



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 009 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, October 22, 1999

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

All parliamentary publications are available on the
“Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire” at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 22, 1999

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

PERSONAL INFORMATION PROTECTION AND ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS ACT

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.) moved that Bill C-6, an act to support and promote electronic commerce by protecting personal information that is collected, used or disclosed in certain circumstances, by providing for the use of electronic means to communicate or record information or transactions and by amending the Canada Evidence Act, the Statutory Instruments Act and the Statute Revision Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh, Lib.): Madam Speaker, discussions have taken place between all parties and I believe that you would find consent for the following:

That, not later than 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders this day, all questions necessary to dispose of the motion for third reading of Bill C-6, be deemed put and a recorded division deemed requested and deferred until Tuesday, October 26, 1999, at the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

[*English*]

Hon. John Manley: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to address the House of Commons again on Bill C-6, the personal information protection and electronic documents

act. This act was developed in response to a very real and pressing need. Canadians have told us in clear terms that they want their personal data protected no matter where it goes, no matter who uses it, trades it or holds it. Business wants a level playing field, with competitors bound by the same rules. As well, Canadians want the option to communicate with their governments electronically.

Privacy is something that Canadians feel very strongly about. In a July 1998 Angus Reid poll 88% of Canadians polled said that they found it unacceptable for companies and organizations to sell, trade or share lists containing personal information with other organizations. Bill C-6 will give Canadians the privacy protection which they desire and which they are entitled to receive.

[*Translation*]

The bill is a legitimate exercise of the federal government's authority to legislate in respect of trade and commerce in Canada. The increasing ubiquity of networks and the speed of the technology means companies are collecting more information, circulating it more widely and combining it more ingeniously than ever before.

Personal information is now a commodity which can be bought, sold and traded. It has commercial value in and of itself. That information is crossing all boundaries—provincial, territorial and national.

Provinces acting alone and even together cannot pass laws that can effectively protect information crossing those boundaries.

• (1010)

A company in Alberta collecting information from Manitobans may disclose it to another company in New Brunswick or New York. Canada needs a federal law to protect personal data in these circumstances. We also need a harmonized regime—with the provinces and territories playing their part in their areas of competence.

[*English*]

Bill C-6 establishes the right of all individuals to privacy in a way that is consistent with the reasonable needs of organizations to collect, use and disclose personal information. As our competitors around the globe scramble to put in place the frameworks that will create the consumer confidence to make electronic commerce a

Government Orders

practical reality, the privacy protection in Bill C-6 will put Canada at the forefront.

Parts 2 to 5 of Bill C-6 will eliminate the paper bias in our federal laws by making them media neutral. Bill C-6 will put electronic transactions governed by federal laws on the same footing as paper ones. It will ensure business and citizens that an electronic document and an electronic signature has legal standing.

Bill C-6 will make the electronic transmission of information through computers an option that is realistic, practical and legally sound.

I would like to acknowledge at this point the excellent work of the Standing Committee on Industry. The committee members have been conscientious and helpful in improving the legislation and I am grateful to them for their efforts. They have helped to make a good bill better. In particular, I recognize the efforts of the member for St. Catharines who served as my parliamentary secretary until August and who provided tremendous support in bringing this bill to report stage.

[Translation]

The committee members identified and addressed the needs of stakeholders with regard to this legislation, and the bill is stronger for their scrutiny and attention. Amendments resulted in key areas such as the primacy of protection of privacy, protection for whistleblowers and provisions for a review of the effectiveness of the bill every five years.

Committee members always remembered that the goal is a balance product and that when you add a bit to one side of the scale you must also keep the other side in mind, to ensure that equilibrium is maintained.

We are all aware that the legislative process can be both and complicated. But again, the process of public hearings and debate has resulted in a superior outcome.

I would like to highlight briefly what some key witnesses told the Standing Committee on Industry during its hearings on the personal information protection and electronic documents bill. Consumers and privacy advocates supported the bill and expressed a desire to see it passed now, even if not all of their requested changes were made.

[English]

Some privacy advocates called for more powers for the privacy commissioner. Some even demanded binding powers for the commissioner. However, the federal privacy commissioner himself stated quite eloquently that he did not want binding powers and that the most elegant and least cumbersome way to achieve the desired results would be through a proactive approach based on education and ombudsman-like powers. In the end, the validity of the privacy commissioner's arguments was recognized and prevailed.

When it was the business community's turn to address Bill C-6 many stressed their support for the legislation and appreciation for its basis in the CSA standard. The view was expressed that the smooth harmonization of privacy frameworks across the country is highly desirable. Businesses and consumers alike told the industry committee that they also welcomed parts 2 to 5 of the bill, which will permit the government to deliver services to its citizens electronically and permit the government and the courts to use and accept electronic documents and signatures.

• (1015)

[Translation]

The business community needs the continued ability to gather information to detect fraud and the violation of agreements. This ability is important to sectors as diverse as the computer software and insurance industries.

The intent of Bill C-6 is to strike a delicate balance between these entirely legitimate needs and consumers' equally valid expectations for privacy protection.

Amendments aimed at helping businesses combat fraud were carefully designed to maintain that balance. The committee received the benefit of appearances by the federal Privacy Commissioner, the Ontario commissioner and the British Columbia commissioner and a brief from the Quebec commissioner.

The commissioners were very strong in their support for public education and held that its value in changing the landscape of privacy protection is great.

The Ontario commissioner emphasized this point. She stated that public education changes practices for the better and reduces complaints.

[English]

Topics such as harmonization and duplication of regulation received thoughtful consideration. The Quebec commissioner made suggestions for avoiding areas of potential confusion, while other commissioners held that the bill could be passed first and appropriate administrative arrangements worked out afterward among commissioners.

The bill's structure was also a focus of comment. The B.C. commissioner dismissed any criticism that the bill might be awkward to read as some had argued. He stated that many laws, even consumer protection laws, were written in complex language and expressed his confidence that Canada's privacy commissioners would be competent enough to interpret and implement Bill C-6.

Ever mindful of the need to continuously improve on the bill, we introduced amendments after the industry committee's report to the House. We improved the primacy clause and required confidential measures in federal court hearings. We have amended clause 30 to clarify how the bill applies in its first three years.

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

And we have made changes to ensure that law enforcement bodies can continue to carry out their mandate as they currently do.

These law enforcement amendments clarify for organizations the circumstances under which they may accede to the lawful requests of government institutions for personal information for national security for enforcement or administration purposes.

These amendments allow the status quo to continue and allow businesses to continue to co-operate, where appropriate. These amendments do not grant new powers to government institutions, nor do they create new obligations on business.

[English]

The intent of the bill is to regulate the commercial use of personal information. For instance, in the case of the publicly funded health care system, the bill is not intended to impede the flow of information necessary for the protection of patients' health and the improvement of the administration of health care. To clarify this, I tabled an amendment on October 15 which specifically addresses the need to share information without consent when it is necessary for the administration of a law or program.

The information highway offers opportunities to improve the efficacy and indeed accountability of our health care system. Organizations such as the Canadian Institute for Health Information assists in this endeavour. Bill C-6 is intended to facilitate these initiatives as it provides a basic set of fair information practices around which all stakeholders can harmonize. In the pursuit of a harmonized privacy protection regime for Canada, we encourage all the provinces and the territories to move swiftly to legislate broadly in their own jurisdictions.

- (1020)

In closing, a brief overview of what the personal information protection and electronic documents act will accomplish will reveal how the government has addressed the concerns of witnesses who appeared before the committee.

[Translation]

The overarching goal of Bill C-6 is to codify a right to privacy without placing a heavy burden on business, intruding unduly on the right of freedom of expression or destroying our historical memory by interfering with the preservation of documents.

Bill C-6 will foster responsible privacy practices. Oversight will be complaints driven, but the Privacy Commissioner has been given a strong public education and advisory role.

The commissioner will be able to help businesses comply with the law, launch investigations, compel witnesses and evidence and conduct audits where he has a reasonable cause to think that something might be happening that is contrary to the law.

[English]

Bill C-6 will establish harmonized national rules to avoid different sets of rules for business and the resulting confusion for citizens. The provisions will also encourage provincial and territorial action to legislate. Only Quebec has its own privacy law in place. British Columbia is working on one, and with the strong federal leadership that the bill represents, we expect others will soon follow.

Canada is unique in the world for having developed a national standard to protect privacy. Considerable momentum already exists in the application of the CSA code in the marketplace. A number of industry associates and firms have CSA based codes. It makes sense to build on that consensus and momentum and that is what Bill C-6 has done.

Internationally, the adoption of Bill C-6 will show the way to the future. The use of standards is an accepted way to resolve trade disputes over differing national rules and Canada will continue to support the movement toward an international privacy standard.

Canadians need and they want privacy protection. The right of Canadians to control their personal data is within their reach with the bill. The bill before the House is a product of informed review by many experts in the field of data protection and electronic commerce, of widespread public consultations and of an extensive examination by members of the House. It is a good bill.

In releasing his annual report earlier this week, Mr. Bruce Phillips, Canada's Privacy Commissioner, said this:

The bill represents considerable ingenuity and not a little courage. It is no magic bullet. . . . But we must begin by doing something and doing it quickly. If we fiddle in the face of lobbying and jurisdictional disputes, Canadians' privacy and the business opportunities on-line will burn.

I could not agree more. It is time to move the bill on. I urge all members of the House to support passage of Bill C-6, to support the right of Canadian citizens to protect their own personal, private information.

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Ref.): Madam Speaker, Bill C-6, which is the old Bill C-54 from the last session of parliament, is a bill largely about the future. The government is trying to catch up with technology to regulate for reasonable order and safety, much like governments did as they tried to keep up with the emergence of the motor car, airplane, travel, telephones, radio broadcasting, television and now a universe of information transfer and monitoring never imagined by the writers of our constitution passed in 1867.

- (1025)

Form continues to follow function and I am sure that the present bill will be subject to much amendment in future years as society

Government Orders

attempts to respond to issues of sovereignty, rights, protection and general order. Maybe it could be said that Alvin Toffler was right that social change accelerates and we all struggle to deal with future shock, even governments.

The future is now, and the bill is written to support and promote electronic commerce by protecting personal information that is collected, used or disclosed in certain circumstances by providing for the use of electronic means to communicate a record of information or transactions and by amending the Canada Evidence Act, the Statutory Instruments Act and the Statute Revision Act.

Part 1 of the bill establishes a right to the protection of personal information used in commercial activities in connection with the operation of a federal work, undertaking, or business or interprovincially or internationally. It establishes principles to govern the collection, the use and disclosure of personal information. It deals with accountability, identifying the purposes for the collection of personal information, obtaining consent, limiting collection, limiting use, disclosure and retention, ensuring accuracy, providing adequate security, making information management policies readily available, providing individuals with access to information about themselves and giving individuals a right to challenge an organization's compliance with these principles.

It further provides for the privacy commissioner to receive complaints concerning contraventions of the principles, conduct investigations and attempt to resolve such complaints. Unresolved disputes relating to certain matters can also be taken to the federal court for resolution.

Part 2 sets out a scheme by which requirements in federal statutes and regulations that assume the use of paper do not necessarily expressly permit the use of electronic technology, may be administered or complied with in the electronic environment. The bill grants authority to make regulations about how these requirements may be satisfied by using electronic means. Part 2 also describes the characteristics of secure electronic signatures and grants authority to make regulations prescribing technologies for the purpose of the definition of "secure electronic signature".

Part 3 amends the Canada Evidence Act to ease the admissibility of electronic documents, to establish evidentiary presumptions related to secure electronic signatures and to provide for the recognition as evidence of notices, acts or other documents published electronically by the Queen's Printer.

Part 4 amends the Statutory Instruments Act to authorize the publication of the *Canada Gazette* by electronic means, which will certainly be thanked by many.

Part 5 amends the Statute Revision Act to authorize the publication and distribution of an electronic version of the consolidated

statutes and regulations of Canada. This is a democratizing barrier removal for all citizens.

We have been at the Canadian democratic experiment at least since 1867, 132 years or more, with our evolution to responsible and accountable government from dependent colonialism.

I am here in parliament as a Reformer in part because it is too evident that we still have a lot of work to do on that score to take up the job of expanding the boundary of democracy, of implementing needed change. Sadly it is a quest that the old reformers forsook, those who became the true Grits, for the Liberals who have long forgotten about being the repressed underdog in governance, for they are now so smugly superior, secretly plotting to avoid real public political accountability. In view of what happened, it could be reasoned that the Reform Party are the liberals of the 21st century, for we are now the agents of change, struggling against an entrenched establishment party that is reluctant to let go of privilege and power.

It is an ideological gap that I am talking about. With Bill C-6 they are playing catch-up. As in commerce, Canada has a long way to catch up politically, even reforming this very parliament.

Canada started with a constitution that was rooted in certain basic principles and was written by some incredibly brilliant people who understood that times would change, the definitions of fundamental things of governance would change and that circumstances would require people to rise to the challenges of each new era by applying old values in practical ways.

It is recognized that as Canada changed from being an agricultural to an industrial society that the laws made under simpler conditions of living could not handle the complex relations of the modern industrial world, and now even the cyber age.

While the bill attempts to deal with some technological matters that have gone way ahead of governance, Reformers also work for the day when we can bring this creaky institution of parliament into the cyber age of political accountability, using technology to more fully obtain political consent from an informed electorate who watches, engages and decides, often through electronic means.

• (1030)

It is present day Reformers that seek to move the boundaries between old and new. We might even get TV cameras in the Senate some day and have more committees televised. Parliament needs to get fully plugged in, turned on and really connected to the people it is supposed to serve.

Reformers of old, it must be remembered, fought hard to adapt our institutions to new realities, to update vital protections for our citizens, to expand the developing notions of the right to privacy which has become most valued by our present culture.

Government Orders

We are in the midst of another vast social transformation. Once again the law needs to govern fluid markets, documentation and legal exchange. They are so dynamic they could not have been imagined in the British North America Act of 1867 when it enumerated responsibilities. But the pace of change is very different, not just the nature of change but the very pace of it. Once again we have to respond, applying our oldest values and practical ways that allow them to be preserved and enhanced in modern times.

We all know that technology and competition have revolutionized the financial services industry. I think most of us believe that by and large these changes have been very good. But many people do not have the knowledge to properly evaluate what is truly a dizzying array of options. Some are falling victim to new abusive practices. Others are being left out of the financial marketplace altogether. That is why we have to deal with these things in parliament, to give all Canadians both the tools and the confidence they need to fully participate in the thriving but highly complex 21st century economy that will often be focused in the world of electronic commerce.

The term electronic commerce refers generally to commercial transactions, involving both organizations and individuals, that are based upon the processing and transmission of digitized data, including text, sound and visual images, and that are carried out over open networks. Although much media attention is focused on online merchants selling books, wine and computers, the vast majority of products marketed electronically business to consumer are intangibles such as travel and ticketing services, software entertainment such as online games, music and gambling, as well as banking, insurance and brokerage services, information services, legal services, real estate services and increasingly health care, education and government services.

In view of these realities there are some principles that must be regarded. The first thing we have to do is to protect every Canadian's financial privacy. There has been analysis to identify where privacy is at risk and finance certainly was the first obvious area of great concern.

The technological revolution now makes it easier than ever before for people to dig into and collect our private financial data for their own profit. Some private financial information is protected under existing federal law. One's banker, broker or insurance company could still share with affiliated firms information of what one buys with cheques and credit cards or sell this information to the highest bidder.

We need better laws to give Canadians the right to control their financial information, to let the consumer decide whether they want to share private information with anyone else. They need to know where it goes and why.

To enhance financial privacy we must also protect the sanctity of medical records. With a growing number of mergers between companies, financial institutions and lenders potentially can gain access to the private medical information contained in insurance forms or from government subcontractors. We need to severely restrict the sharing of medical information. People should not have to worry that the results of their latest medical physical exam will be used to deny them a home mortgage or a credit card. The possibilities must be carefully anticipated for protection.

It should be understood that our basic privacy is at stake. As electronic commerce develops, the volume and the nature of personal data such as name, address, interests and records of all purchases can be disclosed on networks during electronic activities and these transactions certainly will increase.

New methods for processing the vast accumulation of data such as data mining allow the creation of customer profiles that combine demographic data, credit information, usage patterns and minute details of transactions. If consumers do not have control over the collection and use of their personal data, electronic commerce must facilitate the invasion of their privacy. But if consumers are in a position to either decline or to give informed consent to the collection and use of their personal data, electronic commerce will not be too much different from traditional commerce.

In today's world, consumers may participate in what we call fidelity or loyal shopping plans, or choose to exchange their privacy for something they value such as lower prices, convenience or personalization. Businesses and consumers will have to help adjudicate the tradeoff between protecting privacy and obtaining the benefits of electronic commerce that both value. Education on this issue is therefore of primary importance.

• (1035)

The question has come up about illegal and harmful content. There has been much public concern about the content of some of the information distributed and accessed on the Internet. Disagreeable or detrimental content is not more prevalent on the Internet than beneficial content, but the people who distribute and access disagreeable or detrimental material on the Internet enjoy the same advantages offered by the Internet as others do. The positive elements are vast in terms of opportunities for electronic commerce, community development, communication and access to information.

The reality is that with those benefits come the difficulties of coping with content judged to be detrimental. The development of electronic commerce could potentially be impeded by illegal and harmful content issues where users fear unwanted content and where network service providers fear the liability they will take on if they are expected to be responsible for the content that flows across their systems. Although traditional methods for addressing these issues may not be as feasible in the electronic environment,

Government Orders

advances in technology are offering new ways to resolve some of these issues.

We must require greater public disclosure and enhance every consumer's right to know. Consumers received millions of credit card solicitations last year. Some offers contained new traps for the unwary. For example, sometimes credit card companies advertise low interest rates known as teaser rates to reel in consumers who are then surprised with unexpected interest rate hikes.

Millions of consumers have also found out the hard way that making only minimum payments rarely helps retire debt and almost always results in very large interest payments. We should require clear notice of how long and how costly repayments would be if the consumer makes only the minimum payment.

We have to do more to combat consumer fraud. It is remarkably easy now for a thief to take out huge loans in someone else's name, run up enormous credit card debts and tap into bank accounts. We have now heard at least twice this year in the Commons that the RCMP do not have the basic resources to attack consumer commercial fraud. Consequently capacity creates its own demand and it will only flourish if the government is not minding the people's business.

We need to give priority to cases involving identity theft, particularly those involving organized crime groups with the goal of increasing the number of prosecutions. It must be made harder to steal someone else's identity in the first place. Telephone long distance fraud is also rampant and the millions lost is reflected on my telephone bill.

We also need to crack down on fraud committed over the Internet. If we want to seize the Internet's full potential, we have to stay ahead of those who would use this open medium to manipulate stock prices, commit fraud on online auctions or perpetuate any other type of financial scam. We need a national co-ordinated approach for tracking Internet fraud and to train those in provincial and federal law enforcement how to recognize and root out these schemes.

