

Adjournment Debate

Some time ago a newspaper article about Great Lakes pollution upset me so much that I put a question on the order paper which asked the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Sauvé) the following question: What is the estimated tonnage of human waste that will be dumped in the next five years from vessels plying the Great Lakes? The response was that estimated quantity of human sewage, including the usual three gallons of flush-water per person per day, is seven million tons for the next five years. I then asked: To what degree, in percentages, does the dumping of human waste from such vessels contribute to the pollution of the Great Lakes? In other words, how great will be the proportion, in percentage terms, of human pollution dumped from vessels plying the Great Lakes in relation to the total volume of pollution which will be dumped into the Great Lakes in the next five years? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is .3 of 1 per cent.

On that basis we are talking about 2½ billion tons of pollutants which will be dumped in the Great Lakes in the next five years. The discharge regulations under the legislation may resolve this problem in five years, but I suggest that will be too late. I urge the earlier resolution of this problem; let it be done before five years. Why should we allow this condition to continue? The cost of curing it is really not that great.

May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Is the minister rising on a point of order?

An hon. Member: Five o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Order, please. It being five o'clock, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Housing—Neighbourhood improvement and residential rehabilitation assistance programs—request for increased funds; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Air Canada—Possible inclusion of Winnipeg finance branch in terms of inquiry; the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Howie)—Social Security—Suggested increase in old age pensions—government position.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions and public bills.

[Mr. Brisco.]

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

SUGGESTED MEASURE TO ENTITLE SELF-EMPLOYED FARMERS AND FISHERMEN TO AVERAGE INCOMES OVER FIVE-YEAR PERIOD

Mr. John Wise (Elgin) moved:

That in the opinion of this House, the government should introduce a measure to entitle self-employed farmers and fishermen, for the purpose of receiving benefits under the Canada Pension Plan, to average their incomes over a five-year period.

● (1700)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to place before the House a motion which I attempted to introduce some time ago in the form of a private member's bill. Upon receipt of some good advice from the House officials that the substance of my desire and concern might be regarded as a money bill, thus contravening the rules and spirit of this institution, I did not proceed in that manner but, rather, elected this opportunity in House business to express my concern.

The motion, which is self-explanatory, would assist a percentage of farmers and fishermen in this country and would remove one of the many difficulties these Canadians suffer because of a frequently fluctuating year by year income. If members will read through the volume of minutes of the special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Bill C-136, the Canada Pension Plan bill, 1964 to 1965, on page 1163, appendix A15, they will see an excellent statement on this subject presented to the committee at that time by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. The last paragraph in the federation's statement deals with this situation very accurately. It reads:

One other specific point we wish to raise has to do with the calculation of the pensionable income of self-employed persons. Section B of the bill seems to us to define income according to the terms of the Income Tax Act. We take it that this means that when a farmer adopts averaging, then his averaged income will be, also, his income for pension purposes. If this is not so the act should be revised to make it so. With the extreme variability of many farm incomes, there will be many farmers whose income will fluctuate above and below the maximum pensionable earnings figure. If averaging, for pension purposes, is not permitted, the farmer who experiences such fluctuations will certainly end up with a considerably smaller pension.

In the process of preparing this presentation I was advised that considerable assurance was given to the federation, if not publicly then privately, that this inequity would be dealt with. However, if one reads the information booklet for the self-employed produced by the Department of National Revenue, Taxation, by authority of the minister, on page 3 one finds that farmers and fishermen, who are dealt with in like terms in the Income Tax Act, will contribute on their actual self-employed earnings and cannot average their income for Canada Pension Plan purposes. On page 3 of the booklet "Information for the Self-Employed", it reads:

A farmer or fisherman will contribute on his actual self-employed earnings and cannot average his income for Canada Pension Plan purposes. Losses incurred in other years are not deductible in computing self-employed earnings for a year.