

1985 there will be a world oil supply problem. There must be a lot more conservation. I would like to see a lot more money put into this program, but the government's position at this time is very difficult. In any event, \$1.4 billion is a good start. I cannot see a more fair way of doing this than by giving the most you can, taking more from those who can afford it and less from those who cannot. Otherwise, the money would be much less. Those who cannot afford it will not be able to do it. They will be stuck with higher fuel bills. While this clause is not desirable, it is necessary and the government has to be supported in this situation.

I would like to hear some comments from members from the two provinces that have been mentioned with regard to how they feel about the necessity of the program put into effect in December of last year and February of this year. It was an absolute necessity. Those two provinces would have been bankrupt if something like this had not been done. I do not think the other provinces of this country have the same need. I agree they do have need. We do not discriminate against any province; we try to help each province with its special needs. This was a special need; therefore I will support what has been done under this program. I will give all the support I can to it.

Has the minister or the parliamentary secretary any indication whether the provinces of Quebec and Alberta are still considering coming into the program? I ask this because it would have some bearing on the cost to the federal government.

Mr. Lumley: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that discussions are taking place even at the present time with regard to those two provinces.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the previous speaker mentioned the number of the subclause which we are discussing. One of the comments I made in my earlier intervention in the debate on second reading was related to the complexity of the bill and the difficulty of finding, in this 225-page document, the matters of concern to my constituents. I was unable to be here during the past couple of days when this bill was being discussed. I came back to learn that clause 6 was under consideration. I then learned that the home insulation program was the particular matter under discussion. I had been raising matters under clause 6 which had to do with exchanges of property, the roll-over of family properties. I may be wrong in having considered that that is a matter treated in this section. However, in clause 6(2) there are certain definitions which have a bearing on the matter of the roll-over of properties, not necessarily corporate properties but family properties, farm properties in particular.

When I intervened on November 16 I asked a couple of questions. I would now like to get specific answers to those questions. I do not know whether the parliamentary secretary is in a position to answer or whether some of the advisers might be able to help him on this matter. Is any thought being given to providing an index or glossary for bills of this complexity so that anyone who has to go through it, whether it be

a member of parliament or a tax adviser, could find their way much more easily than at present, knowing exactly what elements are being covered? That is my first question. I have four more I would like to ask.

[Translation]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, I shall certainly look into the hon. member's suggestion. If I can help the hon. members of the opposition to understand the bill better, I shall be happy to do so. I personally find a legislative measure like this one very complicated and very difficult.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I find it difficult to follow the minister. There are some factors grouped together in one clause or in another. An index would certainly be very useful to all members.

[English]

The second question has to do with the specific matter of the taxation year. I am not sure whether it would be here, or whether I would have to look into the Interpretation Act, or where, but whose taxation year is at issue when we are talking about the exchange of a farm property? I am looking at page 4 of the bill, subclause (2) and the amendments under 13(4) which have been changed. Is this the taxation year of the government or of the individual who is making the return?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, it is the fiscal year of the individual, not the government.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I thank the minister for that answer. It does clarify it. At about line 25 or so it is stated:

—in his return of income under this part for the year in which he acquires, as a replacement for the former property, a property (in this subsection referred to as a "replacement property")—

There is a time element involved here. We are talking about a change of property from one that is now being used to one that will be used, the existing property and the replacement property. Is the time measured from the acquisition of the new property or is it measured from the time of sale of the old property? This is very important because there is a two-year averaging possibility in determination of the capital gain.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, it is in the income tax return after he bought his property.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Therefore, the sale of the previous property can be made, for determination of the capital gain, within the two-year period following the acquisition of the replacement property?

Mr. Chrétien: To qualify, the property must be real property and the replacement must be acquired before the end of the year following the year of the sale.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Yes, but this prejudices the issue of a change of property, that the sale must take place first and the acquisition follows, if I follow the logic of that statement. It is not always possible to do this. Sometimes the