

[Translation]

If there are valid arguments against the proposed reforms, let them be expressed clearly for the greater benefit of the members and the Canadian public. Once the pros and cons of the matter have been expressed and debated, the matter must be settled rapidly by the vote of the representatives of the people.

If obstruction is made solely for the sake of obstruction, if it is decided to delay the vote for political ends, the very foundation of parliament stands in danger of being undermined. Of course, it is the duty of parliament to see to it that the opposition can express its point of view. But no one should forget that parliament can only fulfil its role by reaching decisions within a reasonably short lapse of time, even in controversial matters.

[English]

Worse still, those who would extend the present debate indefinitely have misjudged the temper of the Canadian people.

● (9:10 p.m.)

I know, Mr. Speaker, that no hon. member will claim his constituents have elected him to frustrate the work of parliament, to stall, to obstruct, and to bring this institution into disrepute.

Surely the members of all parties must agree that if parliament is to play an effective role in the contemporary world we can no longer afford a repetitious filibuster of five or six months on a single issue. In this session we have already allowed three months to go by and only passed nine measures. We should not spend a substantial part of this session wrangling fruitlessly over rules of procedure.

Some hon. members of the opposition have talked of closure. A filibuster is a form of closure. It is a device for invoking the closure of neglect on some measures which must be dealt with later in this session, and the closure of exclusion on others which we may never reach.

If we learned a single lesson from the election, it is that the Canadian people are impatient for reform.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Not only are they impatient for reform in the legislation of this house, Mr. Speaker, but they are impatient for the reform of this parliament and of this house. They did not elect us to take part in a marathon of oratorical endurance; they expect us

*Motion for Concurrence in Report*

to revise our rules with all deliberate speed and to get on with the business of this house. Mr. Speaker, if we respect the will of the people, if we value the institution of parliament, we must debate these proposals fully, and, having done so, make our decision on them.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, we learned something else during the last election. About 55 per cent of the people of this country took a good look at the right hon. gentleman, heard what he and his colleagues had to say, decided they did not like what they heard, and called for hon. members on this side of the house to speak for them. And we intend to speak for them.

As the right hon. gentleman has said—and we on this side of the house agree with him; my leader has indicated he agrees, as have the hon. gentlemen for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and Shefford (Mr. Rondeau)—this is indeed an important issue, probably the most important which will come before this house this session, or even before this parliament. But who is there in this house who, speaking honestly, would not say that if proposed standing order 16-A had been in effect when this session commenced we should now be facing a limited period of debate to deal with this serious measure which is now before us? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the intent of the Prime Minister and his colleagues in proposing the adoption of the standing order is such that, if the standing order had been previously adopted, the time we would have had to deal with this matter would indeed have been extremely limited.

The right hon. gentleman suggested that a filibuster has been indicated by hon. members on this side of the house. I reject that imputation out of hand. We have indicated that we understand and accept the seriousness of the issue; we accept the responsibility of our position and are prepared to debate it. We are so adamantly opposed to this measure that we intend to fight it because it should not, must not and cannot be imposed on this house as a rational measure of debate from now on.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Baldwin:** When we talk of responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, we must bear in mind that the government has an international obligation which will compel it to pass an anti-dumping measure before the new year. In a sly and surreptitious way it has been postponed until the end of this debate in order

[Edwards, 1968]