

requiring Canadian participation. That is an excellent idea to which I am not at all opposed.

What I am opposed to is this vague thing introduced by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen). The minister knows, and this has been discussed in the House, that he has been placed in an impossible dilemma. He realizes the bill should include regulations. Where are those regulations? In order to have these regulations put into effect the minister has recourse to one simple expedient. He should withdraw the bill from the House and send it back to the committee. That committee should have on its membership the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway and one or two others from the other side of this House who could then assist in redrafting the bill so that it might be brought back into this House where it would then make sense and be safe for Canadians. The minister knows he is stuck with a bill that is unfair and destructive, and is stuck with a procedure that is undemocratic.

How can the Crown interpret the law for the purpose of achieving a direction which is against the literal meaning of the law itself? Of course it cannot, but that is in fact what the Minister of National Revenue seeks to do, and by doing that he abrogates to the government powers it does not now have. This is a very dangerous precedent. It is dangerous to the security of the public and it is dangerous to the sanctity of the law. Our lives are governed far too much now by regulation and, my God, we see examples of that every day in this House and every day in our offices.

The minister is faced with a *fait accompli* unless he withdraws this bill and allows those government members to support the motion by Simma. I am sorry, I really should not refer to her by name as that is not done in this place. I had made reference to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. We have such affection for that hon. member that it is very easy to address her by her first name.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Come over to this side where we love you.

Mrs. Holt: I like it here.

Mr. Brisco: As a relative newcomer to this House and to the system of things here I wonder quite frankly how much different and how much improved legislation would be if hon. members on the other side would listen to the reasoned arguments of their confrères. But no, as has been written into the context of the records here, like trained seals they pound their desks in approval or denial.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Brisco: Did the hon. member wish to ask a question?

An hon. Member: You have to say something before we can.

An hon. Member: And that is the longest speech you have made during this session.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brisco: May I continue now that these unreasoned interjections of the hon. members have ceased?

Non-Canadian Publications

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Order, please.

Mr. Brisco: This evening I had the opportunity of reading through the review of another publication, *MD of Canada*.

An hon. Member: Oh no.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is some way that hon. member referred to as "radar" over there could zip his lip? It would be different if what he had to contribute made sense. In any event, I had the opportunity of reading a review of *MD of Canada*, and I am sure the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Railton) is familiar with that journal. I recognize there is an amendment to look after these supposedly professional, agricultural, and trade magazines, but without accepting this amendment there will have to be other exceptions made. I suggest that we should deal with them all right now.

An hon. Member: Remember that phrase "from time to time".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Brisco: Either we deal with the whole thing now by taking this bill out of the House and sending it back to the committee where it belongs, or we will have to deal piecemeal with all these anomalies and odd situations which will occur as we progress. We will have to look after all these oddballs, these so-called loopholes with reference to these trade journals and professional magazines.

An hon. Member: To whom are you referring?

• (2150)

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, was someone addressing a question to me?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Mississauga (Mr. Abbott) rising to ask a question?

Mr. Abbott: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Since the hon. member referred to oddballs I wonder if he would identify to whom he was referring.

An hon. Member: There are too many of them.

An hon. Member: Don't take it personally.

Mr. Brisco: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member took my reference to oddballs as a personal affront. That is his problem, not mine. I shall continue with the debate. This afternoon I had the opportunity to review *MD of Canada*. I was very impressed by its international flavour and content, just as I would be equally interested in reading the cattlemen's magazine with its international flavour and content and its articles submitted by foreign authors not referring to things in Canada but things which affect Canadians, be it in medicine, agriculture, the beef industry, or whatever.

My concern is that somewhere down the line this type of journal will be affected if it cannot be favourably covered by the legislation. Finally, my concern is that I have more than five minutes to go. Surely there is another member over there with another question.