I am concerned about the compulsory nature of the legislation. It says to people, "You must organize." I am concerned about the elimination of a great many people from eligibility. I say this because occasional crops are grown in many area of Canada. They are storable and marketable, and deferred sales may lead to requests for loans. These producers are left out. Many market gardeners operating in the peripheral areas of cities will find themselves locked out, because there is no marketing agency for them. As the hon. member for Wetaskiwin said, by virtue of their own capabilities they have developed their own marketing system. Are they to be eliminated from eligibility, under the terms of this act?

● (1740)

This is not democratic legislation. It is very definitely autocratic legislation. It is compulsive. It is discriminatory.

Has the minister consulted or in some way been in touch with independent farmers? I realize the Department of Agriculture in Ottawa would be faced with certain administrative problems if it were to go to individual farmers. I suggest it delegate that to the provincial ministers who, through their various structures, can on occasion come to the aid of farmers who need this help.

It is high time the government took a look at the democratic requirements of all society rather than being discriminatory and selective in the application of its wishes and compulsive in respect of agricultural organizations. It does not fit with the reality, dispersal and the nature of the men who farm in this country.

I ask the government to accept this amendment so that not a percentage but all farmers in Canada with storable crops are eligible. I agree with the spokesman on behalf of the government in virtually everything that he says. However, when he was through speaking, it was extremely obvious that the bill is discriminatory. It deletes a multitude of farmers from eligibility. It is not democratic. I ask the government to reverse its position. It is bad to make a mistake, but it is most regrettable to make a mistake, recognize it, and make no change. That is precisely what is happening with this bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): There are no further speakers. In accordance with the announcement made earlier today, the decision as to the acceptability of the amendment stands deferred.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

MEASURE TO PROTECT PRIVACY OF INDIVIDUALS

The House resumed, from Friday, February 11, 1977, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-25, to extend the present laws in Canada that proscribe discrimination and that protect the privacy of individuals, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, when I started to speak on this bill last Friday, I mentioned some evidence of progress made in the present situation. Today, I would like to speak about certain weaknesses in this situation, and I shall speak first of the part concerning the protection of the privacy of individuals, and then of the part concerning discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, what strikes me about this bill as it concerns protection of the privacy of individuals is that it contains many weaknesses which must certainly be corrected during the study in committee if we really want to protect the rights of the individual. The right to privacy is one of the main ingredients of the right to integrity and basic liberties.

As emphasized in the legislation passed by the American Congress in 1974—

[*English*]

The privacy of an individual is directly affected by the collection, maintenance, use and dissemination of personal information by federal agencies.

[*Translation*]

There cannot be any real privacy when tens of people are collecting data about each citizen who are denied the right to have access to their files and who do not know to what extent these files to which they cannot have access have an incidence on their daily lives.

Once again, this bill is surely an improvement over the present situation but, in so far as we can compare it with the one which the American Congress adopted two years ago, I think we will notice at the committee stage that further important improvements should be made. I shall give you only a few examples. The first clause relating to the protection of privacy says peremptorily that the law cannot be applied, when a citizen is denied some information, pursuant to any agreement between a minister of the government of Canada and a minister of a provincial government.

To my mind, setting such a principle in the first clause of a bill amounts to admitting that governments have priority over the individual and, as far as I am concerned, I believe in only one principle, namely that governments, states and nations should stand for the individuals and not against them. When it is said at the beginning of a bill that governments can always agree not to respect the right of the citizen to privacy, without giving any reason, I think of the principle in clause 2(b) of the bill which says, I quote:

(b) the privacy of individuals should be protected to the greatest extent consistent with public order and well-being.

I say that principle is not being respected when you go on to read right after that governments can agree among themselves that they will not publish information gathered about citizens without giving any reason.

Another example, Mr. Speaker, is clause 52(2) which stipulates that when a government agency collects information concerning a citizen for specific reasons, it can pass them on to other federal agencies. The first thing that strikes me here is that the agency is in no way obliged, contrary to the situation in the United States, to see to it in every way possible that the