

Supply

from the standpoint of the Official Opposition, I can almost understand why they would want to stretch the debate over a month or a month and a half; after all, if 15.5 million Canadians are involved, it has to include just about every voter aged 18 or more. If they manage to make all voters believe that the Canadian Government indiscriminately fires at them to hurt them at random, they will probably gain a few votes. But the one thing that the Official Opposition forgets is that the first beneficiaries of the taxes collected by the Canadian Government are their own colleagues who head the provincial Governments. They are the first-line beneficiaries of some of the taxes collected by the Government of Canada. And if it were generally true that Canadians are given a hard time by Revenue Canada, and I do not believe they are, then the provinces, as beneficiaries, have not heard a word about it from their people. If that were the case, it would mean that those provincial Governments are simply not doing their job. Either they listen to their people or they do not. That being so, their colleagues sitting here across the floor are convinced that they do not relate the facts as they are, or else they are trying to make political hay. One or the other. Does the Ontario premier know what is going on in his province or are the Conservative members from Ontario trying to score political points with individual cases? They could perhaps tell me, Mr. Speaker, because I do not know. In my Lac-Saint-Jean constituency, for example, I must say that taxpayers would rather deal, and I say it openly, with the federal rather than the provincial Department of Revenue. They are kinder and more understanding, which is greatly appreciated, and it is easier to appeal decisions. The statements are sent with more information when necessary and the federal tax is lower than the provincial. This is already a lot. It is strange, is it not?

Those strong criticisms against the Department of National Revenue in the English-speaking provinces cannot be found in Quebec where the same problem does not exist. I would be lying if I told you that a great many visitors come into my office to complain about federal tax officials. I will even add that for us, in the Lac-Saint Jean constituency, there is a new dimension to the Department of National Revenue.

Thanks to a Government which wanted that Department to be humane, two important events have occurred in my constituency and the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area since 1980. Firstly, an office of the Department of National Revenue was opened in Chicoutimi thus allowing tax collectors to be near the people and get to know them better. Taxpayers can go and see those responsible for the implementation of the legislation, have discussions with them, analyze problems, get acquainted more thoroughly with the legislation and ask questions. Services have been made available free of charge to all non-profit corporations and special advisors can help them to file their income tax returns. In addition, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of regional development and to try to help all Canadians to take advantage of a collection system, the Canadian Government,

in spite of the fact that in 1979, a Conservative Government decided to alter the decision and to put a stop to the project already under way, built in Jonquière a Tax Data Centre which since the beginning of 1983 has hired over 400 people over 20 per cent of whom are from my own Lac-Saint-Jean constituency. Thus, many young Canadians could enter the civil service in the Department of National Revenue, without becoming gansters or torturers and I can tell you that nobody hates them for this in the Lac-Saint-Jean constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in this House we should rather deal with important national issues and plead the case of our own constituents; but we can do it also in our own office with the minister and the Government and all those whose role it is to help Canadians and give them all that is needed for their development and freedom. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order! Questions or comments.

* * *

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like at this time to indicate to my colleagues in the House what the business will be in the coming days. I have already advised my colleagues, the House Leaders in the Opposition, that tomorrow we will be resuming debate on Bill C-3, the Canada Health Act. The back-up Bill, if need be, will be Bill C-7.

I would like to designate Monday as an Opposition day. Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of next week I would like to designate as the fourth, fifth and sixth days of debate on the Speech from the Throne. This is all subject to change, as usual.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLYALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—
TAXATION

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Beatty:

That this House condemns the Government for its contempt for the taxpayers of Canada, which it demonstrates by the creation of a taxation system in the form of the Income Tax Act that is increasingly incomprehensible for individual taxpayers and, by its failure to end capricious and unfair practices of the Department of National Revenue.

And the amendment thereto of Mr. Riis:

That the motion be amended after the words "individual taxpayers" by inserting the following:

"and which favours big business and upper income earners at the expense of small business and average working Canadians."

Mr. John Gamble (York North): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to deal with the motion which my