they did not want us to get into these games that they used to criticize. Members of the Reform Party criticized the games of Parliament well, such as hoist motions.

Now let us get real here with the Bloc Quebecois and also the Reform Party. Their mandate is to try to get some ink. They do not want the government portrayed in a favourable light because it is probably going to have some impact on their sagging popularity. I understand that. Opposition parties have to take that into account. I am a realist. We were in opposition and I know how the game is played. However, when we deal with these fundamental issues of safety and modernizing our legislation there should be some degree of consensus that we work together.

There is a red herring out there. There might be a cod with it because we cannot seem to find any of them on the east coast. A red herring has been thrown out a couple of times and I am not about to let it go by.

They are saying we cannot let this debate go on about the merits of the legislation, we have to talk about procedure. The real problem is that this stuff comes under the Criminal Code and should have been introduced by the Minister of Justice.

When it comes to cleaning up the streets in Dartmouth, I do not care if it is the janitor who introduces the legislation as long as it gets thoroughly debated and the impact on my community is that it is safer. If the people in Backwater Gulch somewhere are having a problem with drugs in their community, I do not think they particularly care who puts the legislation forward. So let us clear that one off the agenda.

If that is the biggest complaint they have maybe everybody in here will jump up and say they support the legislation. By the way, the Minister of Justice supports the legislation. Just because he did not move it does not mean he is opposed to it. Maybe that is what it was with Reform members and why they