It could be said that the law enforcement community compared to people who are doing criminal activity are like unaware parents trying to keep up with their children who go on the computer. It is an endless effort. We need to organize and systematize a continuous retraining effort and have a federal government with a vision to commit the resources needed so that we can stay ahead of the crime curve.

Investors need better information to protect themselves against online securities fraud. Complaints of Internet fraud are greatly increasing, for every new medium of exchange brings a new opportunity for criminal exploitation. Are the Liberals on top of it?

I doubt it, for they have shown time and again that they are not really wise managers of the public trust.

We must provide services for those who have been denied access to the wired world and ensure opportunities for all. Technology can bring, for example, credit and banking services to the disenfranchised. We need to continue to expand the bounds of service for the aged and the challenged with low fee bank accounts and services in ways that maximize the possibility of technology yet preserve safety and accountability.

Electronic commerce dramatically reduces the economic distance between producers and consumers. Consumers can make their purchases directly without involving traditional retailers, wholesalers and in some cases distributors. They benefit from improved information, lower transaction costs and thus lower prices, and larger choices which can include products tailored to individual requirements and instant delivery for intangible services and products in digital form.

For sellers, electronic commerce also presents many advantages. Small scale manufacturers can gain access to a global marketplace with relative ease. Specialist resellers enjoy the same advantage. Neither need maintain a physical store or shop and inventory can be managed more efficiently.

• (1040)

Labour cost savings can be considerable. For instance, one estimate places the cost of buying software on the Internet at 20 cents to 50 cents per transaction as opposed to \$5 for a telephone order and \$15 for a traditional retailer. But just as electronic commerce offers new market opportunities, it will also intensify competition. It will probably make some provisions of provincial labour codes obsolete.

Government must strive to provide the opportunity for everyone to have access to electronic commerce. The key difference in having rights and benefiting from them is the degree of participation and full exchange. Anyone with access to the Internet has access to electronic commerce. Online commerce requires hardware such as computers and servers, software, and the ability to connect to the network itself which may involve access to telephone, cable TV, cellular mobile networks, satellites or broadcasting networks. Equipment costs, access charges and the complexity of the evolving Internet itself are barriers to universal Internet access. At present, regulatory structures in many countries still limit market access by infrastructure providers. This is changing with the liberalization of telecommunications.

Estimates of the number of Internet users vary between 30 million and 50 million. It is a rapidly growing population. Just three or four years ago the number of users was only in the thousands.

Government Orders

The number of commercial transactions made over the Internet is also rapidly growing. Nearly all analysts predict growth by factors of 10 or more and that electronic commerce will overtake the size of mail catalogue sales in the United States alone.

The networks are being built but they will likely never be comprehensive or fast enough for changing demands. Sadly, the law, protections and regulatory climate will always be behind, especially if the Liberals stay in power in Canada.

Internet communications are generally established through telephone systems which were built to carry voice, not data. These systems need to evolve. At present most customers connect to communications networks via a standard telephone line. Local telephone tariffs currently account for more than 60% of the cost of Internet access. The expansion of electronic commerce depends on speeding up data transmission while keeping the costs very low.

Increasing competition in the communications market is the best way to encourage network upgrading. One key to increasing competition is to put in place regulatory structures that encourage the creation of networks providing and supporting all types of applications, including entertainment, voice telephony and electronic commerce. However, it seems that we will always have one hand tied behind our backs in this country, because we have a Canadian policy for Luddites who vainly resist in the name of Canadian content which seems premised upon a cultural inferiority complex.

Our law must properly follow the opportunities of technology for jobs, growth and trade. By raising economic efficiency, electronic commerce will increase overall wealth. In doing so, it will impose adjustments on existing economic structures, for electronic commerce may well result in the loss of employment in traditional distribution and retailing. However, experience demonstrates that technological change will create new and better replacement jobs.

Electronic commerce is already creating new high quality computing and communications jobs linked to the development of global digital markets. Of course the NDP will rail against it and claim it needs an even more iron fisted union to stop the sun from rising, the light of new knowledge coming in, or it will want a world ruler of the Tobin tax to mitigate against what it cannot comprehend. Outdated political ideologies hurt people, stunt potential, breed poverty and perpetuate oppression and servitude. That is what the NDP ideology must be understood to bring, in light of discussing the implications of Bill C-6 and the future.

From the perspective of the firm, the cost of doing business on new electronic networks is significantly lower than the cost of traditional methods. This advantage plus the ability to offer high value, content rich products and services has led to exponential growth in the number of firms entering electronic commerce and

related businesses. This is most evident in the urban North American centres but is becoming evident in other countries as well.

By bringing buyers and sellers closer together, electronic commerce will facilitate trade growth. Canadian wealth is based on international trade, but there is no help from the NDP anti-traders belief system.

What we are talking about also has consequences for taxation and tariffs. Jurisdictional rules applying to taxes and tariffs are generally based on concepts of physical geography, such as place of supply or residence of a taxpayer. As electronic commerce is not bound by physical geography, it may become difficult for taxpayers and governments to determine jurisdiction and revenue rights. For consumption taxes, there may be a need for action to avoid double or non-taxation.

● (1045)

The availability, reliability and completeness of commercial records generated in an electronic commercial environment, including those from electronic payment systems, are also of concern. Such records must be relied upon to ensure that taxation and tariffs have been appropriately and fairly applied.

Many forms of taxation and tariffs are levelled on physical goods. The ability in electronic commerce to create electronic substitutes like electronic books presents challenges for revenue collection and the archaic quota regimes overseen by our heritage minister.

The existence of electronic products also raises issues of fairness between taxes and tariffs imposed on physical goods and electronic substitutes. The ability within the electronic distribution channels to bypass any or all of these traditional middlemen between producer and consumer raises serious issues for the collection of taxes, particularly withholding taxes.

The use of electronic commerce technologies in the form of intranets by multinationals and collaborative groups may tend to increase the prevalence of transfer pricing and increase the difficulty of detecting such behaviour.

The predicted growth of international electronic commerce, much of which may be undertaken by smaller less sophisticated businesses, may mean the number of unintentional breaches of international revenue laws could increase.

Given the global nature of electronic commerce, it is important that the decisions taken by government continue to allow for the international flow of data. Moreover, technological tools will offer new ways to allow users to protect themselves. Some of them are mechanisms for verifying information such as labelling systems which certify that an online business meets certain good standards of business. Other mechanisms exist for notifying consumers of

Government Orders

legal jurisdiction or venue for resolving disputes arising from a transaction. Some others allow consumers to access educational messages that describe their rights in the context of electronic transactions.

Canada certainly needs to work with the international community to provide a forum for continuing exchange of views on developing technologies and an institutional framework to support them. We also have to increase the financial and electronic literacy of the Canadian people. It is not enough to know how to balance a chequebook any more. Even those fortunate to have the help of accountants sometimes have a hard time understanding all the ins and outs of investing in an RSP, paying off credit card debt or refinancing a mortgage.

Knowledge is power and as Canadians understand technology they will use it in ways that make it accountable to them, as it enhances their quality of life. Laws and regulations must go hand in hand with an informed public if technology is to serve us rather than us serving it.

As reported in the Ottawa *Citizen* today, Ontario residents may soon have a single computerized card that will do everything from providing access to health care to serving as a driver's licence under a new project unveiled by the province. The smart card concept announced in the provincial government's throne speech yesterday, it is hoped, will mean more convenience for the public and less fraud. The term usually refers to a credit card with a tiny computer chip that contains lots of information about the cardholder that can replace the need for many cards. The one card will include a driver's licence, access to services such as medicare, social assistance and senior benefits.

The future is here. How far off will it be that a ton of information that can be put on one small card will simply be put on a microscopic chip under the skin on one's hand? By then the universal numbers will be assigned at birth, which can be the international drawing rights credit card, citizenship and right to vote registration for the world, and contain personal international telephone and computer access numbers. The technology seems to be coming, but are the law and society ready for these realities?

That is what we are trying to do with Bill C-6. It is an attempt to improve privacy, enhance disclosure, combat fraud, increase access and bring the transactional world of commerce and law under some semblance of control.

Members of the official opposition engaged fully in the process of the bill. We offered a number of constructive improvements which the government was rather arrogant about accepting, as old style governments usually are. Nevertheless Reformers support the bill since it is as good as we can get it at this time.

Reform recognizes the fine line between the right of Canadians to have freedom of speech and the right of privacy. The need for

that balance has become acute as Canadians embrace new technologies. Therefore we support the regulation that Bill C-6 introduces.

As the world changes and the proposed act needs adjustment in the future, I hope it will not take as long to do as the years it took the hapless Conservative and the bumbling Liberal governments to update the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act. Nevertheless the government had at least one good minister to finally get it done, the Minister of Industry.

• (1050)

In conclusion, the objectives of the bill are broadly similar to the ones used to harness the opportunities and benefits of the industrial revolution. They are just as vital today, if not more so, as they were a century ago. It is now time to use them to seize the enormous potential of the information revolution for every Canadian citizen.

If we work together we can help all families have the benefits of new choices and new technologies. We can help our people thrive in the 21st century. All we have to do is to remember how we got here over the last 132 years.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, here we are at third reading of Bill C-6, formerly Bill C-54, whereby the federal government intends, as far as we are concerned in Quebec, to become king and master of what the protection of personal information should be.

In spite of all the attempts on the part of the Bloc Québécois and all those who came before the parliamentary committee to show how bad this bill would be for Quebec, we are not debating it at third reading.

Before going any further, I want to salute the excellent job done by my colleague from Mercier who single-handedly carried this matter for a year to bring government members to realize the impact this bill would have in Quebec and how flawed it is even for those Canadians it purports to protect.

We could talk about the real efficiency of this bill which is more about promoting electronic commerce than protecting personal information. This week, the government decided to ram through this bill by the end of business today and to defer the division at third reading until the beginning of next week.

The bill contains some amendments coming from the government. It is important to know that, half way through, the government saw the holes in its bills and started improvising, trying to improve certain areas, tabling amendments of its own after witnesses were heard in committee. Thus, the government, realizing

its bill was flawed, brought in new amendments, but did not allow any debate on them to give people a chance to be heard. Groups who appeared before the committee never saw them, which creates a very dangerous situation.

Strangely enough, some of the last-minute amendments exempt the government from the application of its own act in a number of cases. Is it not strange that the government should come to this realization only after the committee hearing stage, and that it thought appropriate to give itself and its components some manoeuvring room in order not to abide by its own law? This is a bit surprising coming from a government that says it wants to protect people but is looking for ways to avoid doing so itself whenever possible.

This brings me to the case of Quebec. For five years now, Quebec has had an act for the protection of personal information in the private sector. This act serves as a model, because there are very few others like it; in fact, it is the only one of its kind in North America. Now the federal government has decided to take a page from our book.

It is a desirable thing that all Canadians be protected with respect to the distribution of their personal information. But, seeing how slow the other provinces have been to act, the federal government decided to introduce legislation. I would point out, however, that the provinces, in conjunction with the federal government, had already embarked on a process of harmonizing legislation. But, last year, the federal government decided unilaterally to withdraw from the process and come up with its own legislation.

It withdrew from the joint effort it had embarked on with the provinces, an exercise in which Quebec had pointed out that it had its own legislation. By the way, there are two relevant instruments in Quebec: the act, and the Civil Code, which also governs the protection of personal information. If memory serves, the applicable articles of the Civil Code are 35 to 40. The act is thoroughly steeped in Quebec's civil law tradition, as opposed to the common law tradition on which the federal government's approach is based.

Enforcement will be extremely difficult. It is no accident that the Barreau du Québec, the Chambre des notaires, the Conseil du patronat, and a union body such as the CSN told the government that what it was proposing for Quebec was ridiculous, that it would be unworkable and complicated for businesses, a complete disaster.

• (1055)

There was legislation protecting personal information and not focussed on encouraging e-commerce. E-commerce will grow despite the federal government. It does not need any legislation to encourage it. It is developing at a phenomenal rate and will continue to do so.

What is needed is assurance of the protection of distribution, disclosure and transmission of personal information.

Government Orders

The federal government has seen fit to provide for this in a schedule to its legislation, not in the legislation itself, and in a conditional mode. I will give hon. members an example of the very fuzzy concepts it contains. In the Government of Quebec's legislation, the consent for release of specific information must be very clear. The individual must have consented to the transfer of his personal information.

At the federal level, the approach is far more vague, so things are not as clear. Explicit consent is not necessarily required. Once again, it can be seen that the two governments are guided by two very different mindsets.

I will continue by quoting from the testimony of some of those who appeared before the committee. In fact, I intend to quote two.

When I was preparing my speech for this morning, a comment I heard came to mind. A man spoke of his fear that the organizations with the greatest interest in invading our privacy were the ones setting the legislative agenda. He said "Now it is clear that Bill C-54"—now Bill C-6—"is an initiative on e-commerce. I believe it is useful to note that the words 'consumers', 'businesses', and 'industry' appear 78 times, while 'citizen' appears only ten times".

So said Valerie Steve, a professor at the human rights research and education centre. This then is a very different approach from what the government was boasting about this morning, saying that it wants is simply to protect personal information.

I will now quote from the remarks made by the former president of the Quebec bar association, who also has interesting things to say. He said "From a very careful reading of Bill C-54, in my opinion, this would mean a significant step backwards for Quebec". I repeat "in my own opinion, this would mean a very significant step backwards for Quebec". He added "These regulations, in fact, this sort of voluntary standard, are given the status of law by making them a schedule. They are not stringent enough to protect consumers. They are full of loopholes for commerce. It is based in large part on a completely outmoded approach to consumer protection with virtually non-existent rights of recourse".

I see that we will soon be proceeding to Statements by Members and Oral Question Period. I will continue afterward. I will return to the notion of recourse for consumers.

I want to ask for unanimous consent to have my speaking time of 40 minutes split into two 20 minute periods, since I will be sharing my time with the member for Mercier. I have used about ten minutes so far and, after my second ten minute period, the member for Mercier will finish the 40 minute period, if there is unanimous consent.

*S. O. 31**[English]*

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to permit the hon. member to share his time in two 20 minute periods?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS*[English]***BURLINGTON**

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, each year graduating students in Burlington win hundreds of awards recognizing their academic achievement, athletic abilities and interests. Each year it is my pleasure to honour one student at each school with a Paddy Torsney MP Citizenship Award.

This year's winners include Michael Lazarovitch from Assumption, Liane Mahon from Notre Dame, Manjinger Shoker from Burlington Central, Anthony Adrian Van Veen from Lord Elgin, Amy Wah from MM Robinson, Elizabeth Shadwick from Nelson and Sarah Norris from General Brock.

Burlington residents are proud of its youngest citizens. They have demonstrated their commitment to our country. They have volunteered to improve our schools and our community. Their energies are boundless and their accomplishments many.

Congratulations to their parents, teachers and friends for supporting them in their efforts. I know members will join me in wishing each of them continued success and much happiness as they pursue their goals and dreams. Way to go, Burlington.

* * *

DOUKHOBOR RUSSIANS

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in 1899 many Doukhobor Russians immigrated to Canada to escape persecution due to their pacifist beliefs. A great many of those people have settled in what is now the riding of Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan.

• (1100)

Over the years the Doukhobor people have integrated into Canadian society, but while doing so have still retained their language, culture, religion and traditions. The Doukhobor community is a shining example of how a distinct group of people can preserve and celebrate their heritage by sharing it with other Canadians. Our riding and indeed all of Canada benefit from the wonderful example of family and work ethics provided by the

Doukhobors. They amply demonstrate that there is more to be gained through unity than division.

This weekend many of them are gathered here in Ottawa at a conference celebrating their first hundred years in Canada. I am sure that all members of the House will join me in welcoming the Doukhobors and offering congratulations on the contribution they make to Canadian society.

* * *

WINDSOR PUBLIC LIBRARY

Mr. Rick Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell the House that the Windsor Public Library was awarded a gold medal at the Technology in Government Distinction Awards gala held in Ottawa on October 18, 1999. Distinction awards are designed to formally recognize leadership, innovation and excellence in the management and use of information technologies to improve service delivery.

WERLnet, the Windsor Essex Regional Library network project, implemented a state of the art library automation system shared by all partners and available over the Internet. WERLnet was one of 230 projects nominated from all three levels of government from coast to coast. It is the first gold medal winner in the newly created innovative service delivery in the municipalities awards category and was selected by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

I congratulate all those who made this project possible, specifically Steve Salmons, Chief Executive Officer of the Windsor Public Library, who accepted the award on behalf of the WERLnet project and its partners. The city of—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Malpeque.

* * *

POTATO INDUSTRY

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last June 18 I had the opportunity along with the premier of P.E.I. to open the P.E.I. Potato Board Quality Monitoring and Inspection Station. This facility has the capability to inspect the quality of all loads of potatoes leaving the province by truck.

The building was dedicated to the memory of the late Gordon Dawson, a potato producer who was a leader in the industry in growing and promoting quality spuds. A plaque unveiled states: "The P.E.I. potato industry dedicates this facility to the memory of Gordon A. Dawson, Augustine Cove, P.E.I., a potato grower and shipper who firmly believed that growing and marketing the highest quality product is the foundation of Prince Edward Island's strength in potato markets around the world".

Mr. Dawson and his family exemplified what potato quality is all about. His legacy will continue through this new facility and as a result growers, shippers and consumers will benefit.

* * *

CJCS

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this year CJCS, Stratford's first and still operating radio station, is celebrating its 75th anniversary. Founded in 1922 by electrician Milford Higgins and ham radio enthusiast Lawrence East, their radio experiments laid the foundation for Stratford's radio future.

Attaining an amateur broadcasting permit in 1923, the station was named C3GG and was originally situated at 151 Ontario Street. Owned at one time by Jack Kent Cooke and Lord Thompson of Fleet, the station has had a few well known announcers from the broadcasting field start out at CJCS. These include Lloyd Robertson, John Threthway and Frank P. Stalley.

I wish to congratulate the present station owners, Steve and Carolyn Rae, on all their success and wish them a further 75 years of quality live broadcasting.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, many farmers across the country are going broke or are having a difficult time making ends meet. For most it is through no fault of their own. Farmers are paying the price for this government letting them down in trade talks, for this government overtaxing them everywhere they turn and through everything they buy, for this government imposing unfair user fees on them and for this government burdening our farmers with unnecessary red tape and over regulation.

For six years Reform has fought for the government to lower taxes, to remove unfair user fees, to reduce red tape and to get tough on trade talks. For the past 10 years Reform has proposed compensating farmers through a trade distortion adjustment program for losses resulting from unfair trade practices on the part of Europe, the United States, Asia and elsewhere.

Surely even this government must see that it is reasonable for farmers to receive compensation for losses resulting from unfair trade practices in other countries, but so far all they have received is the Trudeau salute, again.

* * *

• (1105)

CHILDREN

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in your great city of Kingston this

S. O. 31

past September a conference, Healthy Children—Healthy Communities, was staged to identify strategies to increase the awareness of and to initiate a call to action for children's health and well-being. Hosted by the Southeastern Ontario District Health Council as a part of its larger Children's Wellness Initiative, it attracted participants from the fields of education, employment, recreation, economics, social services, justice, health and government.

