

did begin work immediately within the government on the question of what we ought to do regarding our own informational data banks in order to ensure the individual's right to privacy.

The other matter in respect of data banks outside the government is rather more complicated, involving quite frequently areas within provincial jurisdiction as well, but we anticipate discussions with the provinces on that matter in the near future.

POSSIBILITY OF USE OF RETAIL CREDIT CORPORATION
BY DEPARTMENTS TO OBTAIN INFORMATION

Mr. Ron Atkey (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. Will the minister advise whether any department of the federal government is a client of the Retail Credit Corporation or company, or of any other commercial reporting agency and, if so, does it use the information received for purposes other than as an employer?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I was not paying attention and I did not hear the question.

Mr. Atkey: I will repeat my question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister advise whether any department of the federal government is a client of the Retail Credit Corporation or company, or of any other commercial reporting agency and, if so, does it use the information received for purposes other than as an employer?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would respectfully suggest to the hon. member that this question should be placed on the order paper. If there is any urgency, it can be considered at the time of adjournment.

Mr. James McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact this has been declared Consumer Week, and in view of the concern across the country about these data banks, will the minister make a statement in the House outlining the government's position on the right to privacy and what precisely the government intends to do about it to protect Canadians?

• (1430)

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter about which I am very disturbed as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I think, however, this is something that falls more directly within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Justice with regard to developing policy proposals for presentation to the House.

Oral Questions

TRADE

IMPOSITION BY UNITED STATES OF COUNTERVAILING
DUTY ON MICHELIN TIRES—POSSIBLE CANADIAN
ACTION THROUGH U.S. COURTS

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, this question is supplementary to the first questions which were asked earlier of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. He advanced a novel suggestion toward the end of his last answer that unless the United States did what Canada hoped and desisted from anything in the nature of discriminatory action the matter could be taken to the United States courts. That is a most novel suggestion. I would ask him to what courts the administration of the United States would be taken if it failed to do that which Canada desires?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, there is a provision under the Tariff Act of 1930, I believe, whereby aggrieved parties can take action in the United States customs courts. Those are the courts I was referring to.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the minister going back to 1930, but we are now in 1973. I ask the minister what courts Canada can go to in order to punish, admonish or secure an injunction against the United States of America? That is the question.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the United States federal court system, and I do not think it is a question of securing an injunction so much as it is a question of securing a judgment.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, does the minister suggest that in order for Canada to get justice it would have to go to a United States court in any proceeding? That is one of the most nonsensical answers ever given.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

COMMUNITY PASTURES IN WESTERN CANADA—REQUEST
FOR EXPLANATION OF FEE INCREASE FOR PATRONS

Mr. Bill Knight (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in his capacity as minister in charge of the prairie farm rehabilitation administration. In view of the fact that the fees for patrons of PFRA community pastures across the west have been increased by some 30 per cent at the same time that the main estimates show that the operating costs have not gone up in terms of what the government is putting in, can the minister inform the House why there has been this increase?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the reason for the increase, as I believe was stated in the public announcement, is that there has been a substantial increase in the operating cost of these pastures and the two will just about even out under the new arrangement. I call the hon. member's attention to the representations he made to me earlier which were also acted on in that we have substantially