

Supply—National Revenue

receive praise. I do appreciate it, having served in the office for some three and a half years, and I want to express appreciation of what hon. members have said on behalf of the staff.

I might say that another deputy minister here, not too long ago, was marking down those who were tendering praise to him because he said he was sure they would be coming to his office with requests. I am sure this does not apply to those who have been bestowing praise on the income tax division, because they know they will not get anything anyway.

The hon. member for Calgary South also referred to the report and recommendations of the committee last year, as did the hon. member for Oxford. I have a long memorandum here which I do not think it is necessary for me to read in full. The recommendations of the committee did receive the very careful attention of the officials and of myself, and as far as we could in keeping with the rulings of the Department of Justice and the statutes involved we have attempted to meet them. There have been changes made in the assessment procedure and in the appointment of assessors. One hon. member, I think it was the hon. member for Port Arthur, raised the question of the salaries we are paying to the assessors and pointed to the recommendation which was made last year. I regret very much to have to say that no great progress has been made in that field.

Mr. Fisher: Who is the stumbling block?

Mr. Nowlan: I do not want to say there is a stumbling block. I am convinced, of course, that the officers of my department are the most valuable, the most able, the most intelligent of the officials of any department of the government of Canada, and that they make the greatest contribution to the public service; but many of my colleagues mistakenly hold the same opinion about their officials. The Department of Agriculture, for instance, is concerned about its veterinarians and the Department of Transport is concerned about its engineers, and the civil service commission has found it very difficult to deal with one class of officials, valuable as I am sure they realize they are, without dealing with them all at the same time. However, this matter is now under review by the civil service commission and the treasury board. I am disappointed that more concrete action has not yet been taken in this field. I am told that some time within the next few weeks we shall have a recommendation to go before treasury board from the civil service commission which I hope will rectify this situation.

[Mr. Nowlan.]

Mr. Benidickson: May I ask the minister a question? The recommendations of a parliamentary committee are, of course, of some consequence. I know the minister has in his hands an observation on practically every point which was raised by the parliamentary committee when it examined the minister's estimates. I wonder if there is any chance of the minister making that document a public document in some way? I refer to the statement which the minister would perhaps, if pressed, be prepared to make with respect to the observations of the parliamentary committee of last year.

Mr. Nowlan: Speaking from memory I feel certain that I did send to the chairman of that committee last year a copy of this memorandum. If I did not, I certainly will do so tomorrow, and I would also be glad to send one to the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River so that he can see what has been done.

Mr. Benidickson: Not for myself. I was thinking that it might be filed with the Clerk of the house.

Mr. Nowlan: Anyway that is the situation with respect to the salaries of assessors. There was another recommendation, one specific one, on which we made progress, of course. The committee recommended that the tax appeal board be enlarged and, as the committee knows, in the tax bill which is going through parliament at the present time—it is possibly in the other place—there is provision for one additional member of the board. That will assist in dealing with the problems with which the board is confronted.

We have spent a fair amount of time this evening dealing with a matter which is somewhat extraneous, that is the relative merits and demerits of a system or an organization known as Moral Re-Armament. Far be it from me to pass judgment or to enter into such a discussion, because I know that many hon. members in this house feel keenly on this matter and have had personal connections with this organization. This is not a subject on which I want to pass any judgment except to say that years ago, before I came into this department, the minister then responsible ruled that Moral Re-Armament was a charitable organization within the meaning of the act, and I have seen no reason, and I have heard no reason tonight, why that decision should be reversed or interfered with.

This is one of the problems with which the minister is continually confronted, this matter of ruling on charity, and I must say that I think there has been, if anything, a greater leniency shown in this respect in