Keynote speakers included renowned medical researcher and early childhood development expert, Dr. Fraser Mustard; Dr. John Wootton, Executive Director of the Office of Rural Health for Health Canada; and our eminent colleague and children's issues advocate, the hon. member for Don Valley West.

Conference participants urged that children be the first priority on all governments' agendas for the new millennium.

Children were indeed a main focal point of the Speech from the Throne. In response, our Prime Minister emphasized that we have no higher priority as a government. "The best place to start is with Canada's children. If we want the brightest future possible for our country, we must ensure that all of our children have the best possible start in life".

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL CO-OP WEEK

Mr. Paul Mercier (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this week is Co-op Week, and I am very pleased to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all co-op members in Quebec and around the world.

In this era of globalization, at a time when major corporations are streamlining their operations strictly for reasons of profits, co-operatives are viewed as an effective protection against desolidarization within the economy.

Throughout the world, an increasing number of men and women are turning to co-ops as a mean to reconcile economic development and solidarity.

In Quebec, there are co-ops in the agri-food, financial services, housing and work industries, and these employ tens of thousands of men and women.

Co-ops inform and develop, while promoting democracy and solidarity. Long live the co-ops.

* * *

[English]

EZRA LEVANT

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Ezra Levant of Reform question period fame is a man of many words and unbridled optimism.

S. O. 31

After a date last year in Toronto he was told his chances of a repeat encounter were a daunting one in a million. Ezra's response? "Yes, I have a chance. I have a shot".

Five hundred roses and countless trips to Toronto later, Ezra got lucky. At 5 p.m. on Sunday, October 24 at Shaarei Tefillah Synagogue in Toronto, Ezra Levant and Golda Van Messel are to be joined in marriage.

Life in Toronto has changed Ezra a bit. He no longer snacks on steaks or chews on members of the Upper House. He now enjoys sushi and spends quiet afternoons doing arts and crafts.

People are still trying to figure out why Golda, a promising digital media specialist, has chosen Ezra as her mate, but future Speakers of this House should beware that one day there will be more Ezra Levants around here.

I invite this House to join the official opposition in wishing both Ezra and Golda all the very best in their new life together.

* * *

[Translation]

SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME MONTH

Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I must remind the House and all Canadians that October is Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Month.

Sudden infant death syndrome, also known as crib death, refers to the sudden and unexplainable death of an apparently healthy baby, usually under the age of one. Every week, three babies die of SIDS, leaving families grieving their tragic loss.

The Canadian Foundation for the Study of Infant Deaths is conducting research to determine what causes crib death. The foundation, along with Health Canada and a number of other organizations, is striving to develop public awareness and to inform people, so as to reduce the risk of sudden infant death syndrome.

I am asking you to join me in wishing the Canadian Foundation for the Study of Infant Deaths and its countless volunteers a resounding success during Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Month.

* * *

MANITOBA'S FRANCOPHONE COMMUNITY

Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in this Year of the Francophonie, I would like to pay tribute to the vital role played by mothers and school teachers in the fight for the survival of the francophone community in Manitoba.

Although the rights of francophones were enshrined in Manitoba's Constitution in 1916, the provincial government prohibited the teaching of French until 1947.

The official story glosses over the role of women, but it is important that young people know that their grandmothers and great-grandmothers were active in helping the francophone community in Manitoba survive.

• (1110)

For over 30 years, these women ensured the survival of their franco-Manitoban cultural heritage by educating children in French. Today, because of their efforts, over 22,000 Manitobans live in French.

* * *

[English]

GRAIN

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, 82% of Saskatchewan farmers support continued regulation of freight rates and 63% want the wheat board to keep its role in the grain transportation system.

However, the Liberals are pressing ahead with their crazy plan to deregulate the rail transportation system. Deregulation has been a colossal disaster for the airline industry, but deregulation in the grain transportation sector is even worse.

Freight rate costs to farmers have tripled since the Liberals cancelled railway cost reviews and killed the Crow benefit, while rail service to branch lines was cut back. The result, railway profits have doubled and thousands of farmers are going bankrupt from skyrocketing input costs, record low grain prices and cruel Liberal policies.

Justice Estey, Mr. Kroeger and the Reform Party want the Liberals to remove the freight rate cap, but it will cost thousands of farm families their livelihoods.

The NDP is the only party fighting for farmers to keep the cap on freight rates.

When will the Liberals stop this economic insanity of persecuting western farmers?

* * *

[Translation]

PEACEKEEPING DAY

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if world peace is to be maintained, the laws governing relations between nations must be enforced and respected.

Faithful to our tradition as peacekeepers, we support the peaceful resolution through peacekeeping missions of the conflicts in which many nations are embroiled.

Saturday, October 23, is Peacekeeping Day, a day to pay tribute to Canada's participation in various peacekeeping missions throughout the world.

This October 23, let us remember the devotion of the men and women who have served the cause of democracy by taking part in these missions. Their contribution has been instrumental in maintaining international peace and security.

Peacekeeping Day provides an opportunity to officially recognize that contribution. On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I wish to pay them a well-deserved tribute and to tell them how greatly we admire them.

* * *

CRIME PREVENTION

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on October 6, the federal government announced allocation of \$557,165 to assist in the funding of 15 crime prevention projects in Quebec.

The National Strategy for Community Safety and Crime Prevention helps communities to develop community solutions to problems linked to crime and victimization and to enhance the awareness of all communities involved in the fight against crime.

There is much still to be done. Let us hope that everyone directly or indirectly involved in crime prevention will participate actively in this type of program, the existence of which was made possible by the federal government.

Essentially, the purpose of this initiative by the Liberal government is to enhance the quality of life of Canadians, and this requires enhanced security.

* * *

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, PC): Mr. Speaker, at the present time the people of this country are greatly concerned about their children's safety, having learned that the Supreme Court will not be hearing the case on child pornography until January 18, 2000.

The Minister of Justice tells us children are at no risk whatsoever, while the families await a decision from the nine federal justices.

Given their case load, the final decision by these judges might come only in 2001. If her department had referred this case immediately to the Supreme Court last winter, the public would be less concerned.

According to her, all our children are still protected nevertheless. Can she guarantee that the message these recent decisions are sending to predators is not encouraging them to continue their

despicable behaviour? Can she prove to us that the lawyers of these predators are not using the recent court decisions as legal loopholes?

We trust that the minister will not wait for some other dramatic event to make the news before she does something.

* * *

[English]

PEACEKEEPING

Mrs. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Ajax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has been and remains one of the most dedicated supporters of peacekeeping. Of all the activities conducted by our nation, few reflect the attitudes, beliefs and spirit of Canadians like peacekeeping.

Today more than 4,000 Canadian forces personnel are far from their loved ones, unselfishly giving their best to missions in far away places such as the Golan Heights, Cypress, the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait, Kosovo and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

• (1115)

Our men and women are also contributing to other complex and sometimes dangerous peace support operations in East Timor, the Arabian gulf, Cambodia, Guatemala and Mozambique.

To commemorate United Nations Day and the 11th anniversary of the Nobel Peace Prize for peacekeeping, the Canadian forces will at 10 a.m. on Saturday, October 23, 1999 hold a ceremony at the peacekeeping monument in Ottawa to pay tribute to the men and women of the Canadian forces who have died while serving on peacekeeping missions around the globe.

I know that all members of the House will join me in honouring both the sacrifices and continuing exemplary commitment of the men and women of the Canadian forces.

* * *

PAY EQUITY

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals need to stop saying one thing when they mean another. Take the notion of pay equity. Canadians want anyone doing the same job to be paid the same. Same job, same pay, that is pay equity, except if you are a Liberal. To them the state should decide what your job is worth and which job should be paid the same as other jobs.

How does the state make this leap of logic? The Liberals cannot really say. But naturally they know better than workers, unions and employers what jobs are worth, and once that dollar figure has been pulled out of the Liberal hat, someone has to pay a lot of money, unless that someone is a Liberal. They fight for years not to have to pay the price of their own foolishness.

Oral Questions

Equity means fairness and equal treatment. Only the Liberals could undermine this fine principle by using it to cloak arbitrary state intervention.

Canadians beware, fairness can become what the government says is fair not what citizens agree is fair in free negotiations. Is that the—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Dartmouth.

* * *

YWCA

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this week has been the fourth annual YWCA Week Without Violence, the campaign where all Canadians are challenged to build solutions to violence in their own communities.

As the member of parliament for Dartmouth, I know where much of the violence in my community comes from. It is from poverty, from hopelessness and from an sense of deep frustration of being left out of the good things which the country has to offer. It comes from running up against brick walls as people look for jobs, decent housing, pensions, as they stand in line at food banks. It comes from seeing government policies that do not address these issues but instead continue to maintain high levels of poverty, unemployment and economic barriers to higher education.

As we applaud the YWCA for its efforts to draw attention to violence, let us here in the House collectively address the roots of poverty with progress and with humane policies that put people first, children first and equity first.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

APEC INQUIRY

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister claimed in the House that there was no proof that he was involved in the APEC security arrangements.

However, documents released by the RCMP Public Complaints Commission show that the Prime Minister and his office were up to their eyeballs in taking action against the APEC protesters. The Prime Minister told the House that he had nothing to do with it and yet we now find that he and his staff were intricately involved.

Why did the Prime Minister and his office tell police that they had to find some way to get those protesters out of there?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this matter is being considered by the Public Complaints Commission under the former Mr. Justice Hughes. This is an independent

tribunal. I suggest we let the tribunal get on with its work in examining this matter.

I want to also point out that senior officials of the Prime Minister's office have already testified. I suggest that the hon. member look at what they have to say and take that into account as well.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as incredible as it sounds, in order to stop the protesters at the APEC meetings, the Prime Minister arranged to temporarily lease land from UBC so that he could charge any protesters for trespassing, arrest them and then throw them in jail. In other words, where it was perfectly legal and lawful to protest one day it suddenly became a place to charge, arrest and jail students the next day.

Are these legal shenanigans the Prime Minister's way of getting around the charter protected rights of these protesting students?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I reject categorically the premise of the hon. member's question. I do not accept it at all.

I will repeat that this matter is being considered by an arm's length tribunal headed by a very distinguished former judge. He will take all these documents into account. Let us wait until he states his conclusion. That is what we should do if we respect the work of the tribunal. That work should not be carried on in the House when the tribunal has been set up to do that work.

• (1120)

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, here is what an independent RCMP Public Complaints Commission found. It found that the chief of APEC security was quoted as saying "Even they, the prime minister's staff, say they are not concerned about the security aspect of the Prime Minister's visit; it's the politics of it".

In other words, the Prime Minister and his office were prepared to move in on protesters, not because they did anything wrong, no, it was because the Prime Minister did not want it to look bad for the dictator Suharto.

Why did the Prime Minister pressure the RCMP to compromise the legal rights of the protesters in order to protect the dictator Suharto?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept, in fact I reject the premise of the hon. member's question. At the same time, I wonder why the hon. member does not respect the jurisdiction of the tribunal and wants to have its work duplicated improperly in the House.

A very distinguished former judge is looking into this matter. Contrary to what the hon. member has said, the tribunal has not reached any conclusions. We will be happy to see the conclusions and have them considered once they are reached and announced by the judge.

Oral Questions

Why does the Reform Party not want to let the commission do its work and respect the work being done by former Mr. Justice Hughes?

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the opposition rejects the premise of the Deputy Prime Minister's answers. He is trying to throw a wet blanket on APEC and that is not going to work. It is not going to go away.

The Prime Minister still denies he was directly involved. Let me read a quote from one of the police officers at that time. The police officer said "We know how we normally treat things, but then the Prime Minister is not directly involved. But right now the Prime Minister of our country is directly involved and he's going to start giving orders".

What part of that quote does the Deputy Prime Minister not understand?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I do not understand is why the Reform Party is unwilling to let an independent arm's length tribunal carry on its work and allow the commissioner, Mr. Hughes, to consider all the matters in question, including the evidence of senior officials of the Prime Minister's office, and then reach his conclusions and issue his report.

Why does the Reform Party not understand the process of justice in the country?

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.): It would be nice, Mr. Speaker, if the Deputy Prime Minister answered questions instead of asking them all the time.

The Prime Minister on October 28, 1998 said "At that time I did not have time to discuss anything with police. Anybody with common sense would know that". Not only was the Prime Minister burning up the phone lines, but now we learn he was busy leasing land in order to crack down on student protesters.

How can the Prime Minister continue to stubbornly deny he was directly involved in APEC operations when everybody with common sense knows he was?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I again reject the premise of the hon. member's question. There has not been a finding to that effect by Mr. Hughes. The commission has not completed its hearings. Mr. Hughes has not rendered his judgment.

If the hon. member asks why in addition to answering questions I ask them, I want to demonstrate that the Reform Party members on this or any other subject fail to have any real, meaningful or important answers. They do not have the answers and they do not have the facts.

[Translation]

AUDIOVISUAL PRODUCTIONS

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the week, the Minister of Canadian Heritage announced that the Montreal urban police were to meet yesterday with officials from Canadian Heritage and Revenue Canada.

Could the minister tell us the outcome of this meeting?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe the allegations are being investigated by the police. So I ask that we let the police do their work.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we never get an answer from this government, because everything is always under investigation.

If the Deputy Prime Minister cannot tell us about this meeting, it is, perhaps, because the rumours are true and the meeting was not held.

Could the government tell us why the meeting between the officials and the police was cancelled?

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, the meeting did not take place because the RCMP is carrying out investigation and has asked to continue its investigation itself.

For the ninth or 10th time, we invite the Bloc Quebecois members, we encourage them, to contact the RCMP directly if they have any allegations or information.

• (1125)

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the media are reporting that Telefilm Canada is showing arrogance by refusing to answer the questions asked by journalists, preferring instead to refer them to the Access to Information Act.

My question is: How can the government tolerate the arrogance displayed by Telefilm Canada, which is refusing to answer questions about how it is spending public moneys?

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Telefilm Canada is not refusing to answer questions.

Members opposite and in fact all the members of this House have had many opportunities to ask questions to Telefilm officials when they have appeared before house committees, and this will continue to be the case.

Telefilm Canada is complying with the Access to Information Act and if the hon. member is alluding to an RCMP investigation,

Oral Questions

again, we urge him to contact the RCMP directly if he wants to make allegations or communicate information.

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in order to allow Telefilm Canada to regain its credibility, what is the Minister of Canadian Heritage waiting for to ask the auditor general to shed light on a case where the actions of a minority are detrimental to the whole television industry?

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one wonders which actions, by whom, are detrimental to whom in this House.

Again, and I believe I am repeating this for the 13th time, if Bloc Québécois members have allegations to make or information to communicate, we urge them to contact the RCMP directly. It is investigating this matter at the minister's request.

* * *

[English]

APEC INQUIRY

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, another autumn in the 1997 APEC fiasco haunts us still.

The transcript of an RCMP conference call reveals the Prime Minister's office was deeply involved in security arrangements for the Vancouver summit.

Listen to what RCMP Inspector Wayne May had to say at that time. He is quoted as saying, "When the Prime Minister is told of this he is just going to tell them to do whatever it takes to get the protesters out of there".

I would like to ask the solicitor general, the minister responsible for the RCMP, to confirm what Canadians already know, that the Prime Minister and his office had a direct role in security for the APEC summit.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague is well aware that the Public Complaints Commission is an independent tribunal. Mr. Hughes is examining all information relevant to the RCMP.

What my hon. colleague should do is let the Public Complaints Commission do its job.

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the APEC inquiry is about investigations into the RCMP. What we are interested in talking about today is what the Prime Minister's involvement was in all of that.

RCMP Inspector Bill Ard is quoted as saying, "The Prime Minister wanted everybody removed. That was the deal and we are feeling there is no legal way to do that".

In the face of these hard RCMP facts, why will the government not confirm the involvement, and indeed the interference of the Prime Minister and his office in the APEC summit in 1997?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has co-operated fully with the Public Complaints Commission. Very senior members of the Prime Minister's office have testified before the commission. Why will my hon. colleague not let the Public Complaints Commission do its job?

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, the existing chaos and menacing atmosphere resulting from the Marshall decision is taking its toll on fishermen, families and stocks.

Will the minister make a public statement that will clarify the position of his department and apply the principles of conservation for all fishermen in Canada?

I say to the minister, if conservation is truly coming first, why does he not prove it?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, conservation is our number one priority and we operate and manage the fishery on that basis. That is exactly what we are doing out there.

I have said from day one that we will have a regulated fishery. We have a regulated fishery that we are enforcing to ensure that we have conservation.

I have been in contact with all the groups. We now have a federal representative out there speaking to the commercial industries and the aboriginal communities and working to have a practical arrangement. That is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, we do not have conservation, we have confusion; confusion among the fishermen, the aboriginal people and the ministers themselves.

It appears as if the ministers' plan to put a negotiator in place has failed. Now that the Sable gas plan may be interrupted, it seems that every time the federal government goes to court it loses. Even the Liberal chair of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans stated there has to be more leadership coming from the minister.

● (1130)

If the minister has a plan to resolve the crisis in the fishery, will he please share it. What is that plan?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously the member and his party have not been listening. We put together both a short term and long term plan. We have a federal representative who is now talking to the groups.

Oral Questions

The only plan the Conservatives have is to use the notwithstanding clause. They do not even recognize that in this case we cannot use the notwithstanding clause. That is the only solution coming out of the Conservative Party.

* * *

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is official. Possession of child pornography is now legal in provinces other than British Columbia. Despite promises from the justice minister that this would never happen, yesterday in an Edmonton courthouse right in the minister's own backyard, charges against Lawrence Edelstein were held over pending a supreme court decision.

Given this contradicts everything the minister said would not happen, including the child pornography case reaching the supreme court, would the parliamentary secretary tell us if the government will now invoke the notwithstanding clause?

Mr. John Maloney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is committed to ensuring the safety of our children. We have intervened vigorously at the British Columbia Court of Appeal level and we will do the same at the Supreme Court of Canada.

Let us not forget that possession of child pornography is illegal in nine provinces and three territories. Let us not forget that. Also let us not forget that it is illegal to produce, to transfer, to sell child pornography. The government is acting well on this issue.

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I still thought Alberta and B.C. were part of Canada. Let me remind the government of the justice minister's words on February 2, 1999 in this House. She said "We are acting immediately. We will not wait for this case to reach the supreme court".

Let me also remind the government that in January the parliamentary secretary who just answered the question wrote to the Prime Minister asking him to use the notwithstanding clause to solve this child pornography case, as did 62 other Liberals.

When is the government going to bring in the notwithstanding clause and put children first instead of the sexual deviants who are still operating in this country?

Mr. John Maloney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this case will be heard on January 18 and 19. We are vigorously defending it. To invoke the notwithstanding clause at this time would weaken our case, a case where we feel we are constitutional-ly strong.

