

Social Security

in legislation until it had been given a fair trial. I think the time has now come to make an assessment based on the facts I have laid before the house, facts which can be demonstrated in any number of instances.

In order to elaborate further as to the difficulties faced by farmers, may I be permitted to read into *Hansard* part of the brief which was presented to the department? How much time do I have left?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): There are about four minutes left.

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): This is what the brief said:

It cannot be denied that to comply with the terms of The Canada Pensions Act, far more extensive farm records will have to be maintained. This will principally affect sharegrowers as well as farm owners. The bulk of the work will occur during harvest when the time for the bookkeeping can least be afforded. While large farm operators may well be able to cope with such problems, the smaller farmers, who form the bulk in numbers, will be hard pressed to do the necessary work.

Producers will be insecure in their labour force, not knowing at the time of hiring whether an employee will quit before the 25 days or \$250 limits are reached.

This refers to the \$250. I am suggesting that we forget the amount of money and simply give a 40-day exemption. The brief goes on:

At hiring, the farmer must decide whether to deduct Canada Pension Plan contributions or not. Will he be able to collect retroactively if he does not and the employee goes over the minimum? He must calculate allowance for board and lodging once \$250 is reached. In all the general stress and strain associated with harvest, the time available for proper keeping of detailed books becomes a question of considerable importance.

The ethnic groups also have a problem in that a number of farmers have difficulty with English and French languages.

Some of this is repetitive and I do not think I will burden hon. members with more.

In December of the same year the tobacco growers presented a second brief demonstrating their concern. In addition, I have here a petition signed by 204 farmers from different parts of Ontario, after my motion had been placed on the order paper. This is what one farmer had to say about the situation, and I quote him because it sums up what so many farmers think about this plan. I refer to Mr. Jack Gilchrist on whose land near Guelph the international ploughing match is held. This article appeared in the *London Free Press* of Saturday, October 12:

Jack Gilchrist has become disenchanted with the extra workload placed on farmers through [Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand).]

legislation in the form of workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance and Canada pension deductions for hired labour.

The article goes on to say that in order to be relieved of all the bookkeeping and red tape in connection with hired help Mr. Gilchrist has placed his herd under contract to another man. The article says, quoting Mr. Gilchrist:

I am now relieved of all this bookkeeping. There's so much red tape with hired help (the deductions) its driving farmers out of the business.

Perhaps that is an exaggeration, but it certainly describes the feelings of the majority of farmers in this regard. The results of the changes proposed would be to remove some of the irritations which I have outlined. It seems to me that a good law should accomplish its purpose without causing undue vexation to those who are called upon to submit to it. These laws and regulations as they now apply to farmers do the opposite and create in farming people a disrespect for laws and regulations. The government has a responsibility to remove as many of these irritations as possible.

It might be argued that by taking the course I suggest the government would lose considerable revenue. But every farmer is willing at the end of the year when his crop has been harvested to fill out the T-4 forms in connection with income tax which show the total earnings of all his employees. Revenue authorities can then easily determine whether or not an individual should pay. The amount which the Unemployment Insurance Commission would lose is negligible, since this applies only to migrant workers. I am glad the parliamentary secretaries to some of the departments are here to listen to what I have had to say. I hope I have pleaded my case earnestly and sincerely, and I trust hon. gentlemen opposite will take note of these things because I can assure them they will hear more on the subject.

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Forestry and Rural Development): I wish to give general support to the motion moved by the hon. member from Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles). I have two or three points to mention and I hope I can do so in a constructive fashion which might strengthen the motion.

● (5:20 p.m.)

First of all, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand. By this motion he is carrying on the tradition of his