

tabled in the House. I think that, with his experience in the House of Commons, he should have known that.

Furthermore, I said the story reported in the press was not accurate. I would like to point out that two factors were considered by the Director who set up the contest. First of all, penalty points were given to auditors who kept taxpayers' files for review, in their offices, for more than sixty days. I fail to see how this could harm the interests of the taxpayer. On the contrary, the auditor was motivated to finish his work quickly and to return the file as soon as possible to the businesses concerned who would need the papers themselves.

I will give another example, and I hope the Hon. Member will listen carefully. The auditors were also given penalty points when correspondence sent to taxpayers did not meet the standards of excellence set by the supervisor. Here again, we see the same concern for providing taxpayers with a good and quick service and for treating taxpayers like human beings. This is the exact opposite of the twisted picture the Hon. Member has given of the activity initiated by an audit director.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### LABOUR CONDITIONS

##### LIST OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE RECIPIENTS RELEASED TO PETERBOROUGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

**Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough):** Mr. Speaker, it was brought to my attention on the weekend that a list of the unemployed in the federal riding of Peterborough has been published and circulated to the principals of the eight high schools in my area. This list includes social insurance numbers, age, number of weeks on unemployment, number of weeks insurance was collected, along with addresses and names. The principals of high schools in my area, as a pilot test centre for Canada, have been asked to give back the lists of those people on the unemployment list.

I have here 11 sheets of a computer printout. These people are now being matched with the enrolments in the high schools in the Peterborough federal riding. Is this your policy? Did you, as Minister of Employment and Immigration, instigate this underhanded method of trying to disclose unethically the list of the unemployed in my federal riding of Peterborough?

**Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I heard of these allegations to which the Hon. Member has referred for the first time this morning. The allegations concern me very much if they turn out to be entirely accurate. I have given instructions to my officials to ascertain exactly what the facts of the situation are, and to report to me as quickly as possible. At the moment I am not in a position to confirm, deny, or comment on the allegations to which the Hon. Member has referred. I can tell him that I have instructed my officials to ascertain the facts and report to me as quickly as possible. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I will be in touch with him as soon as I have that information.

#### Oral Questions

#### NATIONAL REVENUE

##### DEPUTY MINISTER'S REPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Revenue which follows up on the question of the Hon. Member for Cambridge. Will the Minister inform the House whether his Deputy Minister, under any circumstances, reports in any fashion on any matters whatsoever through either the Prime Minister's Office or the PCO?

[Translation]

**Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, the Opposition House Leader ought to know that the Deputy Minister reports to his Minister.

[English]

**Mr. Nielsen:** I take it that the assurance he is giving the House is that the answer to my question is no.

##### PRIZES FOR AUDITORS

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the \$50 lunches a head per auditor that are set as the prizes for harassing taxpayers, can the Minister inform the House what the prize is if they nail a taxpayer and put him in jail? Is it a \$500 dinner complete with entertainment? What is the prize for putting a taxpayer in jail?

[Translation]

**Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member's question is so ridiculous it does not deserve an answer.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### FINANCE

##### THE BUDGET—TAX PROVISIONS AFFECTING OIL COMPANIES

**Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance on behalf of taxpayers who do not earn enough income to pay taxes. My question pertains to the half billion dollar blank cheque he has given to the oil companies in the form of windfall tax relief. PGRT legislation is currently before the House which would give in the order of a one-quarter million dollar return. In the Minister's Budget we are also considering the IORT suspension again which this year is \$190 million.

A few minutes ago the Minister said that a person would have to be a charlatan to say that something could be done to help the unemployed. When are we going to stop giving unconditional tax breaks to oil companies when there is no guarantee they will be passed through to consumers or that they will go into investments in Canada, and when the major multinational oil companies are the major beneficiaries and could just as well pass it through as dividends to their parent corporations, or invest it in the South China Sea? In short,