February 19, 1968

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Chairman, further on the point of privilege, I should like to refer you to a precedent in the house when the Speaker referred to the bringing up of a question of privilege.

hon. member for Lapointe was The involved at that time. The Speaker said the question of privilege should be brought up immediately and he reminded him that he had not done so. I would also draw your attention to the fact that when I first brought up the subject the Minister of National Health and Welfare had the opportunity to defend himself. He passed it up, and when he finally got to his feet he did not state that he was in his place or in the house when the vote was called. All he said was that he left the seat he had been occupying to come over to congratulate the whip on winning the vote. He did not say he was here when the vote was called.

Mr. Tucker: Mr. Chairman, had I voted I would have voted for the bill.

The Chairman: Shall clause 6 carry?

On clause 6—Refund of tax.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, I have two minutes left in which to speak. When this measure was brought in it was brought in as part of a method of controlling the economy and, in particular, controlling inflation. At that time I objected to the way in which the minister had bound his hands with regard to the refunding of the refundable tax because, as will be recalled, the money was to be held for 18 months and could be repaid at the end of 18 or not more than 36 months. Now it is proposed that the 18 months provision be taken out and that the money be repaid not more than 36 months after the payment of the tax. It seems to me, if this sort of tax is to be of any value, that some discretion must be left to the government with regard to the time when they can re-inject the tax money into the economy.

At the time the tax was introduced I suggested that the minister had read rather carelessly reports of the measures that were taken in Sweden along similar lines. Had he read them more carefully he would have realized that in Sweden it is left entirely to the government of the day to decide in its discretion when such funds shall be re-inserted into the economy. May I call it six o'clock?

Income Tax Act PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at ten o'clock this day are as follows: The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), The Canadian Economy—steps to meet increase in cost of living; the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), Criminal Code—suggested amendments respecting representation by counsel; the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), Industry—possible change in criteria respecting designated areas.

It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

INCOME TAX ACT

The house resumed consideration in committee on Bill No. C-193, to amend the Income Tax Act—Mr. Sharp—Mr. Tardif in the chair.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order. When the committee rose at six o'clock it was considering clause 6 of Bill No. C-193.

On clause 6—Refund of tax.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose for dinner I was suggesting that the effectiveness of this particular piece of legislation as contained in the bill-that is to say, section 105J of the Income Tax Act-was rendered largely ineffective by the limitations that were placed upon the discretion of the minister with regard to refunding the amounts paid by those who qualified under the refundable tax scheme. It seemed to me that if this measure was to be of any use it would have to be left to the discretion of the minister when to return those funds to the economy. We were told that in large measure this was part of the government's policy in relation to the control of inflation. Presumably it was an economic weapon to control the economy.