

Canada Pension Plan

each month. It refers to a ballot which appeared in the December issue which asked the following question:

What services do you do free for the government?

The answer is very interesting and indicates that many free services are performed for the government by small businessmen, including the following:

Paperwork involved in employee payroll income tax deductions, paperwork for unemployment insurance, for provincial hospital insurance, for the collection of federal and provincial sales taxes, for workman's compensation, hiring and separation reports, reporting diesel fuel tax, reports to dominion bureau of statistics. There are others.

"Others" means there are other services performed for the government free of charge. I have only one question. It may have been answered before and I did not hear the answer. Are business owners expected to do all this extra work of collection of contributions free or will there be some form of compensation?

Mr. Benson: I dealt rather fully with that particular question a little earlier today. If the hon. member will look at *Hansard* he will see my rather detailed reply.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I do not particularly want to go back to the charge except to make a plea to the minister. I think the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre made eminent sense when he suggested the recasting of this section. Everyone agrees that the minister may demand information. This is done now and there is a proper procedure whereby he can make a demand for information. I would say that only in the case of a refusal to furnish such information should the minister's representatives be able to enter the premises. My heart bleeds over the minister's concern for employees. After all, I would say that 30 to 35 per cent of the people of Canada are employers and we should not put them in the position of being suspect simply because we want to protect employees. If you are operating a one-man law office you are an employer because you have a secretary. You are classified as an employer. Although I may be a little high in my figure, I would say that at least 30 per cent of adults would be employers.

Miss LaMarsh: Would the hon. member permit a question? I am sitting here in fascination and dying to know, as I know other members of the committee are, where he got the figure that 35 per cent of Canadians are employers.

Mr. Lambert: I said 35 per cent of adults, not of all the population.

Mr. Pickersgill: You must have the decimal in the wrong place.

Mr. Lambert: No. Even if I am somewhat optimistic in this regard, the proportion is high enough that we must not put them in the category of being potentially dishonest.

Mr. Benson: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I did not say at any time that employers were dishonest.

Mr. Lambert: The minister can answer later. There is no question of privilege here. He can argue the point. The inference is there and I would suggest to him the inference was that the motive of the legislation was to protect employees. I will agree that the employee must be protected but I say that the employer has to be protected as well. He has as much right to protection as his employees. He is not a second class citizen. That inference can be drawn from the minister's earlier remarks. I do not think he intended it but it was there.

I would say that when the minister makes a request for information it will be complied with by the vast majority of employers. I would suppose there would only be a small fraction who might neglect to do so. It is in such cases that the minister would seek greater authority but I think that, like the Income Tax Act, if the minister is going to seize books he should do so under a warrant or under a writ. But that is not necessarily provided for in this legislation. I would say it is in those extreme cases where the minister should do so but the minister's representatives must be able to justify why he is doing this. Therefore I should like the minister to reconsider the position. We might stand this clause to see whether we cannot work out something that would be agreeable. So far as the lawyers of the country are concerned as well as many other people, legislation of this type goes much too far.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Chairman, I should simply like to point out to the hon. member that this particular legislation does not go nearly as far as the Income Tax Act in respect of the seizure of records by warrant and that sort of thing, and using the Exchequer Court of Canada and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to seize records. This section of the bill provides for an ordinary examination of records. First of all, if you require information from an employer that can be provided to you on the telephone or in answer to a