

Mr. Trudeau: You are quite right; I am reading too rapidly and perhaps I should slow down.

Mr. Lewis: Sir Ivor Jennings knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Trudeau: That is right, and I want some members to know, too.

I quote again:

The guillotine, whether formal or informal is... essential if highly controversial bills are to be passed through strenuous opposition in a reasonable time.

Mr. Lewis: Who will say what is a reasonable time, that is the point?

Mr. Trudeau: Reasonable men.

Mr. Lewis: On the treasury benches only.

Mr. Trudeau: The proposed new standing order 16-A makes provision for two kinds of bills; those that are not highly controversial and those on which there is a fundamental disagreement. The proceedings committee to be established under the standing order would include one member from each party. The proposal is designed to encourage participation and co-operation. It puts pressure on both the government and opposition parties to attend, and to strive for a unanimous recommendation from the committee to the house. My hope is that in most cases all the members of the committee would agree on such a recommendation.

But perhaps, Mr. Speaker, there is no point in being naive. There are bills, and there will be bills, on which the opposition will believe the government is fundamentally wrong and on which the government will believe that it cannot procrastinate. On such bills it would be unfair and unreasonable to insist that the opposition ought to co-operate. After all, the opposition, too, has its responsibilities.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you.

Mr. Trudeau: But I have not said it was always responsible, Mr. Speaker. When the opposition believes a government bill is fundamentally wrong, it should not be coerced by cries for co-operation. In such situations the opposition has a right to say to the government: "We think you are wrong. We hope that you will reconsider. If you won't change your mind, don't ask us to conspire against our principles. You are the elected government. If you think you must go ahead with

Motion for Concurrence in Report

your plans, don't ask us to subscribe to them".

Mr. Lewis: Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.

Mr. Trudeau: Virgil.

Mr. Lewis: That is right, Virgil. Don't be so nice to us.

Mr. Trudeau: The proposed standing order 16-A is meant to be nice to you; it anticipates being nice to you.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Lewis: Even the Prime Minister smiles.

Mr. Trudeau: Like the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, I smile even when I am serious.

This standing order would permit the government to present to the house a plan for dealing with a controversial bill, and it would permit the House of Commons to decide whether or not to accept that plan.

A good deal has been said by some members about reliance on full co-operation. I wonder if hon. gentlemen opposite have read the testimony on this very point given by Right Hon. Herbert Morrison in 1958.

An hon. Member: Who is he?

Mr. Trudeau: Somebody Ivor Jennings knew. The complaint had been made that the debates on the motion to set up a guillotine timetable were always predictable and dull, and lasted an entire day. Better methods of planning the work had been sought. Mr. Morrison was asked if a voluntary timetable could be adopted for all bills. His reply was emphatically negative. When leader of the house he said this:

I was genuine about wanting a voluntary timetable, and I would have been not ungenerous about agreeing time with the opposition, but the opposition took the view—and I understood their point of view—that this was a fight to the death, so to speak, and that therefore if they made a voluntary timetable, then at any rate the death element in the fight would be eliminated and in the eyes of their supporters inside and outside the house they would, so to speak, have compromised in the spirit of the battle against a bill which they regarded as a very bad bill and which we regarded as a very good bill. So the tendency was for the opposition not to agree to a voluntary timetable on such bills. But I do not see why we should not try a voluntary timetable over as wide a field as we can. It may enable the house to deal more expeditiously but nevertheless adequately with legislation; but I think you must have a provision whereby the opposition is not bound to agree to a timetable and even that it would prefer to be guillotined by the government—