

Incorporated and the government's involvement with that company.

Another matter which concerns me, and in connection with which I may have been losing certain rights, is that prior to this session I put a series of questions on the order paper during the second session of this parliament which dealt with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, and in particular the Pembroke-Renfrew designated area. These were questions Nos. 2,559 and 2,623 in the second session of the thirtieth parliament.

On October 14, before the third session commenced, I received a telephone call from the office of the deputy minister of the department in which he suggested that the answers to these questions be made orders for return, on the understanding that the answers had already been prepared and that they could be tabled on October 20 or 21. On October 17 the questions were made orders for return, but they have not yet been tabled. I did not put my questions back on the order paper, in view of the undertaking given on the government side of the House, because I did not want to confuse the situation and have to wait another three months for a reply.

On October 27 I wrote to the office of the President of Privy Council, and on November 10 received a reply from his parliamentary secretary in which he indicated that those questions were not yet ready for tabling, in spite of the fact that I had been told by the Department on October 14 that they were. He indicated there was a translation problem; they had not been translated. We are now a long time past that date, and I am wondering when I might expect these answers. I have tried to co-operate by not confusing the order paper by placing the questions on again.

[Translation]

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, we will look into it.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### INCOME TAX ACT

#### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed, from Wednesday, November 30, consideration in committee of Bill C-11, to amend the statute law relating to income tax and to provide other authority for the raising of funds—Mr. Chrétien—Mr. Turner in the chair.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order. House again in committee of the whole on Bill C-11, an act to amend the statute law relating to income tax and to provide other authority for the raising of funds. When the committee rose yesterday, clause 6 of the bill was under consideration. Shall clause 6 carry?

On clause 6—*Exchanges of property.*

### Income Tax

**Mr. Crosbie:** Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this clause yesterday, so I will not take too much time provided we get answers to the points we are making. The minister was not here yesterday, but I imagine that this morning he read *Hansard* and knows the points which were raised. I want to put a few questions to the minister about the home insulation program. A provision in this clause makes taxable grants to people under the home insulation program in six of the provinces of Canada, namely, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia. These provinces have entered into an agreement with the federal government. I understand that today the energy ministers are meeting at a conference in Ottawa. The provinces other than Nova Scotia and P.E.I. are very upset at the program, in view of its discriminatory features, and they are proposing changes or perhaps a new program of their own. I further understand that Quebec and Alberta may now join the program. This means that eight provinces will be discriminated against, instead of six.

The point I am making is that under the program people in these six—or it may be eight—provinces who receive a grant to insulate their homes better, to a maximum amount of \$350, must add that to their taxable income. This is only one aspect of the discrimination of the program in the six provinces compared with the program in Nova Scotia and P.E.I. where the amounts are not taxable.

I am sure that the minister is not a minister of finance who wants to bring into this House discriminatory legislation. I do not think the minister wants to see taxpayers in Quebec, Ontario, Newfoundland New Brunswick and so on, treated differently from the taxpayers of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. I am, therefore, asking the minister if he will agree to remove this particular provision from clause 6, namely, subclause (5) which permits the government to carry out its announced intention of making the grants taxable.

I should like to see the home insulation program changed entirely, but I am not going to speak at length now because members from other provinces may want to speak on it. However, I do have a number of questions to ask, and the first is whether he will withdraw this discriminatory provision. I suggest it makes no sense. I cannot see any reason for the government of Canada telling recipients of grants in these provinces that they must add the amount to their taxable income and pay tax on it. Taxpayers of P.E.I. and Nova Scotia do not have to add their grants to their taxable income. I say it is an outrage. It takes my breath away. I find it so dumbfounding I can hardly speak. Indeed, I wish I knew another language to speak, such as Afrikaans or something, because I find this so repugnant and it is why the Canadian public must know about it.

Secondly, how much do the officials estimate they will get from this tax, in terms of revenue? For example, the program has been extremely unpopular. It started last January in the two provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. The new program in the other six provinces started on September 1. They all accepted with great reluctance. My information