[Translation]

GENETICALLY ALTERED FOODS

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at the closing session of a meeting of the Canadian Health Food Association held in Ottawa last weekend, David Suzuki quite rightly remarked that Canadians are being used as guinea pigs for genetically altered foods.

Is the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food waiting for the food inspection system to be discredited before labelling and regulating genetically altered foods, as the Bloc Québécois requested last June?

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the approval of foods no matter how they are produced and come about in Canada is a very rigorous process. The Ministry of Health sets the terminology and the rules and regulations. The Canadian Food Inspection Agency monitors and enforces those standards and regulations. The Ministry of Health audits and monitors the Canadian Food Inspection Agency.

[Translation]

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, will the government undertake to move quickly to carry out exhaustive studies of the effects on health of genetically altered foods and to increase the budgets necessary to evaluate these foods?

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no food is approved for sale in Canada unless it has gone through one of the most rigorous food inspection systems in the world. It takes a number of years before that process is completed. The best way to explain to everybody how successful and how good it is is to look at the track record. Canadians are fortunate to have the best food regulatory system in the world and the track record shows that.

* * *

PAY EQUITY

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have undermined the solid principle of pay equity by substituting their fuzzy notion of equal value work. The Liberals' little experiment has wound up costing taxpayers \$5 billion. Worse, it has sparked a rash of similar suits that will cost consumers billions more. Unfortunately the government's loss has already set a precedent in those cases.

Oral Questions

• (1135)

When is the government going to end the confusion for Canadian workers, employers and consumers by defining what it means by equal value work?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that there is a big difference between the Reform Party and our government. I remind everyone that the Reform Party in its electoral platform said: "We will discontinue employment equity programs and will repeal section 15(2) of the charter of rights and freedoms". That is the section about equality rights. I do not think we have any reason to hear from the Reform Party on that.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pay equity is nothing but pay inequity.

Bureaucrats assigning an arbitrary value to jobs has nothing to do with fairness. It has nothing to do with unity. Every other worker in the country can now kiss a tax cut goodbye so the government can finance its loss to the federal court. It is hard to see the equity in that. There goes the surplus. There goes tax relief.

Why is it that whenever the government makes a mistake, taxpayers end up paying the bill?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member has been. He certainly was not listening to the Prime Minister the other day.

The Prime Minister said that the pay equity decision will not cause the government to back down on its commitment in the throne speech and before to carry out general tax relief for Canadians. It has already begun doing that to the tune of \$19 billion. The government will continue to do this.

The hon. member should not say things which cause confusion and misunderstanding on the part of Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

GENETICALLY ALTERED FOODS

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in order to protect biodiversity, an international protocol on biosafety that would regulate the export and import of genetically altered organisms is now being negotiated.

My question is for the Minister of the Environment. Why is Canada one of the small group of six nations blocking the accord and putting trade ahead of the protection of health and the environment?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is one of the group of nations that export

agricultural products. We are also trying to have some good exchanges of views and to reduce the distance separating the opinions of the group of countries to which the hon. member referred from the other countries with their differing views. We are doing our best to bridge the gap and to find common ground.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how does the minister explain that Canada is refusing to include in the biosafety protocol a clause making companies responsible for damage caused to the environment by their genetically altered products?

[English]

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will continue to work with like-minded nations which face similar problems.

As the logic of the hon. member's position would indicate, the fact is we cannot simply halt international trade in foodstuffs. We have to recognize that there are differing points of view of differing countries of the world. We must continue to work to bridge these differences and attempt to bring together an accord which will in particular protect the less developed countries. That also depends on our assisting them with technology, information and systems which will allow them to make benefit of any future accord.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the historian whose expert opinion Justice Binnie relied on in the Marshall ruling has publicly stated his testimony was twisted to fit the ruling. Justice Binnie interpreted Professor Stephen Patterson's testimony as evidence that the treaties granted a permanent native right to fish or hunt, but Patterson, the person Justice Binnie relied on, does not agree. The decision is flawed.

Given this evidence of a flawed decision, will the government join with the West Nova Fishermen's Coalition in petitioning the supreme court to stay and clarify the Marshall decision?

• (1140)

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the important thing is to work out an arrangement involving all the parties in a fair and equitable way. Discussions are under way right now for that purpose. A very distinguished legal scholar has been appointed as mediator. We should support his work to make sure there is a fair arrangement respecting the rights of all concerned, whether the fishers are native or non-native people in any part of Canada, including Atlantic Canada.

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it would be good to hear from the fisheries minister.

Oral Questions

The Marshall decision establishes a race-based commercial fishery on the east coast. History Professor Patterson was one of the central experts cited in that case. He thinks the ruling was flawed. He said:

Mr. Binnie relies extensively on my testimony in order to support that position. But I think what he has quoted from my testimony is very, very incomplete.

Why will the government not ask the supreme court to stay the Marshall decision, and clarify it?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our position has been very clear from day one.

We have a supreme court judgment. We will make sure that we live within the spirit of that judgment. We have already recognized that treaty right. We are now making sure we have dialogue and co-operation.

The Reform Party of course has a different position from the other parties in the House. Since 1993 it has voted against every major aboriginal initiative in the House and as usual it is carrying on as it always has.

* * *

[Translation]

GENETICALLY ALTERED FOODS

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

Section 5 of the Department of Industry Act provides that the minister shall exercise his powers and perform his duties "in a manner that will promote the interests and protection of Canadian consumers".

In order to guarantee consumers proper information on the food they consume, would do the minister promise in this House to make it mandatory to label genetically altered foods, yes or no?

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the grocery distributors council announced an initiative with the Canadian standards council, the industry, the provinces, the federal government and the Consumers' Association of Canada to conduct meetings and put together a criteria for voluntary labelling.

Before we do any labelling, we have to have a criteria in place so that it will be credible and enforceable labelling. We recognize the consumer's right and desire to know and we are working in that direction.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last June the Minister of Health tabled an announcement regarding the

medical use of marijuana in a Health Canada document on the medical use of marijuana. The minister, under section 56 of the act, exempted two persons.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health explain to the House what other actions have been taken over the summer?

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the actions of this government have shown it to be taking a humanitarian approach to people who are suffering and believe the use of marijuana would help them.

On October 6, the minister granted 14 exemptions under section 56 bringing the total to 16. As it there has been some criticism of the procedure, the minister is undertaking consultations in order to improve it.

He has also announced an action plan for clinical trials and an action plan to ensure a domestic source of supply within one year.

* * *

[English]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like read a quote by one of Canada's most infamous 80 year olds:

There is a long term intention on the part of the government—to arrive eventually at a situation where Indians will be treated like other Canadian citizens of the particular province in which they happen to be.

Pierre Trudeau made that comment in the House at the tender age of 49. What exactly happened to the Liberals' long term intentions when they signed the Nisga'a treaty?

• (1145)

Hon. Robert D. Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the intention of signing the Nisga'a agreement is to bring certainty, not only to our responsibility under the constitution to first nations rights but also economic certainty to the province of British Columbia, a province that needs certainty in the forestry area.

That is where we are at. That is where we were going. We are doing the responsible thing, and I hope the Reform Party will come to its senses and support the Nisga'a agreement like everybody else in the House.

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, assigning democratic rights according to race is offensive. The government is attacking the very foundation of our country. Equality of opportunity is at the core of what it is to be Canadian.

The government has quashed the principle of equality with the Nisga'a treaty. No longer will hard work be the determining factor

Oral Questions

of whether or not one can make a living in forestry, fishing or mining. Now success will be based on race.

Why is the government promoting a treaty that abolishes equality of opportunity?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this was the exact argument used by members of the Reform Party to keep the Sikhs out of the RCMP. They said that they did not want the regulations to change and that they did not want turbaned Sikhs in the RCMP. Members of that party stood for that and they are using the same argument as they did before. They should be ashamed of themselves.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps hon. members should calm down for a moment.

* * *

WATER EXPORTS

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we all remember the fiasco of having to pay the Ethyl corporation \$19 million. We learned today from Santa Barbara, California, that Sun Belt Water is suing the Canadian government for up to \$15 billion under chapter 11 of NAFTA.

My question is for the Minister of the Environment. Would he now admit that Canada's water export policy will not be decided by the Parliament of Canada, Canadian laws or the courts of Canada, but that it will essentially be decided by three faceless trade lawyers operating in secret on the basis of NAFTA trade rules?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am astonished that the NDP policy would be put forward by the hon. member in this way.

We do not believe that bulk water is an item of trade. We do not think it should go to NAFTA panels. We think that is covered entirely within Canada by the decision of Canadians.

The NDP may think differently. It may think it is a matter of trade. It may think it should be sent off to those lawyers elsewhere, but we say we make the decision and not other people.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment can stand and yell in the House all he wants that this is not a trade deal. The issue of Canada's future water exports is going to a NAFTA trade panel. The suit for \$15 billion is being launched now as we sit here in the House of Commons.

One reason this is happening is that the government and the minister have been dithering on water policy. Back in 1993 the Prime Minister said that there would be no water exports. We have been calling for legislation. Will he now introduce legislation and initiate talks to remove ourselves from chapter 11 under NAFTA?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member and his party keep insisting that somehow water is an item of trade which can be handled by NAFTA. We say no. We say this is a decision for Canadians, not for people elsewhere. We are saying no to water diversions from any of the major watersheds in Canada.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC): Mr. Speaker, the owners of leaky condos in British Columbia are faced with tens of thousands of dollars in repair costs through no fault of their own.

Given that Ottawa has no consumer protection legislation in place for condo owners and that CMHC required all those homeowners to get inspections, will the minister of public works, allow those homeowners at least to use some of the money from their RRSPs without penalty? This measure would not cost the government one penny. What can the minister do to help those people in B.C.?

• (1150)

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, CMHC has been at the forefront of this situation. It has been inviting the owners of those condos to come forward if they need financial assistance.

We have been opening the mortgages and giving more time for payments. We have also consolidated mortgages and we offer all the research. We continue to work in helping those people in a similar situation. We understand it is a terrible situation but we are taking our responsibility and we are acting.

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC): Mr. Speaker, the provincial government of B.C. agrees with the Barrett commission that condo owners should be allowed a sales tax exemption for the repairs.

The federal government assisted people during the floodings in Manitoba and the Saguenay and during the ice storm in central Canada. We are asking the government to have a little compassion and to help those people in B.C. We are all Canadians; people from B.C. are also Canadians.

Will the minister use a little compassion and help those people through GST exemption on the repair bills for those condos.

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we are trying with all the means we have to help condo owners, to give them relief so they can make repairs. I assure the member that our financial assistance through the CMHC loan insurance program is working.

Oral Questions

The hon. member has made a representation that we should use retirement savings plans for those things. I can take that representation to the Minister of Finance, but I remind him that we did not use such things for the ice storm or the Saguenay tragedy and so on. We also have to keep the integrity of our retirement pension system.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

Mr. Bill Graham (Toronto Centre—Rosedale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today the Minister of Health made an announcement in Toronto of major funding for the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

Can the parliamentary secretary tell us how health research will be enhanced by this new funding, and how our researchers will be able to contribute to the quality of health in Canada as a result of these new resources?

Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure to confirm the announcement made this morning in Toronto by the Minister of Health.

A total of \$65 million will be injected into health research through the creation of institutes. Their purpose will be to improve the co-ordination of health research throughout the country through involvement of both the private sector and other levels of the public sector.

This is a result of an announcement made in the 1999 budget. Also, a commitment was made in the Speech from the Throne to introduce appropriate legislation in the very near future.

* * *

[*English*]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, barely 60% of the Nisga'a themselves voted in favour of the Nisga'a treaty. The fisheries minister should abandon his name calling for a while and ask the Nisga'a why they voted against it.

The fact is that the absence of land ownership rights is a major flaw in the Indian Act and the Nisga'a deal. Hundreds of band members from the Squamish reserve in my riding have come to tell me that the lack of land ownership is the single biggest impediment to self-sufficiency for aboriginal people in Canada.

How can the government support a treaty that works against individual property rights and that has been completely rejected for that reason by some of the Nisga'a and the Liberal Party of B.C.?

Hon. Robert D. Nault (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will try one again more time. It is very important for the member opposite to read the agreement.

If the member wants to listen he will know that in the agreement it is not the case that there are no land rights for individual Nisga'a people. They can in the agreement set up a land code which will allow through fee simple for the individual Nisga'a owners to have a deed to that property based on their own regulations as a government.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILL C-6

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Minister of National Revenue stated that his colleague, the Minister of Industry, had already responded to numerous requests from the Government of Quebec to avoid any form of duplication following passage of Bill C-6 on electronic commerce. However, contrary to that statement, the Minister of Industry did not propose any amendment of satisfaction to Quebec.

Why is the government refusing to meet Quebec ministers concerning an issue as important as the protection of personal information before ramming through the House a bill that could easily have been put on hold until after such a meeting?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the hon. member that the protection of personal information is a very important issue for all Canadians, including Quebecers.

• (1155)

It is not possible for a provincial government to fully protect privacy. Federal legislation is also required to achieve that goal.

The Government of Canada also needs such legislation to fulfil its international obligations. We already discussed on two occasions the idea of such a bill with the ministers responsible for the information highway. Personally, I do not understand—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.

* * *

[*English*]

GASOLINE PRICING

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the consumer price index shows that the price of energy, the linchpin of our economy, is driving inflation hard. Overall energy costs are up 13% over the past year, but gas prices are at record highs.

Oral Questions

These high energy prices are driving up rail and trucking costs and reducing the disposable incomes of Canadians while giving big oil companies record profits.

Why has the Minister of Industry ignored the competition problems in gasoline retailing when the clear result has been record high gas prices, higher inflation and the potential for higher interest and mortgage rates? When will he start protecting consumers instead of big business?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is ironic to listen to a member of the NDP from Saskatchewan make a statement like that one. Even in Ontario yesterday the provincial government recognized its responsibility for pricing in the retail sector.

If the Government of Saskatchewan wishes to follow the example of the Government of Prince Edward Island, the Government of Quebec and what is proposed in Newfoundland to have a provincial pricing regime for gasoline, let the member take it to his own government which is of his own political stripe.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, tensions on the east coast remain high. It will come to no one's surprise to say that since the minister has become the minister of fisheries he has been sleepwalking through the Marshall file.

It is even more shocking that the current Minister of the Environment, the former minister of fisheries, did not even give a political heads up to the new minister on the issue.

Given that these two ministers and cabinet in general have, to be polite, lost all credibility on the issue, will the Deputy Prime Minister stand in the House today and make two principles very clear: that conservation and preservation of lobsters stocks are paramount and, second, that the livelihoods of traditional fishers will not be jeopardized by any potential decision that DFO may undertake?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is interested in conservation he should be congratulating the Minister of the Environment because he has taken a lead role throughout his term by putting conservation as the priority, our government position, and we followed that through.

As far as commercial fishermen, I have said in the House before that the long term solution will not be at the expense of our traditional commercial fishermen and their families. This is a solution that we all have to sit down and negotiate, and that is exactly what we are doing through dialogue and co-operation.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour.

For 50 years health and safety provisions in the workplace have not been reviewed. What action will the Ministry of Labour take to modernize health and safety issues?

Mrs. Judi Longfield (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the House should know that the issue of occupational health and safety in the workplace is very important to the government.

We are very pleased to note that employers and employees have become more comfortable of late in addressing concerns in the workplace.

We are also very pleased that there has been a genuine willingness on the part of employers and employees to work with government to bring forth a new regulatory regime which will address the current realities of workplace health and safety. To that end the Minister of Labour will be introducing amendments in the near future.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am a Sikh and I am living proof that the Reform Party believes in equality.

Why does the fisheries minister support policies that segregate Canadians and create inequality? I challenge the fisheries minister to debate equality and the Nisga'a treaty with me in Vancouver.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Deputy Speaker: I did not hear a question there. Perhaps we can move on.

* * *

● (1200)

[Translation]

APEC SUMMIT

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, six columns on the front page of this morning's *National Post* are devoted to comments by RCMP Superintendent Wayne May that the PMO and the Prime Minister himself intervened directly in RCMP decisions concerning APEC summit security.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. How does he square these comments, which came out in RCMP testimony, with the repeated statements we have heard in this House from his government?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there was also testimony from representatives of the PMO. The hon. member must give sufficient weight not just to the allegations she is mentioning today, but also to what spokespersons from the PMO said.

This is before a commission operating at arm's length from the government. It is headed by a very distinguished gentleman. It is up to him to make a decision, so let the court do its work.

* * *

[English]

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the transport minister is trying to decide the future of Canada's airline industry all by himself.

In August he suspended the Competition Act. In September he blocked Liberal MPs from attending a transport meeting. In October he stacked the House of Commons transport committee. Now his November plan is to get the cabinet to give him the sole power to decide the future of the airline industry.

Why does the minister think that only he knows what is best? What about involving Canadians? What about involving this parliament?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not only did I not know that I was so nefarious, but I did not know I had so much power, especially over my own colleagues.

The fact is that this whole process has been a very open one and will become even more so now that the standing committees of both houses are looking at this matter.

As I have said repeatedly, airline policy will be made by the government after consultation with members of the House and the Senate. I thought that was our role as a parliament and as a government. Perhaps the hon. member can tell me otherwise.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Deputy Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of all hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Tim Sale, Minister of Family Services and Housing for the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Deputy Speaker: I have notice of a point of order from the hon. member for Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys.

Mr. Nelson Riis: Mr. Speaker, there seems to have been some misunderstanding earlier today.

Points of Order

I wonder if I could seek the consent of the House to table, as part of the proceedings, the notice of claim and demand for arbitration filed by Sun Belt Water against the Government of Canada.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

The Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table the report of the Government of Canada respecting measures it has taken to give effect to the human rights committee's views on Mr. Gauthier's communication.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

QUESTION PERIOD

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during question period today a member on the other side of the House used what I consider to be unparliamentary language for this House.

The member for Lakeland, when the President of the Treasury Board was answering a question, said "You are lying through your teeth". Then when the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans was responding to a question, he yelled twice "You are a number one scum ball".

I am not aware of the type of language that the member for Lakeland uses outside of the House, but one thing is clear, that is unparliamentary language and I would ask that the member for Lakeland apologize and withdraw those comments.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Dewdney—Alouette.

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in response to the member's point of order, I think, as you are well aware, our emotions run high during question period and during debate in this place. In fact, the member for Peterborough last week called me a racist in this place. I did not get up and ask for a withdrawal of that remark. I think the hon. member knows that if we were to stop and look at all the comments that were said in this place we might be having points of order forever.

• (1205)

The Deputy Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for Lakeland could clarify the matter. If the statements alleged by the hon. member were stated, they clearly were unparliamentary and would not have been allowed. I must say that as Speaker I thought I heard

Routine Proceedings

one of the alleged statements quite clearly. I did not step up because I did not know who said it.

I would ask the hon. member for Lakeland to clarify the situation. If he did say those things, perhaps he could withdraw the words. I think it would be best if that were done immediately and we could simply end the matter here. If he did not, we will hear that from him.

