

you live in Ontario, your house has to be built before 1921, and if you live in Newfoundland it has to be built before 1941. In Newfoundland, only 25 per cent of the houses are eligible, apparently, in the pre-1941 category. Second, if you want to get a grant you have to apply to Montreal. The province of Quebec is not even in this scheme. Even though they refused to be in the scheme, it is administered by CMHC from Montreal. You have to call the CMHC office in Quebec and deal with them, if you want to participate in this program. That is not a convenient or proper centre to have it administered from, particularly in view of the fact that Quebec is not even in the program.

● (1752)

Third, and this is another major discrimination, the program lays down that in six provinces, not Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, only two-thirds of the expenditure on insulation materials is refundable, up to a maximum of \$350. The maximum you can get if you want to better insulate your home and you do not live in Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island is \$350 maximum or two-thirds of what you spend, up to \$350.

In addition, only certain specified insulating materials may be purchased. You cannot just purchase whatever you want in the way of materials. However, if you look at the Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, scheme number one, as I said, the subsidy is not taxable. Number two, it can be spent on any insulating material. You are not restricted, in Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, as to the kind of insulating material you buy. You are only restricted if you live in the non-Liberal provinces. If the people in your province had the audacity to vote against the Liberals provincially, then you can only spend on certain insulating materials. If you live in Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island you can be covered for any insulation materials, including windows and storm doors. You can get up to \$500 if you have the work done by a contractor, or up to \$350 if you do the work yourself. However, if you live in Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario or British Columbia, you only get \$350. If you go to an outside contractor, tough luck: you will get \$150 less if you spend the maximum than if you are lucky enough to live in the Liberal provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

Has legislation of this type ever been introduced into the House before? I do not think so. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has been 35 years in parliament today, or some fantastic number of years like that. I hope he is here another 35.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: I think he will have a little celebration later. When I conclude my remarks, I would be interested in hearing from him whether he ever came across this kind of discriminatory legislation before, in his long experience in the House. His province of Manitoba is one of the provinces being discriminated against.

There is another area of discrimination. In Newfoundland, for example, a house owner has to spend \$525 to get a federal

Income Tax

grant of \$350, and then he has the \$350 added to his taxable income. However, if he lives in Nova Scotia he only has to spend \$350 to get \$350, and he has nothing added to his taxable income. The President of the Treasury Board is here now. He looks as if this is the first time he has heard about it. I do not think the minister understood that such a discriminatory program against the interests of the people of northern Ontario went through the cabinet. He could not have been there that day. I am sure he will strike a blow for the people of northern Ontario and his district and have this discrimination taken out of the bill. If not, the people of Port Arthur might ask him: How are you representing our interests in the House of Commons, in cabinet and in government, when you permit this to be done to us?

What are some of the other areas of discrimination? I have given some of the worst. The Newfoundland government accepted the program. Do hon. members remember the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources telling us how enthusiastically this program was received by the eight provinces? I do not say it was deliberate. I do not think the hon. gentleman knows what he is doing, in any event. In fact, there was a report in the *Ottawa Journal* the other day to the effect that he does not like to be briefed because he does not want to know what it is all about when asked questions. He is like the Minister of National Revenue; I will not say he deliberately misled the House, but he got up in this House and said—

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I suggest that the hon. member get back to clause 6 which is under discussion.

Mr. Crosbie: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources introduced this program with which we are now dealing. That gentleman has, as a feature of his program, that the grant should be taxable in the eight provinces of Canada outside of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. He is the same minister who said that the eight provincial governments were overjoyed with this new program. We now know that Alberta and Quebec did not even accept it. Premiers and ministers from every other province are now protesting against this program. This is something we should vote against. It is tax legislation that is not equitable. It is not fair. It discriminates against every resident of Ontario, Quebec, Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. It discriminates against them in favour of residents of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

I support the program being non-taxable in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. That is right and proper. What is the point of trying to help people, presumably of below average income, insulate their homes in order to have better energy conservation, if you are going to give them a grant on one hand and make it taxable on the other? The program in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island is a proper one. However, that means we should not be taxing those who get grants in the eight other provinces of Canada. Why should they be treated differently from someone who lives in Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island?