

Income Tax Act

would have introduced into taxation administration most difficult problems, and that is why we did not employ that method. We finally concluded that it would be best to enact it for an indefinite duration and to indicate by the heading and otherwise that it is intended to be temporary.

Mr. Patterson: We have heard the minister say it would be difficult from the administrative viewpoint to make this tax applicable for one year. Nevertheless I suggest that in applying this tax the government will inconvenience many who will find it difficult to meet the increased tax. Had the first amendment which the hon. member for Comox-Alberni moved been accepted we would have supported it. We recognized from the reference in the legislation to "subsequent years" that the tax could be imposed in perpetuity. I agree with the hon. member for Comox-Alberni that it is contradictory for the government to enact a tax which will apply to 1968 and subsequent years and then claim it is only temporary.

We shall not fall into the trap set by this amendment. We do not want to help the government to sell this tax to the public. To prevent people saying that the opposition insisted on deleting the word "temporary" and therefore making the tax permanent we prefer to have the word "temporary" left in the legislation. We therefore oppose the amendment of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, there are a variety of offices in the cabinet in which the word "general" is used—Attorney General, Solicitor General, Receiver General and the like. After reading the bill and after listening to the Minister of Finance, and comparing his words with what the hon. gentleman has said on other occasions it seems to me we should change the name of his office to deceiver general. I say this because he has set out precisely to deceive the Canadian public.

It seems to me fairly obvious that the minister is acting in a deceptive way in trying to explain the intentions of the government with respect to this tax and that he is also showing clearly that he is disposed to treat his Bay street and corporate friends in a different manner from the way he intends to treat the general public. A couple of years ago he and the government introduced a special levy on corporations called a special refundable tax. The refunds carried interest and presumably

the tax was levied for a purpose similar to that of the surtax with which we are now dealing, namely, to help control inflation.

I point out that in the special tax proposal affecting corporations it was spelled out, because corporations are so friendly to the minister and undoubtedly he will be looking to them in the next week or two, if he has not done so already, to see whether he can find some sustenance to maintain an effective campaign, that the special tax was to apply only for a certain specified period and that it would be paid back with interest. The paying back with interest was another aspect of that tax. The first was that the period in which the special corporation tax was to be levied was spelled out precisely in the act; no subsequent taxation was involved. The minister guaranteed that his buddies in the corporate world would not be liable to pay the tax on an open-end basis. However, when it comes to dealing with the wage earners, the farmers and the ordinary citizens of this country the minister comes up with the concept that this special tax is to be imposed on a permanent basis.

The other aspect, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend from York South and my national leader, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, was that the special tax applicable to corporations was to be repaid after the government had kept the money for a certain period of time. But when it comes to the special tax levied on the people of this nation the minister has no intention of giving it back either with or without interest; it is to be made permanent.

It is noteworthy that the hon. member for Fraser Valley at least told the committee he would have supported the original amendment moved by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni, which would have made the tax applicable only to this current year. That is what the minister said would happen when he made a public announcement about this matter. I should also like to point out that when the hon. member for Comox-Alberni moved that amendment he indicated clearly what his intention was, and his subsequent amendment was put forward with the idea of finding out from the minister precisely what intention the government has in mind. However, if there is any doubt in anyone's mind about the attitude taken toward the whole tax structure as reflected in this clause he should pay attention when the vote is taken and see who votes for or against this taxing provision in its entirety. I would be