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I admit that I do get a little excited by some of the so-called answers, and I completely withdraw any comments that the hon. member finds offensive.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments made recently by the government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these appointments are deemed referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the associate membership of standing committees, and I move that the report be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House give the hon. parliamentary secretary unanimous consent to proceed with this motion at this time?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

PETITIONS

TAXATION

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present petitions on

behalf of 163 voters in my riding of Nanaimo—Cowichan concerning the high level of taxation in this country. They feel that it is time for, and that they deserve, a tax break and they so indicate by these petitions.

THE SENATE

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of residents of my riding, as well as throughout Canada, who wish to see the Senate abolished. They recognize that it is an unelected house and Canadians do not need people looking over their shoulders who are not elected representatives. Therefore they would like the unelected house to be abolished.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to present a petition put forth by the African Refugee and Immigration Aid Services which calls upon the government and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to deal with the urgent resettlement needs of refugees in Sierra Leone, including tortured victims, women, children at risk and internally displaced persons with family ties in Canada. They ask the Canadian government to act on this immediately. I fully support this petition.

THE SENATE

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am very pleased to present a petition on behalf of the constituents of Saskatchewan, in particular Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Regina, Moose Jaw, Weyburn, and parts of my constituency as well, communities such as Duval, Strasburg, Davidson, Craik, Tugaske, Eyebrow and other places.

• (1210)

The petition calls upon the House of Commons to take a very important measure. The petitioners are unhappy with the fact that the Senate is undemocratic, is unelected and is unaccountable to the people of this country. They are really, really unhappy with the fact that two senators who have been charged and found guilty of fraudulent matters are continuing to receive huge paycheques from taxpayers through the Senate. The petitioners ask that the House of Commons abolish the Senate immediately.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

PERSONAL INFORMATION PROTECTION AND ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS ACT

The House resumed consideration of motion that Bill C-6, an act to support and promote electronic commerce by protecting personal information that is collected, used or disclosed in certain circumstances, by providing for the use of electronic means to communicate or record information or transactions and by amending the Canada Evidence Act, the Statutory Instruments Act and the Statute Revision Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for the information of our viewers, I would like to point out that today we are debating Bill C-6 at third reading stage.

Today is the one and only day of debate on this bill at third reading, because the government has decided to gag all those of us who would have liked to give their point of view on this bill after today's debate.

Those who are familiar with House procedure know that Friday is the sitting day that has the shortest period for government orders. The gag order has been imposed, and we will not be able to continue this debate after today.

But there is something else. It is rather curious in our system, and it is part and parcel of the problems of the Canadian federation. Two ministers of the Quebec government have asked for a meeting with a federal minister in order to discuss the terrible problems this bill will create in Quebec. These two ministers have asked for a meeting. That is not a big deal. But they got a rather cool reception: the federal government is not in the least bit interested.

A week ago, in a long speech called the throne speech, this same government was extolling the virtues of the Canadian way, the co-operation between the federal government and the provinces. Two elected ministers representing the people of Quebec asked for a meeting and got no other answer than the one given here during Oral Question Period, namely that the federal government was not interested in meeting them, that it was not interested in their point of view, that it had decided to go ahead because it believed it was in the public's best interest to do so.

Last week, this same government delivered lengthy speeches, claiming to be co-operating in what it called the Canadian approach. But there is the rhetoric, and then there is the reality. Today, we are talking about the reality, and the reality is that there is no

Government Orders

co-operation. And then the federal government wonders why, year after year, for the past 35 or 40 years, more and more people in Quebec want out of this political system.

Getting back to Bill C-6, a number of government amendments were made after the committee discussions. As a result, none of the witnesses were able to comment on them when they appeared before the committee. I will mention two in particular, which are extremely worrying.

In Division 1 of the bill, which deals with the protection of personal information, clause 7 says, and I quote:

7. (1) For the purpose of clause 4.3 of Schedule 1, and despite the note that accompanies that clause, an organization may collect personal information without the knowledge or consent of the individual only if—

We are talking about exceptions whereby the government could, without the knowledge of the individual—what is meant by that is explained further on—collect information without the consent of this individual. And then comes the list of exceptions.

• (1215)

The government bill provides for an exception for investigative bodies in specific instances. That exception, for investigative bodies, applies to circumstances where the government believes or has reasonable grounds to believe that offences have been committed. Therefore, it is possible, under such circumstances, not to comply with the act.

This started out as a rather limited definition or exception. Already, in committee, that definition began to be broadened a little. What the exception says is that it is possible not to comply, without the knowledge or consent of the individual, only if the disclosure is

d) made on the initiative of the organization to an investigative body and the information relates to an offence under the laws of Canada or a province that has been or is about to be committed—

And then this has been added:

—or to activities suspected of constituting threats to the security of Canada;

In the committee hearings, this concept of exception began to be broadened. The federal government felt that it was a good idea to have that exception for threats to security, and now, after the committee stage, it is adding, in what is becoming subclause *c.1*), what is suggested in the government's Motion No. 15:

c.1) made to a government institution or part of a government institution that has made a request for the information, identified its lawful authority to obtain the information and indicated that

(i) it suspects that the information relates to national security, the defence of Canada or the conduct of international affairs,

Government Orders

So, there is now reference not to “reasonable grounds” but to suspicions and three categories are defined: “national security”, “defence of Canada” and “conduct of international affairs”.

Knowing how paranoid the government gets when sovereignist members of parliament go overseas and do a good job of expressing Quebec’s point of view, we also must ask how far the government will go in its suspicions about international affairs and national security.

The government will now be able to ignore its own legislation if it thinks that the information it is seeking—I am sorry, I guess I should say if it suspects that the information it is seeking, and some wise guy could get up one morning and say that he suspects—concerns these things. The federal government, a government agency or a subdivision of such an agency, if it has suspicions, will be able to ignore this act, which should guarantee the protection of personal information.

If this is not enough to worry you, it certainly is enough to worry me and I am convinced that it also worries a lot of Canadians. I hope that the Privacy Commissioner will also be worried.

I am looking forward to hearing his comments on the proposed amendments, as the minister quoted him earlier as speaking highly of this act. I am convinced that the commissioner will not approve of this initiative and of these last minute amendments.

As if by chance, and I have a hard time believing that the government did not mean to do this from the beginning, these amendments were tabled after the committee hearings. It is as if the government had not wanted to hear people’s comments on this particular part of the act.

The government has presented another motion dealing with investigative bodies. I will attempt a comparison here. For the investigative bodies who believe that there was a violation, the exception will apply if they have reasonable cause to believe that the violation occurred.

For the investigative bodies, the words are “reasonable cause to believe”. However, where national security or the conduct of international affairs are involved, suspicion is enough. The same act, on the same page, uses two different concepts. It will be enough for the government to suspect, whereas the investigative bodies will need a reasonable cause to believe. It is in fact a lot more reasonable to require a reasonable cause than only a suspicion. But then again, this does not mean that there was no recourse in the past.

• (1220)

It is possible to swear out a warrant to obtain information. To obtain such a warrant, one must explain why the information is needed. The system offers some protection, since the warrant is

issued by a judge who must ensure that the information required will be obtained by appropriate means.

However, there is much cause for concern. I said so earlier this week in a press conference. We do not know how the government will use the information and what it really has in mind. It is the Big Brother syndrome. The government wants to control all kinds of information and is setting up the legislative framework it needs to do whatever it wants.

The provisions of this bill give rise to many very serious concerns. Let me repeat our objections.

First, we are against the bill because Quebec has already passed legislation on this and because the federal act will only create duplication and cause many problems.

Second, a harmonization and discussion process was started with the provinces to establish a common framework. However, the federal government pulled out of this process and decided that it would decide on its own what is good and in the interest of the people.

Why? For reasons of international visibility, because Canada wants to show leadership and boast that it passed legislation. Yet, the bill is riddled with loopholes. Even if in some parts of the bill the government is proposing measures that are both flawed and vague, it can still say that it does have legislation. There is more to it than just passing a law. There has to be some real impact to it.

This gives us another reason to oppose this bill, since the protection of personal information under this bill is subject to many conditions.

It will be hard to enforce this bill. The people who want to do e-commerce have a lot to gain by using personnel information, but the citizens would have liked better protection. Here again, we have another reason to oppose this bill.

It is easy to play with rhetoric. I listened earlier to those who are in favour of the bill. They were defending some fundamental principles, as if they were speaking on a motion to protect personal information. This is not what we are doing here: we are considering a bill with real provisions in it.

I have to say that I am very surprised to see the Reform Party supporting this bill; in fact, I am stunned. But they will have to defend their stance, it is their problem. I am also very surprised to see that federal Liberal members from Quebec are not interested in this issue and come to the House only to reiterate what has been said by the industry minister, who does not seem to care much about what is going on in Quebec in this area as in many others.

There was not a peep out of these Liberal members. We did not hear from them, we did not see them. It is as if they simply did not care. I am convinced that some of them do not even know that there

is a personal information protection act for the private sector in Quebec. Where are the people who defend this bill? Who are they defending? Are they defending their government in Quebec, or are they defending their Quebec voters in Ottawa?

The answer is the first option. These people are strictly propaganda agents in Quebec, nothing else. This is very regretful. Next week, and this is my prediction, we will see another example of this with the Young Offenders Act. These Liberal “carpet MPs” from Quebec will do the same thing.

Not one of them will rise. Yet, there is a great deal of opposition in Quebec regarding the legislation on young offenders, as there is regarding the bill now before us. And this opposition is not just from the Bloc Québécois or the Quebec government.

The Commission d'accès à l'information presented a very detailed submission to the committee. The Barreau du Québec also came and said the same things. The Chambre des notaires du Québec told us about the problems that this bill would create. The Conseil du patronat and the CSN did the same. So, representatives of the management, unions, lawyers and notaries, in other words all those who will have to live with this legislation, are telling the government, if only it is willing to listen, that what it is doing does not make sense.

But this is not important to the Minister of Industry. It does not bother him at all. He does not even want to take the time to discuss his bill with the Quebec government, in spite of repeated requests to that effect. This all began in November 1998. It continued in January, in April, and recently through letters. The government never agreed to meet the expectations and requests of the Quebec government.

To conclude, this is my last intervention on this bill. My colleague, the hon. member for Mercier, will use up the time left. I will conclude by saying that even if the bill is passed by next week, the government will continue to hear about it because, as far as we are concerned, the fight will not be over.

• (1225)

There will be a lot of practical issues and we will be here day after day to remind the Minister of Industry of the negative impact that his bill will have in Quebec. The minister will still hear from us. I hope that some Liberal MPs from Quebec will soon wake up and remember, when the time comes to vote next week, who elected them and whom they should represent in this House.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank my colleague from Témiscamingue for sharing his speaking time with me. He knows how much the fight against this legislation is close to my heart, and I think that he is carrying the torch beautifully, as usual. I know he will continue to fight in this

Government Orders

House against this legislation that cannot be allowed to go unchanged.

Having followed this legislation through all the stages since its tabling in early September, last year, effectively suspending the long-standing consultation process between the provinces and the federal government, it is clear to me that the minister of Industry could have used the time available to him to try to harmonize his bill with the Quebec legislation. But he obviously did not even try to do so.

And yet, this minister is an intelligent man. Why has he not tried to make stock of the Quebec experience? I should point out that Quebec is the first North American state to have passed, in 1994, a legislation for the protection of personal information. Quebec's five-year experience made it possible to confirm with businesses that the law was starting to be enforced seriously.

There is no personal information protection culture. Neither is there sufficient training for the public. In Quebec however the law was starting to be seriously applied.

Instead of building on this experience, the minister has developed an altogether new logic based on a national standard originally designed as a voluntary measure by businesses. That is what he would rather have.

He decided to change this proposal, which was not as stringent as a legislative proposal would be. He made it into a legislative proposal and an appendix to the bill.

Based on the opinion of several legal counsels and according to witnesses who appeared before the committee, this is the worst legislation ever developed. But this act is not just any act. It does not respect the spirit of the Speech from the Throne and is not some kind of government provision. No, it is an act similar to the Labour Code.

This act is one people will actually have to work with. Citizens who want their personal information to be protected will depend on it. The situation will be extremely confusing for Quebecers. Why? Precisely because the minister decided to ignore Quebec's experience and did not even try to accommodate Quebec's act. He chose to use a completely different logic.

• (1230)

Let me say this: I know that those who worked to have a Canadian standard, a voluntary standard for businesses, developed—and we have nothing against that, on the contrary—are for the most part from Quebec. The Civil Liberties Union was one of them. But some of the individuals who participated in this process told me that they would never have done it had they known that their work might be used as the foundation for a piece of legislation, because it was not designed for legislative purposes. It does not specifically provide citizens with rights.

Government Orders

We are now reviewing a legislation that will soon be enacted. On the pretext of dealing with electronic commerce, this federal act would infringe upon a jurisdiction that comes under the provinces, and Quebec in particular.

I noticed that the other provinces, after reacting strongly, through their justice ministers, when they looked into the federal government's bill, decided to put up with this, with the exception of Ontario with regard to health information, and maybe a number of other provinces in western Canada. The fact is that they did not have any legislation in that area. This bill, which will soon become law, means that Quebec will have to enforce a federal act in an area under provincial jurisdiction.

One must know that, prior to the federal government legislating in that area, personal information enjoyed complete protection under Quebec's legislation. According to the legal interpretations we have seen, only the adoption of a federal act could challenge the application of the provincial act. Again, I do not know what decisions will be made but, for the time being, Quebec's legislation continues to provide complete protection with regard to personal information.

What does the federal act do? It says—actually, it is the minister who introduced it and the government that supported it who had the nerve to say this—that, in an area that comes under Quebec's jurisdiction, it will be up to the federal government to decide in which circumstances the provincial act will apply, in what area and to which organizations.

What a mess. Will this mess promote better enforcement of the law? It will, and for a long time, not provide greater protection but, on the contrary, slow down the process that gave Quebec a system that was working more and more smoothly.

Let me say briefly that, contrary to the federal legislation, Quebec's legislation is clear. People can see what their rights are. It is easy to apply because any citizen can go to the Human Rights Commission where, after an inquiry, a decision is rendered. The Commission can make a ruling and exercise this right so all citizens can obtain justice.

For most people, the issue of personal information protection is about changing some incorrect information contained in a person's file.

The federal legislation provides that that person must try to agree with the company, and when this is not possible, he or she must file a complaint with the Privacy Commissioner. After reviewing the case, the commissioner makes a recommendation which is forwarded to the complainant. A report is produced within a year and if the complainant is not satisfied, he or she may take the case before the federal court.

• (1235)

Of course, the Privacy Commissioner can also decide, in exceptional cases, to take the case himself before the federal court. Otherwise, after the long process provided in the bill, the complainant is back at square one and still has to pay if he wants the recommendation to become a ruling.

I heard the minister say that Canadians want their personal information protected. Yes, they do and they should not have to wait. But when he says, however, that the bill will ensure the protection of personal information, I respectfully submit that the minister has maybe relied too much on his counsellors and, above all, that he has not looked at Quebec's legislation. He has not considered that there could be more efficient and clearer ways to protect the rights of citizens.

There is more. Not only the federal legislation will be enforced, but it will also state in what fields the provincial legislation can be applied. But does the citizen who has a problem with a business know if it is federally or provincially regulated according to this legislation? What will he do? He will either not file a complaint at all or file one with the wrong government, in which case the legal time limit could expire. This legislation will create more confusion.

It is for good reason then that, on five occasions, Quebec's ministers wrote to the industry minister and requested a meeting with him, and asked him to postpone the process in order to harmonize it. We, members of the Bloc Québécois, have repeatedly tried to convince the industry committee and the minister to take advantage of the delays during the session of Parliament, or even of the summer recess, to make an attempt at harmonization. Why did the government not try to do it?

I attended the Forum of Federations, where I heard what I already know: Federalism—and I am not talking about Canadian federalism—is a system that is theoretically flexible. It is a system that, in theory, allows different cultures and languages to coexist. I say theoretically because the process of legislation on personal information in which I have been involved for more than a year is not the least bit flexible.

According to the theoreticians, including those working for the Forum of Federations, federations work best in homogeneous countries. That is the problem. The problem is that Quebec is a people and a nation. Its privacy legislation is governed by civil law, with its origins in France. But it is civil law. The rest of Canada is governed by common law—this is not a defect, just a difference. In fact, in the western world there are two major traditions, civil law and common law. Now, instead of trying to take the difference into consideration, the federal government has chosen to eliminate it.

This is one more lesson. Any student of law, politics or anyone else wanting to know the status of Canadian federalism has only to

Government Orders

trace the process of passage of this legislation. It is a significant piece of legislation, since it goes to the very heart of Quebec civil law.

Earlier this week, I had the opportunity to accompany the minister to the G-8 summit, where one of the issues addressed was e-commerce security.

• (1240)

As I discovered, and the minister ought to have before me, when there are international negotiations on harmonization—as there will have to be, because a degree of harmonization on personal information based on existing legislation will be necessary—he will find that Quebec is not alone.

The European countries with their differences and their civil law will do as Quebec has done, use a definition of a positive right for citizens. He may also, of course, find there are other countries with a common law tradition that will settle for standards—I will withdraw that expression—will prefer protection related to standards to which businesses agree to comply. Someday, negotiations will have to take place, and Canada could have benefited from the fact that it still has a province, Quebec, which has a civil law tradition, instead of trying to bury this tradition and replace it by something else.

Instead of making good use of the time it had on its hands to harmonize both legislations, it has steadfastly refused to do it. Instead of using to its advantage the Quebec experience to deal with an issue that is quite difficult, as it will find out, it preferred to go about it in a completely different way, with a totally different logic, by relying almost totally on businesses' co-operation. Quite well. Everything is fine when businesses do co-operate, but what happens when they do not? What should we do? Should we let private citizens fend for themselves? Of course not. That is the problem.

When the citizens' rights are not clearly and precisely spelled out, when the means to have them respected are not free and efficient, we can have all the legislation we want, it is of no use to them. Instead of using the Quebec experience, in which companies will have to abide by a certain set of rules, it will force companies in Quebec to follow two set of rules, never knowing for sure which one applies.

The government has refused to even try to harmonize its legislation with the one in Quebec. Instead of taking this advantage it will soon need in international negotiation, that is the experience of harmonizing two great traditions, the civil law and the common law, the government chose to set one of these traditions aside, the French one, to bury it, and forget about it.

The Chambre des notaires is extremely concerned about the definitions of signature. The Chambre des notaires can only accept

a document if the signature meets the conditions set out in the Quebec Civil Code. This is a whole aspect of French live, Quebec tradition and culture which is at stake, and the minister, instead of understanding the intensity of the responses triggered by this, and the depth of the problems created, prefers to ignore the whole thing.

I believe this bill, when it becomes law, will come back to haunt the government because it is not true that it will promote the development of electronic commerce. Everybody has been saying that people must feel safer before they engage in more electronic commerce. This bill will certainly not achieve this goal in Quebec, on the contrary. It creates—as if on purpose, but let us assume it is not on purpose—additional problems for every Quebec company and for all the companies that do business in Quebec.

