

is included to allow, for instance, for the precise problem raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West and, within reasonable limits, I suggest the rules do allow for the inclusion of new items, particularly if they do not involve major matters of policy or increases in the tax burden. I am willing to submit this material either by tabling it or as part of my remarks, or, as the hon. member suggests, by making it an appendix to *Hansard*, with the consent of the committee.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I take it I have consent.

There are, in total, 39 clauses or subclauses in question. Of these, 15 might be considered consequential. Eight of the clauses are corrections to the French version of Bill C-259, the earlier tax reform bill. The remaining 16 clauses are technical changes involving no alteration in policy. Virtually all of them are relieving in their effect. A number of the clauses are intended to clarify the operation of particular sections of the act or of the application of rules. In a few instances it has become apparent that a particular section or subsection is redundant. Therefore, the bill proposes to eliminate it. For example, I refer to clauses 2 and 70(1). In another case, clause 82, there is an extension of the filing date for an election to be treated as a public corporation. In some cases obvious anomalies of a purely technical nature are corrected: for instance, clauses 3, 5 9(1), 21 and 89.

• (1600)

In a sense, most of these 16 clauses or subclauses can be said to be consequential amendments, except that they are not consequential upon the amendments proposed in the ways and means motions of March 29, 1973; rather they are consequential upon the provisions of the Income Tax Act and the income tax application rules themselves. These 39 clauses or subclauses were not mentioned in the ways and means motions because they were of a purely technical dimension and do not involve any important changes in policy nor any significant change from the existing act. I wanted to clarify that for the committee in view of the point raised on second reading by the hon. member for Edmonton West.

As to this particular clause—

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Chairman, may I put a question on that to the minister? Could he tell the committee, either now or later, how many of these amendments in the bill constitute an attempt by the government to comply with the statement made by the former minister of finance to the Senate committee? The minister will recall that when Bill C-259 was in its final stages in the other place, in order to accelerate passage of the bill through the other place the then minister of finance appeared before the Senate committee and admitted that Bill C-259 did require a number of very important changes, both remedial and mechanical. Indeed, the minister will know from the experience of the government that there were certain defects in that bill which we drew to the attention of the House, and this was followed by this admission made to the Senate. The minister of finance at that time said that these changes would be made and would be brought forward "next spring", meaning the spring of 1972. There-

### Income Tax Act

fore, may I ask him whether Bill C-170 is, to any extent, the implementation by the government of the promises the former minister made in the other place?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to give the committee a precise list. I am advised that, to the best of our knowledge, we have fulfilled all the commitments made by my predecessor in the other place, but I shall be glad to furnish further details to the committee.

**The Chairman:** Before discussion continues, may I ask the minister whether the analysis of clauses which was sent to the Chair is the material to be printed as an appendix to today's proceedings?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Chairman, I think that was the general feeling of the committee.

**The Chairman:** Then that can be done when Mr. Speaker is back in the Chair.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Chairman, as to the specific clause before the committee, this amendment makes a relieving change to the provision of the act that deals with determination of the reasonable stand-by charge for the use of an automobile in cases where an employee is furnished with an automobile for personal use by his employer. Relief goes primarily to salesmen in automobile dealerships and there is also some change to the wording for sake of clarity. The hon. member for Edmonton West had the general sense of it.

**Mr. Ritchie:** Mr. Chairman, may I just ask the minister a question. Every car would carry a different charge, depending on its make and value. As most of the automobile dealers have suggested, their accounting departments would have obviously an impossible task in view of the number of different prices. The price would differ monthly or even daily, since a salesman could have a different car every week or month.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Chairman, I believe this does meet the problem that the automobile dealers put to us. The salesman has the option of taking three-quarters of the actual charge or of taking three-quarters of the averaging of all the demonstrators in the dealership. Depending on the accounting facilities of the employer, he can now do it either way.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 2.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Chairman, I have a note on this particular clause. If one traces through the effect of the amendment to see what it means, one is taken to section 12 of the act, first of all. This amendment goes to subparagraph 12(1)(e)(ii) and all that is being dropped is a reference to subsection 20(7). Section 12 deals with amounts to be included in income from business or property. This amendment removes subsection 20(7), which in itself is a listing of reserves to be included in income. We then go to section 20, and the chief heading is "deductions permitted in computing income from business or property".