

chronic dimensions. However, I think I must continue, with faithful respect for precedents in the past, to regard economic problems as matters of a chronic nature and, therefore, unsuitable, in their very basic nature, to an application pursuant to Standing Order 26. Without some other special item or aspect—which does not occur to the Chair at the present time—I feel obliged to set aside the application for a special debate pursuant to Standing Order 26.

I do now leave the chair for the House to resolve itself into committee of the whole.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed, from Monday, December 5, 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. Laniel in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose at its last sitting, clause 6 was under consideration and an amendment of the minister had been presented to the committee.

On clause 6—*Exchanges of Property*

• (1532)

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, as we consider the three interrelated amendments which the minister tabled yesterday, I feel I should put one or two questions on them. As I read what the minister is now proposing, clause 6 will be amended as follows:

(b)(i) an amount received under a program that is a prescribed program of the government of Canada for the purposes of paragraph 56(1)(s)—

From that, it would appear that any prescribed program with respect to insulation could be taxed. Am I correct in that? Does it mean that the Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia insulation programs are likely to be taxed, in that they will be prescribed programs under this new section?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, on the first part of the amendment, the hon. member's interpretation is right. On the second part, the Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia programs will not be taxed because they are not prescribed.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, if the Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia programs will not be taxable as they are not prescribed, can the minister indicate if he has any other programs in mind that might be prescribed, other than the Canadian Home Insulation Program referred to in the income tax motion?

Income Tax

Mr. Chrétien: Not to my knowledge at this moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stevens: May I ask the minister why he did not bring some simplification to the act, in referring specifically to the Canadian Home Insulation Program, by using the wording in the income tax motion, rather than bringing in this piece of ambiguity speaking about prescribed programs which could presumably be greatly extended over the initial program that we understood from the income tax motion would be dealt with in this section?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, I understand there is a technical problem because the appropriate act has not been passed yet and we cannot describe it that way. That is why there is the difference.

Mr. Stevens: I take it that we have the assurance of the minister that, while the wording is a little ambiguous, the department has no taxation in mind at this time other than the taxation of the Canadian Home Insulation Program itself.

Mr. Chrétien: That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stevens: That would be the only prescribed program?

Mr. Chrétien: The hon. member is right.

The Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chrétien: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. There are consequential amendments to clauses 23 and 115(1). I do not know if the hon. member for York-Simcoe would be agreeable to make sure that the whole aspect of the bill is covered by what the House has voted on at this moment; and, of course, the New Democratic Party and the Social Credit party—

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, we have no reason to object to the minister's suggestion that we deal with the three amendments touching on the insulation question at the same time. Perhaps it would help save confusion when we come back to those amendments later.

The Chairman: Order, please. I have to object. Hon. members can only go from one clause to another and come back if there is unanimous consent. There is no way we can adopt an amendment unless the clause concerned is before the committee.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, I should like to move an amendment to clause 23(2). I would make a consequential amendment, and by unanimous consent go to subclause 115(1).

The Chairman: There is nothing to prevent the committee from doing that, and if hon. members agree, it will have to be done one by one. The hon. minister makes the proposal, and if it is accepted by the committee I shall call the amendment to subclause 6(5) and then by consent we will go to the two