• (1245)

At the international level also, this bill will come back to haunt the government. For my part, I came to the full realization, once again, that when it comes to the legislative process, Canadian federalism is not consistent with the main characteristics of federalism.

[English]

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the last presentation and I agree with some of the points that the hon. member made.

I am delighted to participate in today's debate. This is probably one of the most important debates that we will have in the House for some time dealing with the future of the country.

I know it must be difficult after lunch to have so many members in the Chamber trying to stay awake to listen to my presentation.

I remember giving a speech once and there was a young man in the back of the crowd. He kept saying, "Yea, yea". I thought it was very nice and very encouraging. At the end of my speech I was commenting to one of my friends about this young man's enthusiasm. My friend said "Did you not notice that he had his headphone on and was actually listening to the hockey game". In any event, I know, Mr. Speaker, that you will be listening to my presentation today.

I feel very enthusiastic about speaking to Bill C-6 today. The bill aims to support and promote electronic commerce by increasing Canadians' confidence in online transactions, providing protection for personal information that is collected, adjusting the legal framework for the electronic environment and providing an alternative means for the federal government to provide services to Canadians.

I direct my comments in particular to the people in the gallery who I think sometimes get the wrong impression that we are here in

Government Orders

the Chamber fist-fighting, arguing and yelling at each other all the time when in fact most of the time it is fairly boring here. I mean boring in a sense that it is very straightforward. I am probably not going to change that mode this afternoon as I make my presentation on Bill C-6.

I normally like to be a bit more flamboyant in my presentations but this is a very detailed piece of legislation. It is very specific and very integrate in terms of dealing with protecting Canadians' privacy. I will quote from the privacy commissioner's annual report of 1998-99 when he refers to this specific legislation and states:

—the bill will take the most important step in defence of individual privacy since passage of the Privacy Act bound the federal government in 1982.

In terms of our concern here in this place for people's security and the security of their personal information, whether it is medical records, financial records or whatever, this piece of legislation takes us further than any other piece of legislation, bar none, with the exception perhaps of the Privacy Act itself.

The privacy commissioner goes on to say that the bill is a major leap forward by providing a mechanism for independent oversight, mandating the Privacy Commissioner of Canada to investigate complaints, issue reports and conduct audits. As a last resort, it provides recourse to the federal court and empowers the court to award damages when it feels the penalty is justified.

I could go on and on, but the privacy commissioner basically states that this is really important and significant legislation. It recognizes that the world of commerce, in which all of us participate either in our roles as businesses or as consumers, is more different today than it ever has been. It has taken on a speed and operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It is not a nine to five operation any more as it used to be just a handful of years ago. There is indeed a business-industry revolution taking place before our eyes. The transactions are so horrendous in both scope and speed that something has to be done in order to protect Canadians' private information.

• (1250)

When we make a call to purchase some goods over the telephone and are asked for our VISA number, I suspect we are hesitant to give it. However, that is the way it is. We have to give it. Goodness knows where the heck it is going and who is going to be using it. Hopefully, the person at the other end of the line is not an unscrupulous type. In terms of the need for privacy, this is a simplistic version of what I am talking about, but I think we have all been there and are concerned about it.

Since we will be talking a lot today about the Internet and electronic commerce, I want to share with my colleagues a funny

little quote that I read somewhere which describes the Internet as "A worldwide network of university, government, business and private computer systems all run by a 13 year old kid named Jason". We all smile because we know that children are very comfortable with these new technologies. In fact, I suspect that most adult learn their skills from their children when it comes to learning how to work our computers.

Before I get into the substance of my remarks, I would like to emphasize the importance that I feel the entire House of Commons, without regard to political affiliation, should attach to this matter. We are really debating something that is very important to our children and their children's future. When we talk about implementing legislation in the public interest, we have to acknowledge the entire public, and clearly that includes the young people of the country who are probably a whole lot more tuned in to what I am talking about today than most people.

The federal government has been at this experiment for many years. We started with the constitution and the charter of rights rooted in certain basic values. The people who drafted our constitution and the charter of rights understood that times would change. Indeed, they understood that definitions of fundamental things like privacy would also change. They also understood that circumstances would require people to rise to the challenges of each new era by applying the old values but in very practical ways.

In the past, this change occurred when we went from an agriculture economy to an industrial economy. This change is now occurring with the move toward a new modern digital economy. It is our responsibility to fight to adapt our institutions to new economies and markets and to update and modernize our citizens' rights to uphold their right to privacy in the midst of these vast economic transformations occurring before us. In the past, leaders recognized and lived up to this responsibility. Now it is our opportunity and our responsibility to do the same once again.

The pace of change, not just the nature of change, is very different. Once again it is our responsibility to respond to this change applying the oldest basic values and principles in practical ways that will allow them to not only be preserved but enhanced by our modern technologies during these modern times.

We all recognize that technology has revolutionized the way we live and the way we do business. I suspect that we have only seen the beginning of this. I am sure that many of us, in different ways, have experienced how new technology, such as the Internet, can be a valuable tool and a valuable resource. However, it is only valuable when placed at the service of humanity.

Technology, by its very nature, requires unconditional respect for the fundamental interests of society. On this theme there are only two direct topics that I would like to focus my remarks on

Government Orders

today. First, Internet technology must be at the service of humanity and of unalienable rights. It must respect the prerogatives of a civil society, among which is the protection of our privacy.

Second, guiding principles and values cannot be inferred from mere technological efficiencies of from the usefulness occurring to some at the expense of others. New technologies must promote our integral development for the benefit of all citizens of our country.

Today I am going to concentrate my remarks about Bill C-6 on these two topics. We have all made presentations in the House over the last little while about some of the very specifics of the legislation as well as its overall thrust. I want to focus simply on two topics, the first one being the protection of our basic rights.

It is obvious that new technology and the amazing advances that have been made in telecommunications have changed the way we all communicate with each other. There is no question that we are living through a revolution in the telecommunications industry with cheaper, easier to use and faster ways to communicate and do business with people within our homes, communities and around the globe.

I believe that on the whole the Internet and electronic commerce do present outstanding possibilities for the advancement of our basic rights and values and, on the whole, are very beneficial tools to the citizens of Canada. No doubt things such as education and commerce will be improved in the next few years because of the Internet. Generally speaking, our daily lives will likely be improved.

• (1255)

The other day I was visiting an elementary school. I asked some rhetorical questions to I think a grade 4 or 5 class. The students looked awfully little. One young boy said "I will run out and find out. I will get on the Internet and I will come back". I did not quite know what he was talking about, but he came back with a long printout of all the answers to the questions that I had been asking. In other words, this little boy knew he could run out, get on the Internet and find out information that would probably take me a good day of searching in some library to find out. I realize I have a long way to go to catch up to this young person who, in this case, was probably in grade five.

A byproduct of this technological revolution is that supervising our rights takes on a new dimension of responsibility. New Democrats realize that when the world changes so do our responsibilities. Just because new technologies are developed does not mean that our basic rights and responsibilities no longer apply. At the present time there is very little protection or, more precisely, there is no legislative protection or legal deterrent of our privacy rights in cyberspace. There are mostly voluntary codes for businesses to follow.

Whatever exists, it does not loom large in cyberspace. For example, a website posts a privacy policy. Does that mean our privacy is protected? Not really. I do not think so, nor do most Canadians.

The task before us is to make our laws and principles apply to changing technology. The old laws may require some redefinition but the same old general principles around protecting our privacy rights must stand very firm. We must find the means to protect our personal information in modern times. We cannot be neutral in the development of or application of these new technologies.

It is not acceptable that these new technologies be endorsed simply because of their efficiency. In the interest of advancing human rights, we all have a responsibility to make sure that new technologies respect the values of a civil society, among which is the protection of our privacy rights. That is where legislation like Bill C-6 comes into play.

We know that Bill C-6 partly grew out of a public concern about personal privacy in the face of this rapidly changing technology. We have all become data subjects. All sorts of organizations and companies have personal details about us in their computer databases. While growing up our mothers may have told us that a person's mail is private, but in today's digital world I am not so sure that is the case any more, at least our name and address certainly are not.

The chances are very good that most of us have had, at some point or another, our mailboxes stuffed and overflowing with catalogues, sales ads, prize offers which we never requested and probably do not want. How many times have one of us been notified that we have won a huge benefit or something and all we have to do is phone up, pay a couple of thousand dollars and they will send it to us? There are all kinds of legitimate initiatives but there are also a lot of scams out there. The point is that somebody somewhere gets hold of our personal addresses and of information about us personally.

We now know that companies have sold or traded mailing lists containing our personal information time and time again. The public concern is that if the information is entirely wrong, is out of date, is confused with someone else's, or, in the worst scenario, the information is abused, it can actually cause serious problems. People could be unfairly treated, denied jobs, housing, benefits, insurance, credit or even a spot in a university.

Today information is becoming increasingly valuable. Information is a valuable commodity and New Democrats believe we have to be leaders in developing these new ways of doing business through protecting individual's privacy.

We obviously have to protect our privacy rights. We also have to ensure that we solve the problem that we set out to fix and that the solution is in the best interest of our society. The essential

Government Orders

questions are: Is Bill C-6 a strong law; and, if enacted, does it demonstrate that we have lived up to our responsibility of protecting privacy rights in the face of these new technologies? On the whole, I think the answer to that question is yes. That is why New Democrats will be supporting Bill C-6 at this particular reading.

I want to address one other theme before I close and that is ensuring that new technologies benefit all of us.

I want to begin discussing this second theme, which is the need to ensure that we all have opportunity to benefit from the new technologies, by saying a variety of all commentators from all sorts of disciplines have commented on the increasingly important role that electronic commerce is playing in the lives of everyday people.

I do not often quote the chairman and CEO of Bell Canada, but I guess we try everything once in our lives. Mr. Jean Monty told delegates at the Ottawa OECD conference last fall that "What we are witnessing today is the birth of a new economy, a new economic order that is based on networks and chips."

• (1300)

A quick glance at the current electronic commerce situation in this country reveals that not all Canadians are being given the same opportunity to participate in this new economic order. If we assume, and I believe this is a safe assumption, that 30% of Canadians have some sort of access to the Internet, and this may just be the fact that they have a connected computer at their school, we must acknowledge that about three-quarters of Canadians remain in the dark.

Even worse, many Canadians in rural areas have begun to voice concerns that they may see exorbitant increases in the cost of local phone services in the near future. Traditionally, phone companies were able to subsidize local phone rates in rural areas with money taken from long distance funds and urban areas. However, with the increased competition in the long distance market through deregulation, these subsidies are drying up. If future governments cannot ensure reasonable local phone rates for rural Canadians, I wonder then how they can expect the farmer in rural Saskatchewan for example to invest in a second phone line for Internet purposes.

It is the government's responsibility and indeed our responsibility to make sure that all Canadians have the necessary opportunities to participate in the new economy. All Canadians must be given an opportunity to get on board this new economy. Otherwise, we risk creating a future society of electronic haves and electronic have nots.

In the case of businesses, we have heard small and medium size businesses complain that the costs of participating in electronic commerce are often simply prohibitive from their point of view.

Ideally e-commerce would provide an excellent means for small businesses to expand their market reach. Unfortunately, many cannot afford the fees charged by banks for setting up the necessary security and privacy protection services. The costs are keeping electronic commerce in the big leagues and small businesses could be put at a competitive disadvantage as a result.

I know that Industry Canada has implemented a community storefronts program which helps small businesses become online merchants, but we need an expansion of this program if Canada is to have a thriving small business presence on the Internet.

On another issue, it is impossible to deny that when electronic commerce becomes the way of doing business, thousands of Canadians will risk losing their jobs. Many commentators, including American expert Jeremy Rifkin, have warned of the adverse effects electronic technology will have on society.

There is a potential danger that as e-commerce takes off, whole types of workers could easily be displaced. Those at risk are a diverse group, everyone from stockbrokers to call centre operators, to shipping clerks in warehouses. A society in which there is a large pool of labourers with displaced skills and no work and a group of information elites is not what New Democrats want.

At the Ottawa OECD conference, Mr. Bill Conner, the general secretary of Britain's largest union for retail employees, expressed disappointment that "the meeting did not consider in any detail e-commerce's potentially devastating effects on traditional low and middle income workers". He added that the euphoria over the potential for exponential growth of e-commerce overshadowed concerns about what may be left in its wake.

This is certainly not a good thing to see. It demonstrates a lack of vision and a lack of ability to see the big picture. It is not working toward our goal of ensuring the majority of Canadians have the opportunity to participate in the new economy.

We New Democrats agree that Canada must be a world leader in e-commerce technology. However, we also believe that true leadership requires attention to all of the implications of this issue. That is essentially the difference between our party and some of the others that have spoken to this legislation.

I know my time is limited and I have much more I would like to say, but I am not going to have a chance. I will simply say that in terms of protecting privacy, as the privacy commissioner has indicated, this is a major step forward. However, in terms of those people who will clearly be displaced by the introduction and the expansion of e-commerce, this is something that all of us must take much more seriously unless we are going to have an increasing society of those who have and those who have not.

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say that the member for Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys gave us an excellent speech dealing with the opportunities and the challenges of e-commerce.

• (1305)

I would suggest that all members of the House read that very thoughtful speech and take to heart many of the points the member made.

Mr. Nelson Riis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments by my hon. colleague. I have known him for a long time and respect the work he has done in the House of Commons.

I will use this opportunity to add one further point which I did not have time to make in my original presentation and that is about the need for proper education and training.

I know the government has introduced the possibility of implementing Internet sites across the country that would be serviced by 10,000 young people with Internet skills and presumably other computer skills. That is obviously a major step in the right direction, but let us not lose sight of the ongoing need to properly educate and train people.

It is fair to say we all agree that one of the impediments to the process is the tremendously high tuition fees students face at our universities, colleges and technical schools. The economic burden is sometimes prohibitive and a lot of people who ought to be improving their educational training skills are unable to do so.

We should take the bold step and acknowledge that if we are moving into the knowledge based economy of the 21st century, we should ensure that everyone has equal access to our colleges and universities. We should consider joining the other 16 OECD countries that have tuition free colleges and universities. The cost would be \$2.6 billion. We have a contingency fund in this year's budget of \$3 billion. If we had the will to do that today, we have the finances that would ensure that every young person and not so young person in the country had access to university and college education without paying any tuition fees.

Can anyone imagine a better millennium project for the government and parliament than to implement such a program.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on this issue, the government's position or rather its insensitivity in setting up a system that contradicts or even impacts on the whole concept of civil law, is of course well known.

I would like to know how the NDP member would have reacted. He is obviously arguing in favour of an act like the bill before us. Is

Government Orders

he at least more sensitive with respect to the complaints made to the government? On that, I would like to quote the Quebec bar association, which said that the protection of personal information is under provincial jurisdiction because it concerns property and civil law.

We all know that the Quebec system is based on civil law and not common law and that important practical problems are to be expected. We wonder if the government is the only one to think along those lines and we also wonder what the other parties' position is on the fact that the Government of Quebec, the Quebec bar association, the Chambre des notaires du Quebec, the Conseil du patronat du Quebec and Quebec unions have all said that it would have been better to recognize Quebec's legislation.

The bar association even went further and said that Quebec's legislation must apply in areas under federal jurisdiction areas to ensure that the law is the same everywhere and that it is understood by everybody, particularly as Quebec's legislation contains flexible mechanisms for consumers who feel that the protection of their personal information is being interfered with. There is a simple appeal mechanism, not too complicated, that does not involve the traditional courts, where things are complicated and intimidating.

Would the NDP member and his party have the same approach as the government or would they be a bit more flexible?

[*English*]

Mr. Nelson Riis: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the interventions made by the groups during the hearings into this legislation that my hon. friend referred to. I acknowledge that he has a point. The situation in Quebec is significantly different than in most other parts of the country.

It reminds me of the debate yesterday when we were talking about the replacement of the Young Offenders Act. The same case was made that the Quebec experience in terms of dealing with young offenders is much more advanced than in some of the other parts of Canada, is much more effective and that we have much to learn.

• (1310)

While I acknowledge my friend's point, we now have an opportunity as a country to be on the leading edge of technological change in terms of electronic commerce. It will benefit business and consumers. I acknowledge that the government has taken some steps in this direction. We have much to learn from the Quebec experience particularly in terms of the appeals process my friend has referred to. I am not an expert in this field but perhaps there are other areas we could learn from.

The important thing is to acknowledge as a country that we are poised on the edge of revolutionary change in the way society

Government Orders

operates as a result of these new technologies. We are in a position to take global leadership on this issue. If this legislation takes us one more step toward that, Canada can lead the way in the development of new technologies. Canada can show other countries ways of approaching these issues by implementing policies both in terms of privacy and in terms of acknowledging and not forgetting the people who will be replaced by technology. We have a great contribution to make not only to future generations of Canadians but indeed to the world itself.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Brien: Mr. Speaker, I have a comment to clarify what I asked the NDP member previously.

I want him to understand one thing clearly. I fully share his concern that there must be a legislative framework, that Canada wants to take a leadership role and fulfil its own obligations. I have no objection to that.

However, the problem we have is that, in order to meet a need in other parts of Canada, in the nine provinces of Canada, the government is significantly changing a balance that was in the making because of a very progressive law in Quebec. In fact, the problem is not only with this bill. He mentioned the bill on young offenders. The same thing applies.

Is the New Democratic Party open to the idea that some asymmetry could be allowed occasionally, or does it feel that there should be a national objective at all cost, and too bad if Quebec already has its own legislation? Their point of view is: "We Canadians need a law, therefore we will impose it to Quebecers too, because we need that law and we want to play a role".

Is there not room for recognition, in the federal legislation, of the Quebec legislation, and should it not simply say that, where legislation on the protection of personal information already exists, that legislation will be allowed to apply?

This especially true in the case of Quebec—I know it could be different in the case of the other provinces—as Quebec has a civil law system, while the other provinces have a common law system that is different in its approach and philosophy. They are not different for nothing. In speeches, Quebec is recognized as distinct, among other things, because of its civil law, but in reality, this bill does not recognize that fact.

Consequently, I would like to know if the member would be willing to go as far as to support the bill's recognizing, because of civil law, that in the objective of regulating electronic commerce and protecting personal information, where there is a civil law system, civil law and its legislation should apply, because these provisions are even in the Quebec civil code, and to give precedence to those provisions.

Governments could then hold discussions to ensure harmonization for businesses involved in interprovincial trade. Does the hon. member believe that the federal legislation should apply in Quebec and prevent the Quebec government from making regulations under civil law? This is what I am asking the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. Nelson Riis: Mr. Speaker, my colleague raises an interesting question.

This perhaps is one of the ongoing dilemmas we often face when we are trying to introduce a pan-Canadian approach to a problem. We recognize that one province abides by a civil code and therefore has different approaches from the rest of the country.

I would be open to further discussions on this. The need to integrate the systems is critical. We must recognize and take into consideration that a different legal system exists in the province of Quebec. It is something that is certainly open for consideration.

• (1315)

Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the PC Party of Canada I am pleased to speak to Bill C-6, the personal information protection and electronic documents act.

