

that the only response from the Government is to see that there is a major reduction in the fleet, anywhere from a 25 per cent to 50 per cent reduction in the fishing fleet in British Columbia, which will mean massive unemployment in one industry that up until now has been practically regulated out of existence.

In view of the Minister's concern, or professed concern, about unemployment in Canada, and that in British Columbia there is already 13.6 per cent unemployment, will he commit some funds in his Budget of next week in order to protect those jobs in the fishing industry, or at least provide alternate job opportunities for fishermen in British Columbia?

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of representations in that regard. Obviously, I will consider my friend's expression of views as a further representation. I would like to remind him, however, that the source of funds does not only come from budgets. It mainly comes from estimates which will be tabled before the end of this month. At that time my friend will also be able to assess how much money the Department of Fisheries and Oceans will have available this year, and how much money will be available in British Columbia in particular.

I quite recognize with him that there is a serious problem in the fishing industry in British Columbia. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has addressed this problem extensively in the last several weeks and months. I hope further steps will be taken later on.

**Mr. Miller:** The Minister will be aware that his counterpart, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, is not with us today and that some of these questions could more aptly be put to him.

#### SALMONID ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

**Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, the latest document from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to the Minister's Advisory Council recognizes that in 1984, 1985, and 1986 there will be major reductions in the amount of chinook and coho available to the fishing industry. As a result there will be a loss of employment despite whether or not there is a buy-back program and a reduction in the fleet.

Would the Minister assure the House and the fishermen of British Columbia who are with us today that he will give full support to any recommendations which the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans proposes to him, in view of the necessity of increasing the Salmonid Enhancement Program and the employment opportunities that program could offer to British Columbians?

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I think the record of the last ten years in particular clearly indicates that the Government has played a part, very much a part, in the welfare of fishermen and of the fishing industry. A number of steps have been taken, both on the East Coast and on the West Coast, over the last 10 years or 15 years. As a matter of fact, we have taken some quite recently on the East

Coast. My friend can be assured that the representations made by the fishing industry and by fishermen on the West Coast will be given most careful and most sympathetic consideration.

**Mr. Miller:** As a supplementary—

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West.

\* \* \*

#### NATIONAL REVENUE

##### REPORTED CONFISCATION OF CHILDREN'S BANK ACCOUNTS

**Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue. According to reports of statements attributed to the Minister, he said, "people facing financial problems because they are being pursued for back taxes are getting what they deserve". Do Canadians deserve to be telephoned at 6.30 a.m. with a demand that they have \$34,000 in hand for the Department within seven days? Do Canadians deserve to be harassed into a state of mental depression? Do Canadian taxpayers deserve to have their children's accounts confiscated by Revenue Canada? Specifically, is it true that Revenue Canada has confiscated bank accounts of children in order to pay the income tax reassessments of their parents? If so, does the Minister condone this practice? If not, will he bring the practice to a stop forthwith?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[Translation]

**Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on the words quoted by the Hon. Member. I said in an interview that, when a taxpayer is in a financial bind because some of his assets have been seized by the Department of National Revenue, in most of the cases I examined it was because the taxpayer had been guilty of gross negligence in failing to respond to repeated requests by the Department, after having been given numerous periods of grace. Considering the provisions of the Act and the fact that, the taxpayer's negligence in responding to the Department unfortunately led to such restrictive or Draconian measures being taken by the Department, it was because the taxpayer had neglected to communicate with the Department to explain what the situation was, whether it was difficult, or to indicate how soon he was prepared to pay his taxes.

The Hon. Member is now referring to a news item which mentioned the fact that a child's bank account was seized. I obtained some clarification on this particular case. The taxpayer's bank made the mistake, because the taxpayer's son whose account it was had the same name as his father. The bank explained the mistake was theirs and they had taken corrective action.