

### Supply

—a meeting yesterday between union and senior Revenue Canada officials ended with a joint statement saying both sides are satisfied there is no quota policy within the department. Union representative Gordon Gillespie said he is satisfied that the practice has stopped in cases where local managers have used quotas.

● (1610)

#### Further on the article stated:

Mr. Gillespie, president of the 13,000-member taxation component of the Public Service Alliance of Canada, said he is satisfied quotas have never been a Government policy.

"There's no deliberate policy of Revenue Canada to go out and harass taxpayers," he said.

Mr. J. R. Robertson, Director-General of the Department's compliance division, said, according to the article:

"There are supervisors who are more off-the-line and aggressive on their own."

#### He went on to say:

—the department's position has always been that it is impossible to set quotas on how much money auditors should recover in a given time period because they have no control over the files they receive.

The Minister has gone one step further with his announcement in the House today to the effect that he is initiating a study of procedures in his Department. That is worth noting. He is going to look at the adequacy of the Department's services and at its sensitivity, particularly in the areas of auditing and assessing. A press release notes several areas where the Minister intends to study the Department's activities, its organizational arrangements, its operating policies, communications, management information systems, operating procedures and standards, and training and management programs. The Minister has recognized an isolated problem and has had considerable help and advice on it from the Opposition. I am sure he would prefer it had been offered more quietly, but he took that advice and moved to stop the activities of some over-zealous individuals in his Department. He heard what ordinary members of the Liberal caucus and those across the hall had to say. He paid attention to our advice to him and has initiated a study of areas where the Department can be improved. To this end he has asked an impartial person from the outside to look things over and give an opinion. He has stressed that the report will be given to him in stages for immediate and speedy action.

There have been problems with the quota system, and they are especially important in a democratic society where we have to respect the rights of the individual and to respect due process. It is the job of the MP to be sensitive to people who are trampled on or abused. We not only need a good system, as the Minister has undertaken to provide, but we also need the input, sensitivity and individual attention that ordinary Members provide. In my opinion, that is the crux of this whole matter. We have seen the House act properly and we have seen the Minister act properly. As a result of that, we will see an improved Department and greater sensitivity on the part of public servants to their responsibilities and to the people they serve.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Hon. Member. I wanted to put it to the Minister this morning but was denied the opportunity by the refusal of the Liberal side to have the questions extend for two or three minutes.

In 1976 a ranch family in my riding filed tax returns and was assessed. I believe the taxes were paid. A little later a reassessment was done by Mr. Peter Ruzman, who levied no additional tax. Some months later the 1976 returns were again reassessed, this time by a Mr. David Innis, and this resulted in the levy of thousands of dollars in additional taxes. A reassessment of the reassessment of the assessment was then made by Mrs. Kay Thompson who found that only half the taxes assessed by Mr. Innis on the second reassessment were proper.

In other words, we had the first assessment, then a reassessment by Ruzman who found no additional taxes due, then a reassessment by David Innis who found thousands of dollars of additional taxes due, and then another reassessment of the reassessment of the assessment by Mrs. Thompson who said that Mr. Innis was wrong and only about half the taxes should have been levied.

Does the Department condone this type of harassment? Every time there is a reassessment the Department requires a guarantee, so you go to the bank and pay additional money for the guarantee assuring that you will pay any taxes that are levied. This is unfair. These reassessments, reassessments, reassessments destroy confidence in the Department. When are we to know it is finalized when reassessments are ordered as is illustrated in this case?

**Mr. Fisher:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but I am not going to comment on that case. I congratulate the Hon. Member for his concern. I have heard him raise other tax issues in the House. He is obviously an eloquent and concerned spokesman for his constituents and that is his job, but I do not think this is the proper place to discuss that kind of individual case. I urge the Hon. Member to send the information to the Minister and to deal with him privately, as he should.

**Mr. Crosby:** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Hon. Member's speech. I understood most of what he said but I found some of his points somewhat obscure. The allegation is that officials at Revenue Canada have been guilty of unfair practices in the past and that there ought to be a reaction to this problem and action taken.

Is the Hon. Member saying that there were no unfair practices? In that case he would defend wholeheartedly the officials of the Department. Or is he saying that there are unfair practices but that nothing should be done?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** The Hon. Member for Mississauga South.

**Mr. Fisher:** Mississauga North, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) is a Tory and a great man; I am not a Tory nor a great man. I live in the north quite happily.