Before I begin I would like to thank many witnesses who took the time to make submissions, either in person or in writing, to the Standing Committee on Industry. Their representations were extremely helpful with respect to bringing new issues to light. I would also like to pay tribute to my colleagues on the industry committee for their vigorous discussion of the contents of the bill, in particular my colleagues from Mercier, Lévis and Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine. Regardless of our political differences we are all trying to ensure that parliament acts appropriately on legislative matters.

Moreover, I would like to note the efforts of the member for St. Catharines, the former parliamentary secretary to the minister of industry, in terms of his credible defence of the government position. I would also like to commend the member for Durham for bringing forward an amendment at committee to section 18 of the bill which was identical to an amendment I had sponsored.

It is always a rare pleasure to see Liberals deviate from the government line. Perhaps we will see a day when the chair of the industry committee shows similar courage, but I digress from the subject at hand, Bill C-6.

The intent of Bill C-6 is a positive one. The bill unfortunately has become known as the e-commerce bill, which is a bit of a misnomer. Part 1 of Bill C-6 deals with the protection of personal information irrespective of whether it is in an e-commerce environment or whatever. Meanwhile parts 2, 3 and 4 of Bill C-6 pertain specifically to electronic documents.

Government Orders

It is unfortunate that the industry committee spent most of its time on part 1 of the bill at the expense of the other parts. We really did not delve into the technological feasibility of the bill's clauses related to electronic signatures. For a so-called e-commerce bill, the committee should really have devoted more time to sections pertaining to electronic documents.

That being said, let us never forget that this is as much a personal privacy law as an e-commerce law. The two distinct issues have become intertwined. It is the growth of e-commerce that is driving initiatives such as Bill C-6.

As I noted during my remarks on second reading the increase of electronic commerce in Canada and throughout the world, more appropriately North America, is growing exponentially. We require a law to carefully examine the extent of government regulations in this domain.

The European Union has before its member countries a hard hitting directive to require companies to take exhaustive measures to protect the privacy of their customers. Meanwhile the United States has chosen the route of self-regulation. In essence, it is letting companies prove their worth in protecting the personal information of their customers. As someone who has spent 28 years working for one of Canada's largest high tech companies, with many of those years spent in sales and marketing, I understand the logic of the U.S. approach.

The private sector has a strong stake in protecting its customers, especially as it relates to the still unrelated realm of e-commerce. If customers do not trust a company with their information they will find another company that will. Competition is therefore a strong motivator for companies to take meaningful measures to protect the information of their customers. While I understand the U.S. approach, and I do believe it is the right answer for Canada, I also understand that the U.S. is now beginning the process to develop a privacy and e-commerce act.

Today I listened to the industry minister in the House when he said that we must do something and that people were saying we must do it now. I am not saying that the privacy and e-commerce act is not important, but when I look at privacy, at e-commerce and at the consumer or the customer, I think we should have been a lot more transparent. We should have had a comprehensive e-commerce privacy act that incorporated all the provinces, more importantly, and made sure that we were in step with our biggest trading partner, the U.S.

The PC Party and I believe in the need for legislation to protect personal privacy.

• (1320)

There are many flaws in Bill C-6 that I have attempted to address at committees, flaws which many witnesses have asked parliament

to correct, flaws which the government continues to leave in the bill.

For example, subclause 18(1) gives the privacy commissioner the right to audit a company based on a dispute regarding recommended business practices which are listed under schedule 1 of the bill. Recommended business practices are just that, recommendations. They are not laws and should therefore not be enforced as such. The privacy commissioner should be allowed to conduct an audit only when there are reasonable grounds to believe that the law has been violated.

Audits are intrusive and place a heavy administrative burden on the business operations of Canadian companies. The audit power under Bill C-6 should only be used to cover alleged violations of mandatory obligations set out in the bill. The privacy commissioner should not be permitted to micromanage whether a company complies with recommended business practices such as what type of passwords or encryptions are being used by a company.

Subclause 18(1) as presently drafted is not necessary since Bill C-6 already provides the privacy commissioner with the tools needed to ensure the compliance of schedule 1. For example, section 11 allows an individual to file a complaint if he or she feels that an organization is contravening the legislation or not following a recommended business practice. Furthermore, section 12 gives the privacy commissioner the power to investigate all complaints including complaints that an organization is not following recommended business practices.

I must also reiterate the longstanding objections of a variety of witnesses to the far-ranging powers granted to the privacy commissioner under clauses 12 and 18. While I do not object to extending search and seizure powers to the privacy commissioner under Bill C-6, it is in the best interest of all concerned that his office be required to obtain prior judicial authorization. The lack of any obligation for the privacy commissioner to obtain the approval of our courts before exercising certain seizure powers is deeply troubling.

Clauses 12 and 18 of Bill C-6 create a fundamental conflict by allowing the privacy commissioner to determine whether to exercise search and seizure powers and execute those same powers. The authorization should be granted by a neutral third party as in the case of criminal investigations.

Bill C-6 already provides the privacy commissioner with broad investigative and audit powers. The commissioner may summon and enforce appearance of persons under oath, converse with any person, compel the production of documents and receive and accept any evidence in the same manner as the superior court. It is for these reasons that additional safeguards are needed in Bill C-6 as it relates to the privacy commissioner or his delegate actually entering the premises of a private organization and seizing records.

Government Orders

Indeed, Blair Mackenzie of the Canadian Newspaper Association told the industry committee that the provisions within Bill C-6 are "frightening". Other witnesses have alluded to a challenge under the charter of rights and freedoms if the privacy commissioner acts on clause 12 or 18.

Furthermore, I am also troubled that the government did not bring forward any study or report on the cost impact of Bill C-6. From a legal, constitutional and economic standpoint these unfettered audit powers constitute a tremendous defect in the legislation.

Sadly the Liberal majority decided to ignore the fears of free speech advocates and the pleas of the private sector and chose to defeat my amendment to oblige the privacy commissioner to obtain a court order before exercising certain seizure.

However there are many other problems with the bill which the Liberals chose to ignore. As Bill C-6 is currently drafted there is no provision to facilitate the sharing of personal employee data between management and the union pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement. Again the Liberal majority defeated my amendments before the industry committee to remove these potential obstacles to the employee-employer relationship. Moreover, I do not feel that the amendment brought forward by the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine to clause 27 adequately addresses this problem with the bill.

The Liberal majority also defeated my amendments to limit the costs charged by an organization for those seeking personal information to the same level of fees charged by government organizations. Despite the great rhetoric from the Liberals regarding personal privacy, Bill C-6 leaves the door open to the application of high fees for someone's personal information which if not properly regulated could become a barrier to access.

• (1325)

Bill C-6 also raised the spectre of a new round of federal-provincial battles. The governments of Canada's two largest provinces, Ontario and Quebec, have spoken loudly and strongly in opposition to Bill C-6.

The industry committee heard from distinguished constitutional lawyers including a former deputy minister of justice. They disagreed passionately on whether or not Bill C-6 intrudes on provincial jurisdiction. I found it quite troubling that one of these distinguished experts mentioned the possibility of Bill C-6 as presently drafted becoming another referendum issue.

The Liberals had a chance to suspend clause by clause consideration at committee to allow the industry minister to negotiate a possible solution to prevent a constitutional challenge but the Liberals said no. They refused to co-operate.

The Ontario ministry of health also expressed its concern that health information falls clearly under provincial legislation. It was better prepared than the federal government to bring in such legislation. Regrettably the federal Liberals did nothing to address these concerns. They seem more interested in provoking fights than finding real solutions. Anybody who witnessed the partisan Liberal attacks against the Ontario ministry of health bureaucrat would attest to the poor attitude of the Liberals.

I will give credit where it is due. For example, the government supported my amendments to subparagraph 7(3)(h)(i) which would protect personal information for the shorter of 100 years after the record's creation or 20 years after the individual's death. Bill C-6 previously would have allowed for the disclosure only after the shorter of 110 years after the record's creation or 20 years after the individual's death.

As amended, this provision of the bill is now a more reasonable balance between protecting the personal information of the living and allowing the use of such information for historical, research or literary purposes. This is still a relatively small aspect of Bill C-6. I thank the government for helping me to get this part of the legislation right.

I also thank the government for supporting my amendments to remove a clause from the original version of Bill C-6 which would have allowed the government through order in council to change schedule 1 of the bill.

Regardless of these minor improvements the bill remains fundamentally flawed. The PC Party supported Bill C-6 with the hope that the government would allow the industry committee to correct many of these errors and omissions. Sadly not enough of these flaws were corrected.

The bill opens the door to legal battles due to the unfettered power given to the privacy commissioner. It unduly restricts the legitimate activities of small and medium size businesses. It causes a new restrictive, regulatory framework without a cost impact study. It aggravates the delicate relationship between the federal government and the Ontario and Quebec governments.

It rushes headlong into meeting an European Union directive when our number one e-commerce and overall trading partner has adopted a position with the directly opposite approach.

I have tried to be constructive and I have tried to improve the bill at committee, but by and large the Liberals have refused to co-operate. They have refused to compromise. Without concrete evidence they ask us to trust them that all the problems will sort themselves out.

On behalf of the PC Party I oppose Bill C-6 and urge the government to respect and act upon the differing points of view raised by so many in opposition to the bill as it is currently written.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very important for me to speak on Bill C-6. I want to indicate that I will be using the whole 20 minutes that I am entitled to.

• (1330)

Bill C-6 is very important to me. As our NDP colleague pointed out, the protection of personal information in the private sector, what with the technological progress being made, must be regulated if we are to protect our fellow citizens from coast to coast.

What is the purpose of Bill C-6? First, part 1 of the bill will ensure the protection of personal information collected, used and disclosed by the private sector.

Many Canadians and Quebecers know that Canada already has a law that ensures the protection of personal information collected and used by the federal government, as have all of the provinces except Prince Edward Island. However, these laws do not affect the private sector. Up until now, Quebec was the only province to have a law protecting personal information, which applied and still applies to the private sector.

First, I want to talk about this bill and the protection it will afford all Canadians, and then I will address the concerns raised by my hon. colleagues from the Bloc Québécois.

How will this bill protect personal information? First of all, "personal information" means information about an identifiable individual. This includes but is not limited to the following information: race, ethnic origin, colour, age, marital status, religion, level of education, medical record, criminal, financial or employment information, address, telephone number, numerical identification codes such as social insurance number, fingerprints, blood type, tissue or other biological samples, personal opinions or viewpoints.

This is a broad list, and I did not cover all personal information that could identify a person.

This bill is designed to protect this type of information by requiring organizations to respect the obligations set out in the model code for the protection of personal information prepared by the Canadian Standards Association, or CSA.

The code is entrenched in the bill, which I hope will be passed. This means that it will have force of law as schedule 1 of the law.

So where and when will this bill apply? Once it is passed, this bill will apply to any organization which collects, uses or discloses personal information in the course of commercial activities. Commercial activity means any activity that is of a commercial nature, which includes selling and buying as well as other activities such as barter and exchange transactions.

What is an organization? An organization can be a business, an association, a partnership, a person or a trade union, for example.

However, there are organizations to which this bill will not apply, for example organizations that do not conduct commercial activities, such as a hospital, a public health clinic or a doctor who provides public health services. It will not apply to organizations that use personal information for journalistic, artistic or literary purposes only, nor will it apply to the use of personal information for personal or domestic purposes, such as Christmas card lists.

To facilitate the harmonization of provincial and federal legislation on the protection of personal information, the coming into force of this bill will take place gradually.

• (1335)

After a one-year transition period, the bill will apply to private sector fields, and I repeat to private sector fields, subjected to federal regulatory control. But what are the private sector fields that are subjected to federal regulatory control? That is described in the Canadian Constitution.

Some areas are strictly of provincial jurisdiction whereas others are strictly of federal jurisdiction. Others yet are mixed. Those fields that are subjected to federal regulatory control are: telecommunications, radiobroadcasting, banks and interprovincial transports, as far as the protection of personal information from clients and employees is concerned.

This bill will also apply to agencies that share personal information outside the provincial or national borders. I will say it again because I want to make sure that my colleagues from the other side of the House fully understand this notion. This bill will also apply to the agencies that share personal information outside the provincial or national borders, for example credit assessment officers and some insurance companies.

After three years, the act will be extended to include all personal information collected, used or disclosed within any commercial activity, whether it is subject to federal regulatory control or not. However, if a province pass a legislation that is essentially similar to the federal bill, the agencies or activities falling within the provincial act will be exempt from the federal act. As all of us in the House today know, and as many Canadians and Quebecers know, Quebec has had such legislation since 1994.

I would like to address a few concerns raised by Bloc Québécois members. First, the fact that, in their view, there is no need for this bill in Quebec. We have been told several times that the Barreau du Québec, of which I am a member, the Chambre des notaires, and other professional bodies and societies made their positions known on Bill C-6.

Government Orders

I am sure that the Barreau du Québec did not claim that the personal information of a non-resident of Quebec that is disclosed or exchanged outside the borders of Quebec would be protected by the provincial law. The provincial law is clear: its purpose is to protect the personal information of Quebecers when this information leaves Quebec's borders. The law is silent about the personal information of non-residents of Quebec that is collected in Quebec and disclosed or transferred outside Quebec.

The need exists. I am speaking to Quebecers throughout the province, whether they live in Sept-Îles, Chicoutimi, Ville-Marie, Shawville, Bedford, Montreal, Lachine, Saint-Lambert, Châteauguay, Charny, Lévis, Charlesbourg or Sillery.

• (1340)

I was very proud when the Government of Quebec adopted the protection of personal information act in 1994. As a Quebecer, I was very proud. It is a wonderful piece of legislation, but it is not perfect. Furthermore, representatives of professional bodies who appeared before the committee said so. They even pointed out safeguards in Bill C-6 that do not appear in Quebec's legislation. I could mention whistle blowing. I will get back later to this form of safeguard, which exists in Bill C-6 and not in Quebec's legislation.

There is a need in Quebec and not just in the other provinces. It was suggested today in the House that the need exists in the other provinces because they did not give themselves a law to protect personal information within their boundaries and that only Quebec did—that there would be no need in Quebec for such a federal law, but that need could exist in the other provinces. I am sorry, but the need exists from sea to sea in Canada, including in Quebec.

As I said previously in the House, in the case of a Quebecer living in Quebec and dealing with a company outside Quebec, if that company collects personal information about that individual and discloses that information to some other companies, associations or organizations and if that Quebecer tries to complain or to sue that company which is not carrying on its commercial activities in Quebec but in some other province, he will be ruled out of court. The first thing the court will say is that the Quebec law does not apply to that company.

Bill C-6 is needed to ensure the protection of personal information about all the Quebecers and all the people who are not necessarily Quebec residents but who were in Quebec at the time the information disclosed outside Quebec was collected.

It was suggested that provincial areas of jurisdiction are invaded. I invite my colleagues to go attend a course on constitutional law. That is a well known subject. Here we have a federal system and our constitution has set some areas under exclusive federal jurisdiction. Some other areas are under exclusive provincial

jurisdiction and a third category of areas is under joint jurisdiction. When dealing with the commercial sector, I regret to have to tell my honourable colleagues in the Bloc Québécois that commerce is an area coming under federal jurisdiction also. When a company carries on commercial activities outside Quebec, that is interprovincial or international, we are getting into an area of federal jurisdiction. You can laugh—

• (1345)

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows very well that she must address the Chair and not the other members.

Mrs. Marlene Jennings: You are right, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize. I must always address you, and I must never address the people across the way.

I was talking about infringement of provincial jurisdictions. I again invite our colleagues seated to your left and my right to perhaps take constitutional law 101 to find out about federal jurisdictions, provincial jurisdictions and joint jurisdictions.

They should read the charter and the British North America Act carefully. Banks, telecommunications companies, broadcasters and cross border transport companies, if I may call them that, otherwise I have invented a new term.

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

Mrs. Marlene Jennings: On the other side of the House they are saying that I did not invent the term.

The activities of the organizations I just mentioned come under federal jurisdiction.

They also say there was no consultation. I am quite surprised to hear it claimed in the House today that there was no consultation with the provinces and with those interested in the whole issue of protecting privacy and personal information.

The very members claiming there was no consultation are saying that the Barreau du Québec was consulted along with the Chambre des notaires. There is some confusion in their minds, to say the least.

There were consultations between governments, which led to one excellent thing: almost all the governments, if not all the governments in Canada, recognized the need for legislation to protect personal information.

However, not all these provincial governments had time enough to pass legislation. British Columbia is preparing to pass legislation. But, Bill C-6 addresses this problem, and as I mentioned at the start of my remarks, it is precisely in order to permit the provinces to pass legislation that may be implemented progressively.

At the end of three years, if some provincial or territorial governments have yet to pass legislation to protect personal information, the federal law will continue to apply in all areas of commercial activity in the private sector.

However, in the case of governments passing legislation that is essentially the same, the organizations covered by provincial legislation will be exempted from the application of the federal legislation.

I will close on this. About the claim that Quebec is best protected, I must tell you that, if—

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry but the 20 minutes are up.

• (1350)

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I was anxious to have an exchange of views with the Liberal member on this.

First of all, she spoke of law 101. Well, we are also going to tell her about politics 101, because she said that the Government of Quebec had been consulted. The fact that the Quebec bar association or the Conseil du Patronat spoke out in committee does not mean that the Government of Quebec was consulted. There is a difference between the Quebec bar association, the Conseil du Patronat, the CSN and the government.

The government is a different institution, one elected democratically by the people and representing Quebecers. That is my first point.

Second, she says we were wrong when we said that this was a provincial jurisdiction. I have here a letter from the Quebec bar association to the Minister of Industry, who is with us today, and will read something from the end of its third paragraph. She can discuss it with the bar association, since she is a member. The letter reads:

But the protection of personal information is based on provincial jurisdiction over property, under the civil code.

I would imagine that a nice little discussion between bar association colleagues will ensue, since it is the association's opinion that this is an area of provincial jurisdiction.

The letter is fairly recent, February 4, 1999. I imagine they took into consideration the British North America Act, which has been around for more than a hundred years.

Continuing with this letter, because it is most interesting, they go on to speak of practical application of the legislation. I quote:

This means that a considerable number of companies established in Quebec will from now on be subject to the federal legislation rather than the Quebec legislation,

Government Orders

and this is not likely to make it any easier for members of the public seeking to find out what their rights are in this context of changing legislation. As well, Quebec-based businesses will be required to master a new system for the protection of personal information, one which differs considerably from the one in place in Quebec.

Returning to the phrase “a considerable number of companies established in Quebec will from now on be subject to the federal legislation rather than the Quebec legislation”, this means that they were previously subject to the Quebec legislation. Does the hon. member realize that there was no legal vacuum, as she seems to be implying, that it is not like everyone was urging the federal government to get involved and set up different rules?

I now come to the recommendation made by the Quebec bar, which supports that of the access to information commission and which provides that:

To avoid any confusion and ensure that Quebecers can continue to benefit from a comprehensive personal information protection program, we submit that Bill C-54—now Bill C-6—should be amended to provide expressly that the federal legislation will not apply to businesses governed by the Privacy Act in the private sector.

