

Government Orders

Mr. Telegdi: Madam Speaker, I was not referring to a member with that word. I was referring to an action.

Let me expand on it a bit. The Reform leader promises to do things differently. He makes a great show by taking the keys to a five-year government car and turning them back in. Then we find out about the situation where that party is providing the individual with a \$30,000 suit allowance.

We are told that on this side we are ruled by a dictatorial Prime Minister. Let us not forget the code of ethics the leader of the Reform Party was going to impose upon members of the Reform Party dealing with how many drinks they could have, whom they could have dinner with—of course not with members of the opposite sex—and on and on.

Let me say that the Reform has shown itself to be a warmed up version of the social credit which has a long illustrious history. Let the Reformers say, when they attack appointments by prime ministers to the Senate, that the father of the present leader of the third party was appointed to the Senate. I have not heard criticisms on that.

Be that as it may, let us look at the policies. Gun registration was mentioned. The fact of the matter is that this party supported gun registration because the people of Canada wanted it and it was good public policy. We are not captives of the religious right in the country.

Mr. Morrison: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member would classify a non-believer as I am as being part of the religious right.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry but that is a matter for debate.

Mr. Telegdi: Madam Speaker, much was made about doing what our constituents want us to do. Members of the third party repeat that as their mantra. That is what they are going to do. They are going to represent their constituents. They have 1-900 numbers where they encourage the public to call in to voice their views so they can be represented.

Then we had some members of the Reform Party standing during the gun debate and saying that they did not believe in polls. The leader of the Reform Party said that he would not take a poll on the issue because it was too difficult for the public to understand. He made references to how support was changing but he was not going to listen to the constituents.

Another bill we dealt with mentioned by the member was Bill C-41. It deals with trying to make sure that hate crimes are dealt with harshly. Of course there was no support on that.

Let me just relate a very small incident regarding the present bill before us.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but the time for questions and comments has almost expired. Perhaps he would like to give the member time to respond.

Mr. Telegdi: The hon. member of the Reform Party who took my seat on Waterloo council moved a motion that the proposed redistribution debate should not stand. Not only did that person do it, the former Reform candidate, but every municipal councillor of every political stripe in the regional municipality of Waterloo unanimously said that. That community unanimously opposed the proposal. That is what the bill is all about. I am glad it is addressing that.

• (1220)

How can the Reform argue against listening to communities representing all political stripes and being unanimous in their stance?

Mr. Schmidt: Madam Speaker, there are three responses. First, it would be very beneficial for the member who has just spoken to read the code of ethics of Reform Party MPs. He would be rather severely chastised by the content of that ethics statement for the words he used. He needs to examine very carefully his facts before he makes statements such as the ones he made.

Second, with regard to representing the people of Okanagan Centre, I stand here as I stand there to represent all of them whether or not they voted for me. The issue is not one of representing Reform Party members only. It never was. It is not now and it will not be. I was elected by the community. The member ought to be very careful about the kinds of statements he is making.

With regard to the third aspect of being captive of the religious right, there has not been a more irresponsible statement than that one in the House since I was elected as a member. No religious right has the dominant power within or without or in support of the Reform Party of Canada. It represents all people to the degree that they identify with the principles the Reform Party stands for.

It is for virtue and truth that the House ought to stand. That is what the Reform Party stands for and that is where we need to put our mark.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Madam Speaker, we are debating today the amendments that have been made by the Senate to the boundaries redistribution bill.

Boundaries redistribution is a way of redrawing the federal ridings or constituencies that we belong to as voters and in which we vote. We elect representatives from these ridings to the Canadian Parliament to represent our wishes, our interests and our concerns and to be our liaison with what is happening in the federal government. Because population shifts and growth take place from time to time, the boundaries of our constituencies from which we democratically elect representatives to govern us have to change.