

*Supply—National Revenue*

the immediate past than there was in preceding years. This is a very difficult problem. Lawyers here know we go back to the definition of charities as laid down back in the time of Queen Elizabeth. The present minister as, I am sure, did all his predecessors, has attempted to define charities within the meaning of those statutes and has sometimes given them a very charitable interpretation.

I refer now to the question which the hon. member for Laurier raised with respect to lay-offs. I may say this about the temporary centre: there have not been many questions asked about it, and I thought that perhaps more attention would have been paid to it than has been the case. We have carried out a most interesting experiment this year by establishing in Ottawa a centre which deals with all the T-1 short returns recording incomes of less than \$20,000. That is something we have watched with great interest. It was an experiment.

**Mr. Benidickson:** Was it successful?

**Mr. Nowlan:** We brought in electronic devices. It is necessary because of the increasing growth of population. We hope to have this as a sort of pilot plant here and having ironed out the bugs, as it were, to use a slang expression, we hope to establish the system in other parts of the country. On the whole we think it has been very successful. We have not got the complete returns, of course, but what I am about to say will interest the hon. member for Laurier who was talking about reduction. Speaking now of Ontario, at the peak load on April 30 this year we had 60 less temporary employees than we had at the peak load last year. Of course, we had many temporaries employed here in Ottawa so in areas such as Sudbury the diminution in temporaries would be greater than it would be in the whole province.

As a result of having the work centred here our permanent employees in the various departmental offices were able to give much more time to assessing the problems there. We had our senior expert people dealing with the urgent problems rather than with routine assessments as was the case in the past. It has been a successful experiment. We have had difficulty, of course, in working it out in the first year but I think it reflects credit on the staff responsible for it, and on the deputy minister and the senior officials who planned it. I want to pay my tribute to them for it.

One thing which did result was that rebates and refunds were processed much more quickly than last year. We got hundreds of

letters of appreciation from people throughout the province. I think the only person whose enthusiasm about the speed with which rebates were made was somewhat tempered by other considerations was the Minister of Finance who found that the refunds were going out so fast that before the end of the year he was paying out more money in refunds than he anticipated. I do not want the financial critic of the Liberal party to hold that against the minister next year because probably next year the refunds will not be as great as a result of so many having been paid out so promptly this year.

**Mr. Benidickson:** Notwithstanding what has been said, has the minister got the capital and current costs of the system?

**Mr. Nowlan:** No, frankly, I have not. As I said, there were 60 less temporaries this year. The current cost was less than the cost of the administration throughout the province.

**Mr. Benidickson:** The minister was referring to Ontario only?

**Mr. Nowlan:** Yes. There was some capital equipment that we got from the electronic firms as my hon. friend knows. I am not sure what the cost was in that connection.

The hon. member for Port Arthur raised the question of assessors and I have dealt with that. He also raised the question of what he called legal patronage. This term "patronage" is one that rather intrigues me. I have not found any evidence of it in this place since I have been here. I thought it existed in some other fields. I doubt if that term can be justified in reference to the dealings of the federal government and certainly not in so far as legal counsel are concerned.

My hon. friend may recall a statement which was made by the Minister of Justice last year, I believe on his estimates, when he said and quite properly that he had to assume responsibility for the administration of justice in the trial of cases and when it came to cases going to appeal and cases in the superior courts of this country the Department of Justice and not the Department of National Revenue reserves and exercises the right to appoint counsel to handle cases where the Department of Justice feels this is justified.

I have the highest respect in the world for the legal staff of the Department of National Revenue. That staff is the permanent part of the department and could not possibly deal with all the cases and litigation with which we are confronted. We would have