

Income Tax Act

closure, by guillotine, by choking us off. I asked the Prime Minister a supplementary question: "Was he also speaking about exercising more control over Parliament, and did he have in mind the Senate as well?"

I am sorry the Minister of Finance has fled from his seat. The Prime Minister answered: "No, Mr. Speaker. I think he had in mind getting rid of some of the useless backbenchers in the opposition parties."

That is the view of the Prime Minister—get rid of the opposition parties and get rid of the backbenchers; they are nobodies. That is the way the government likes to govern, by eliminating the opposition. It is a shameful sight to see the Prime Minister of this country making comments of this kind about the House of Commons. To show that this is not just a flash in the pan, the Prime Minister was in Montreal over the weekend and made a speech there.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I usually oppose the slaughter of seals, but when I hear all this howling opposite I am inclined to change my mind. What did the Prime Minister say? I shall not quote. I shall only repeat what an article said:

Trudeau said the opposition parties called his government arrogant when it tightened up parliamentary rules, but weak and incapable of governing when its bills were debated for weeks in the House of Commons.

The fact of the matter is that both these come together. When you find a government that is weak and incompetent, it is arrogant. It is like an incompetent person who becomes a bully in order to get his way in the world in which he lives. That is the situation of this government. The government has imposed closure. It has brought about by closure the implementation of rule 75c, because it is weak, because it is incompetent and because it cannot operate a parliamentary government in the way it should. That is why this government has exercised its arrogant and stupid action of imposing closure. The Prime Minister has his priorities reversed because the government has been arrogant.

This goes hand in hand with the statement of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in Saskatoon, the statement of the Prime Minister that he must be master of the House of Commons and that members of the opposition parties are nothings, the statements of the Prime Minister in Montreal and in this House of Commons, and what the government has done in respect of this bill in imposing closure each week for two successive weeks, as well as the action of the Minister of Finance in finagling his way into the Senate to get this bill through at an early date.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Paproski: Shame on him.

Mr. Baldwin: The Minister of Finance knows that I am speaking the truth. What are the facts? When the guillotine fell last week there were more than 200 clauses and subclauses in this legislative monstrosity on which the question had not been put and which had not been discussed. That is the question which we had to face when for 3½ hours—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Mr. Baldwin:—this House had to sit here, subjected to the discipline of the guillotine, to have questions put on more than 200 clauses and subclauses in this bill, which had not been discussed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Baldwin: This is one of the darkest chapters in the parliamentary history of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friends opposite are behaving in exactly the same way as their predecessors behaved in 1956.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I might take this opportunity to invite hon. members to allow the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) to continue his speech. If hon. members want to contest some of the things that are said, I am sure that the House has all the time and they may rise to speak later.

Mr. Baldwin: I thank you for your protection, Mr. Speaker. I just want to follow on what my friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), said, that there will be a parallel to the pipeline debate, that next year the electors of this country will treat this government the way they treated the Liberal government in 1957. At the next election the brazen conduct of this government will not be disregarded.

This is a government which with utmost contempt and disregard for Parliament has fought for the passage of this measure, not understood and not considered, its implications far beyond the intelligence of the minister and his colleagues and certainly beyond the comprehension of the taxpayers of this country. Every taxpayer of this country will require at his side a tax expert in view of the intricacy of this bill. What did we ask? A simple request, an honest and realistic request, that this bill be divided, that part of the bill which we thought was reasonable on matters for which this party, other opposition parties as well as a few members of the government, have been pressing be passed and the rest of the bill not be implemented until a reasonable length of time had elapsed to permit there to be some comprehension of the bill.

Mr. Benson: It simply means you never read it.

Mr. Baldwin: The Minister of Finance said it was not administratively possible. I repeat what I said in the House last week, that any group of people comprising the minister and his advisers who had the deviousness to incorporate between the four corners of one bill the monstrosities which are envisaged in this bill should have no difficulty at all in making those administrative and legislative changes which would have permitted delay of those parts of the bill which we suggested should be delayed until some time next year. It was only an excuse.