

*Government Orders*

non-tariff barriers entering in to prevent a Canadian product from crossing the American border. Imagine this vast open market that we were promised. You go up to the border and you are stopped. You cannot take your product across the border to sell into that great open market that we debated for so long in this House of Commons.

The hon. member probably brought out a point indirectly that he did not realize. We must remember that the person who negotiated that deal and walked away from it was a long-term bureaucrat in governments in Canada. He should be ashamed of himself for having just thrown up his arms and walked away, not having looked after that part of the task.

The letter of the law. I think the letter of the law is important. I spoke about the way we should handle our finances and be very strict about that. I do not think the letter of the law should bypass common sense. I think what the hon. member was suggesting was that the bureaucracy of the law should not be a hindrance to the Canadian citizen in his or her efforts to be a successful business person or to move ahead in a venture in this country.

The hon. member talked about getting back to the basics. I think that is extremely important. I would just like to wind up my answers to him by saying that the spirit of the law has been a long-time tradition of this House. I think when you go back to try and nit-pick over the letter of the law, you are destroying the very spirit of Parliament itself. That is serious.

The hon. member talks about the bureaucracy producing a 400-page bill here dealing with about seven or eight different acts all in the same package. That really does destroy the spirit of Parliament itself. Members are sent here by their constituents to be legislators. You need to have layman's language as a guideline for a bill like this or any other legislation in this House. I am serious about this. I think there is nothing greater that could happen to the spirit of Parliament itself than to have bills written out in layman's language. They should not be allowed to be tabled in the House until that accompaniment of layman's language is with the bill.

If you do not do that then many people in this House will be voting on bills without fully knowing what is in them. With our strict parliamentary discipline system

here, members get up and vote the party line. I think we are going to have to loosen that up a bit in the years to come. There is no question in my mind about that, Madam Speaker. There are going to have to be rules brought in whereby governments can only be defeated under certain conditions and the members released to vote for the regions of this country. That is a very important unity question in my mind.

If members are not well informed about legislation that is going through the House, what you really end up with is executive type government in Canada. An executive type government means that cabinet governs. It lays down the regulations. It brings in the legislation. It gets the troops out to make sure they are here to pass that legislation, and the Canadian people are saddled with the work that we do within that legislation and the carrying out of the rules that go out accompanying it. My big concern is that as society gets more and more complicated and as tax systems get more and more complicated, then we are simply going to have a lot of members in this House who do not have the privilege of having a layman's statement at hand to read the bill and know what is in it. They could then get up and give a very intelligent speech.

• (1330)

I think there would be better speeches in this House of Commons if that type of work was going on. It is very important that people understand. It is very important that the legislators fully understand what is going on so that cabinet does not become the executive of the country by bringing in their legislation and bringing in the troops to pass it. The Canadian public is saddled with that legislation and members of this House are not really informed about what is happening right here in this House.

If there is anything we can do for the spirit of Parliament and the spirit of real democracy in this country, that is one thing that will produce it.

I want to thank my hon. friend from Broadview—Greenwood for that question.

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to enter into the debate on one particular section of this large piece of legislation. It has been