I can already see the hon. member getting ready to say “Yes, but what about those for whom that act would not apply?” Her friends from the bar added:

“We go even further. In our opinion, the bill should incorporate by reference the Quebec legislation, even in areas of federal jurisdiction, to avoid confusion, overlap and duplication in the legislation applied in Quebec”.

It comes from the Quebec bar, which represents lawyers. These are experts who looked at this legislation and told us that it will create chaos and make things extremely complicated. To avoid that, they propose a simple solution. But this government will never recognize the primacy of the Quebec law, even if it concerns the civil code, which makes us so distinct in the eyes of the federal government.

When the federal government defines Quebec's distinctive character, it usually points to two or three elements. The government includes as few elements as possible, but it usually mentions the civil code. Yet, with this legislation, it is not even prepared to recognize the civil code.

So, what does the member have to say to the Barreau? Not to us on this side, to the members across the way to her right and to your left, Mr. Speaker. What does she have to say to the Barreau du Québec, which is suggesting this should be the solution?

And, before concluding, I would like to come back to one point. She says: “Yes, but we will not be able to regulate out-of-province companies doing business in Quebec”. If that logic applied, how is the Government of Canada going to be able to regulate an American company doing business in Canada?

Government Orders

Using her logic, it could not, because she is saying that Quebec's legislation does not apply to a company holding information obtained in Quebec, if the company is based outside Quebec. So what is she going to do about an American company that obtains information here and holds it in the United States? If the Government of Canada can do it, why would Quebec not be able to do it for Canada?

There is something a bit illogical about what she is saying and I would like her to explain to me why she thinks Quebec cannot fully legislate this situation when, if this were true, the same logic would apply to Canada, which would be able to legislate in respect of American companies.

I would like her to explain this and to respond to the brief from the Barreau that I have just cited and which is very specific. If she wishes, I can give her a copy of the document.

• (1355)

Mrs. Marlene Jennings: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks. The federal bill will be completing the protection afforded consumers in Quebec by the legislation of that province.

Both laws deal with different activities, and the federal legislation will be filling the gaps in the protection given by the Quebec law. In Quebec, the federal legislation will target situations where the activities of an organization are not regulated by the Commission d'accès à l'information. I can think for example of companies under federal jurisdiction, and of the problems Quebecers can encounter in their dealings with companies outside their province.

Bill C-6 settles problems that cannot be handled through provincial laws, even when these laws have been prepared with great care.

When data are transferred across the borders of 13 provinces or territories, the Privacy Commissioner of Canada is in a better position to investigate and settle cross border problems.

A second example would be the case of a company headquartered in Alberta collecting information on Quebec consumers. Since Alberta and Quebec are not bound by each other's legislation, there is a need for federal legislation.

Quebec businesses that transfer personal information within Quebec and between provinces will have no problem complying with both laws. When the Barreau du Québec, of which I am a member, or the hon. member opposite submit that this will cause confusion, they are saying in fact that our Quebec businesses are not capable of coping with situations where two laws are applicable. They are already familiar with that kind of situations. They are obeying industrial safety legislation as well as legislation governing their commercial activities.

Quebec businesses have already had to organise their commercial activities in compliance with different laws, federal as well as provincial. It is a shame to claim that our businesses are not capable of doing that.

Bill C-6 and Quebec Law-68 may be drafted differently but their intent and impact are rather similar. Both pieces of legislation require businesses to obtain the consent of a person before collecting, using or disclosing his or her personal information.

Both pieces of legislation give people access to their personal information that is maintained by private sector organisations. Both provide for monitoring by a privacy commissioner and allow redress mechanisms for people whose rights are affected. Above all, both provide for rights and obligations which are basically similar, since both have the same starting point.

What is that starting point? It all started with the guidelines established by the OCDE in 1980. Sure, there are differences, but Canada can manage them. Canada may be the only country in the whole world which provides in its charter of rights and freedoms that it shall promote its diversity.

• (1400)

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-6, an act aimed at promoting electronic commerce at the expense of privacy.

Since the beginning of the week, I have noticed that the Liberal government opposite, with Bill C-6 and Bill C-3, an act in respect of criminal justice for young persons, has been speaking from both sides of its mouth. The government tells Quebec and the rest of Canada: "We are going to talk with the provinces, we will come to an agreement before introducing new bills."

I am really disillusioned with this government's double talk. I believe Quebecers and Canadians must realize that this government ignores everything that moves both in Quebec and the rest of Canada. This is the general image we have had of this government for the two years we have been sitting in the Parliament of Canada.

Do not tell me it is because I am a sovereignist, an independentist or a separatist that I talk this way. I am defending the interests of a francophone riding in Quebec, the riding of Jonquière. When I travel through my riding, my constituents tell me this about the current government: "What is wrong with them, why do they want to re-invent the wheel, redo what has already been done, and why do they not take the best in other laws to improve the justice system and health care system in Canada?" No, what they want is to re-invent the wheel.

Too much is too much, or not enough is not enough, but I think the government has time to waste, because it has no vision for the next millennium that is fast approaching. I think the government

Government Orders

doe not know hoe to go forward. It wants to relive the past, to return to the time where it was not in power, to give itself good conscience. We have a concrete example of that with this Bill C-6.

I would have liked to ask the Minister of Industry if he is familiar with the Quebec privacy act that was passed in 1994. I would have liked to know if he is aware of the Quebec legislation on the protection of personal information in the private sector, which is unique in North America. Quebec is the only state in North America that has a legislation to protect personal information in the private sector.

I hope the minister noticed that we have a legislation in Quebec. Of course, nothing is perfect, and I think we can rewrite a legislation to improve it, because time goes by and society is evolving. He could have looked at this legislation and say: "Quebec did this, why not do the same for the other provinces of Canada, and also cover other areas that the Quebec legislation does not cover?"

What did the Minister of Industry do? He told us he had consulted with the provinces. I could give you some evidence that the Minister of Industry did not consult with the provinces, because on September 21, 1998, the federal minister sent a legislation proposal to his provincial counterparts. He asked for their comments. On October 1, 1998, he said: "I do not need the views of my counterparts, I will act unilaterally, I will table a bill in the House".

• (1405)

On October 30, the 12 provincial and territorial justice ministers unanimously called—I am not sure if the word "unanimously" has the same meaning in English as in French, but this word means that everyone was in agreement—on the federal Minister of Industry to withdraw Bill C-54, because it was "a major intrusion into provincial and territorial areas of jurisdiction". This can be found in a press release that followed that federal-provincial-territorial meeting of the justice ministers, held on October 30, 1998, in Regina, Saskatchewan.

These are the facts. The government brags about consulting the provinces. Is this the meaning they give to the word "consultation"? I am curious as to what dictionary they might be using. To consult people is to sit down with them, to submit your projects and to ask them for their opinion. That is what consulting is all about.

If you hear about some legislation somewhere that is protecting privacy and working just fine, you sit down, negotiate and take the best of this legislation to try and make a society, a country like Canada a leader in that field to ensure the best protection for its citizens.

This morning, my hon. colleague from Témiscamingue made an eloquent speech in which he gave a clear explanation of privacy.

Personally, I would not like for someone, anyone, to scrutinize my every move and say: "Maybe she should have done this instead of that. We should investigate the matter."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if you would like that, but I certainly would not. I rise up against this tactic that the government of Canada wants to use against me and my fellow citizens who live in my riding of Jonquière and in Quebec. Enough is enough!

Did the Minister of Industry understand? The Minister of Industry created a whole constitutional litigation that could have been avoided had he agreed to work in co-operation with its counterparts.

If Bill C-6 is implemented in Quebec, the rights of Quebecers regarding personal information protection will suffer significant setbacks regarding consent and remedies.

The member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine says she is a legal expert. There are several legal experts in my family. We see more and more shortfalls in the legislation passed in the House of Commons. I think there are many shortfalls in Bill C-6. We must not let these legal experts implement legislation as they like. In all conscience, we must ensure that these bills help our fellow citizens, not the legal experts.

There is also a setback regarding the collection of information from a third party. Moreover, the Bill will be confusing for companies and individuals in Quebec.

The implementation of Bill C-6 in Quebec will require the setting up of two systems for the protection of personal information and it will be confusing for companies and individuals.

Today is October 22. I do not know if the Minister is aware of the fact that the Bill he introduced in this House is a source of confusion.

• (1410)

When there is confusion there is a need for interpretation. I call upon the minister of Industry to exclude Quebec from his bill.

We, in Quebec—and I believe that some people in the House will laugh—are pioneers in privacy protection. The Quebec charter of rights and freedoms allowed our legislators to be at the forefront of privacy protection.

Far from me the idea of pretending that we are perfect, but I can say that we have always been listening to our fellow citizens to be able to take care of their wellbeing and to answer their needs through our charter of rights and freedoms. We are constantly listening to people to improve our legislation.

Bill C-6 does not improve on Quebec legislation, it will diminish it. We have a civil code in Quebec. Contrary to Ontario and the

Government Orders

other provinces of Canada, we are not in a system of Common Law. We reviewed our civil code three years ago because we thought that it needed to be improved and adapted for the next century. We did it and the privacy protection act we passed is based on our civil code. If the minister does not know that code, I would recommend him to read it because it is a little gem as far as the protection of civil rights of Quebecers is concerned.

I will not repeat everything that was said by my colleagues, the member for Témiscamingue and the member for Mercier, but through you, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Industry—it is never too late to recognize one's mistake—to change his mind before it is too late.

I urge the Minister of Industry to wait, to meet both Quebec ministers as they requested and allow them to explain their position. This would make sure that the Liberal government in Canada is listening to the people and does not pass laws that duplicate or undo what has been done in the provinces. I am waiting for an answer from the Minister of Industry and I am putting a lot of energy into this to make sure that my request gets to him through you, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 2.15 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier this day, the question is deemed to have been put and a recorded division deemed demanded and deferred until Tuesday, October 26, 1999, at the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders.

[*English*]

Is it agreed to call it 2.30 p.m.?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 2.30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.14 p.m.)

APPENDIX

**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS WITH THEIR
CONSTITUENCIES, PROVINCE OF CONSTITUENCY
AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS;
COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE,
THE MINISTRY AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES**

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. DON BOUDRIA, P.C.

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

MR. STÉPHANE BERGERON

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

MR. RANDY WHITE

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session — Thirty-sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alarie, H��l��ne	Louis-H��bert	Quebec	BQ
Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, G��rard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, Andr��	Richmond — Arthabaska	Quebec	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Baker, Hon. George S., Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
B��lair, R��ginald	Timmins — James Bay	Ontario	Lib.
B��langer, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eug��ne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, St��phane	Verch��res — Les-Patriotes	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	New Brunswick	PC
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gasp�� — ��les- de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	PC
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton — Riverview — Dieppe	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	T��miscamingue	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Brison, Scott	Kings — Hants	Nova Scotia	PC
Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Oakville	Ontario	Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Caplan, Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Quebec	BQ
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Ontario	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	PC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	Ref.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	Quebec	Lib.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	Ref.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac — Mégantic	Quebec	BQ
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Coderre, Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)	Bourassa	Quebec	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Superior North	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du- Loup — Témiscouata — Les Basques	Quebec	BQ
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta — South Richmond	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver South — Burnaby	British Columbia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or — Cape Breton	Nova Scotia	NDP
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland	PC
Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis—et—Chutes—de—la— Chaudière	Quebec	BQ
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	New Brunswick	PC
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification)(Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	Ref.
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	NDP
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	Ref.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint—Léonard — Saint— Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Girard—Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay — Boundary — Okanagan	British Columbia	Ref.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	Ref.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Côte—de—Beaupré — Île— d'Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
Harris, Richard M.	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia	Manitoba	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	Quebec	PC
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	PC
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	Manitoba	Ref.
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Manitoba	Ind. Ref.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	Ref.
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jones, Jim	Markham	Ontario	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Ontario	Lib.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	NDP
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	Ind.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Whitby — Ajax	Ontario	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	Ref.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton — Springdale	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Erie — Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	Nova Scotia	NDP
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	Quebec	BQ
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Ref.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	British Columbia	Ref.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Beaches — East York	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Muise, Mark	West Nova	Nova Scotia	PC
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Ind.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton — Victoria — Brock	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Alberta	Ref.
Pagtakhan, Rey D.	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles—A.	Rivière—des—Mille—Îles	Quebec	BQ
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Trade	Papineau — Saint-Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham — Kent Essex	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Bas—Richelieu — Nicolet — Bécancour	Quebec	BQ
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	Newfoundland	PC
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	PC
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	Saskatchewan	NDP
Proud, George	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	British Columbia	Ref.
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	British Columbia	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount — Ville—Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois—Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Brossard — La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Algoma — Manitoulin	Ontario	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Quebec	PC
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie-James — Nunavik	Quebec	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	Ref.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville — Musquodoboit Valley — Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Kitchener — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	PC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	Quebec	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	PC
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Ref.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	Ref.
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
VACANCY	York West	Ontario	
VACANCY	Mount Royal	Quebec	
VACANCY	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	
VACANCY	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	Saskatchewan	

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib.—Liberal; Ref.—Reform Party of Canada; BQ—Bloc Québécois; NDP—New Democratic Party; PC—Progressive Conservative; Ind.—Independent.

Anyone wishing to communicate with House of Commons members is invited to communicate with either the Member's constituency or Parliament Hill offices.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session — Thirty—sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Ref.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Ref.
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Ref.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Ref.
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Ref.
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Ref.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Ref.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Ref.
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Ref.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Ref.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Ref.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Ref.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Ref.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Ref.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Ref.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Ref.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref.
BRITISH COLUMBIA (34)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	Ref.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific)	Richmond	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta — South Richmond	Ref.
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver South — Burnaby	Lib.
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	Ref.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	Ref.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	Ref.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay — Boundary — Okanagan	Ref.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	Ref.
Harris, Richard M.	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	Ref.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	Ref.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	Ref.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	NDP
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	Ref.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for

Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification)(Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	Ref.
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Ind. Ref.
Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Provencher	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Pagtakhan, Rey D.	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	PC
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton — Riverview — Dieppe	Lib.
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	PC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	PC
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	PC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	PC
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)		
Baker, Hon. George S., Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Gander — Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Lib.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Labrador	Lib.
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	PC
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Scott	Kings — Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland — Colchester	PC
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or — Cape Breton	NDP
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	NDP
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	PC
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	NDP
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Muise, Mark	West Nova	PC
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville — Musquodoboit Valley — Eastern Shore	NDP
NUNAVUT (1)		
Karetak—Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
ONTARIO (103)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Lib.
Bélaïr, Réginald	Timmins — James Bay	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Ottawa — Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Carleton — Gloucester	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Oakville	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Lib.
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Superior North	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Trinity — Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey	Lib.
Jones, Jim	Markham	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh	Lib.
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Scarborough — Rouge River	Lib.
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair	Lib.
Longfield, Judi, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Whitby — Ajax	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton — Springdale	Lib.
Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Erie — Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Beaches — East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ind.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton — Victoria — Brock	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham — Kent Essex	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Lib.
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Algoma — Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Kitchener — Waterloo	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton — Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Nipissing	Lib.
VACANCY	York West	

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George	Hillsborough	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
QUEBEC (75)		
Alarie, H��l��ne	Louis-H��bert	BQ
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, G��rard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, Andr��	Richmond — Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, St��phane	Verch��res — Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gasp�� — ��les-de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	BQ
Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	BQ
Brien, Pierre	T��miscamingue	BQ
Canuel, Ren��	Matap��dia — Matane	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Anjou — Rivier��-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chr��tien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chr��tien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac — M��gantique	BQ
Coderre, Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)	Bourassa	Lib.
Cr��te, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivier��-du-Loup — T��miscouata — Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbini��re	BQ
Dion, Hon. St��phane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Lib.
Dub��, Antoine	L��vis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudi��re	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel	BQ
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-L��onard — Saint-Michel	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Qu��bec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonqui��re	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Ch��teauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — C��te-de-Beaupr�� — ��le-d'Orl��ans	BQ
Harvey, Andr��	Chicoutimi	PC
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Gr��ce — Lachine	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Laurin, Ren��	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lefebvre, R��jean	Champlain	Ind.
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Lib.
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Brome — Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Trade	Papineau — Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu — Nicolet — Bécancour	BQ
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	PC
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount — Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Brossard — La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PC
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie-James — Nunavik	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphane	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert	BQ
VACANCY	Mount Royal	
VACANCY	Hull — Aylmer	

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Lib.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Ref.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Ref.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	NDP
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Ref.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina — Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Ref.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Ref.
VACANCY	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	

YUKON (1)

Hardy, Louise	Yukon	NDP
---------------	-------	-----

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of October 22nd, 1999 — 2nd Session, 36th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Claude Bachand
Sue Barnes
Raymond Bonin
Paul DeVillers

John Finlay
Ghislain Fournier
Jim Gouk
Ivan Grose

Vice-Chair:

Louise Hardy
David Iftody
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gerald Keddy

Derrek Konrad
John O'Reilly
Mike Scott
Guy St-Julien

(16)

Associate Members

Carolyn Bennett
Cliff Breitzkreuz
René Canuel
Serge Cardin
Bill Casey

Pierre de Savoye
Gordon Earle
Reed Elley

Maurice Godin
Dick Harris
Rick Laliberte

Gilles Perron
Daniel Turp
Maurice Vellacott

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:

John Harvard

Vice-Chairs:

Murray Calder
Howard Hilstrom

Hélène Alarie
Mark Assad
Rick Borotsik
Garry Breitzkreuz

Odina Desrochers
Gar Knutson
Larry McCormick

Joe McGuire
Ian Murray
Dick Proctor

Gerry Ritz
Paul Steckle
Rose-Marie Ur

(16)

Associate Members

Roy Bailey
Leon Benoit
Rick Casson
Michelle Dockrill

Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
John Maloney
Lee Morrisson
Lorne Nystrom

John Solomon
Guy St-Julien
Greg Thompson

Myron Thompson
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair:

Mauril Bélanger
Paul Bonwick
Cliff Breitzkreuz
Sarmite Bulte

Pierre de Savoye
John Godfrey
Wendy Lill
Rick Limoges

Vice-Chair:

Clifford Lincoln
Eric Lowther
Inky Mark
Dennis Mills

Mark Muise
Alex Shepherd
Caroline St-Hilaire
Bryon Wilfert

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
André Bachand
Claude Bachand
Carolyn Bennett
Rick Borotsik

Pierre Brien
Serge Cardin
Antoine Dubé
Maurice Dumas
Gordon Earle

Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Rick Laliberte
Peter MacKay
Louis Plamondon

Benoît Sauvageau
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp
Elsie Wayne

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair:

Rob Anders
Jean Augustine
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras

Vice-Chair:

Paul Bonwick
John Bryden
Joe Fontana
Sophia Leung

Rick Limoges
Steve Mahoney
Patrick Martin
John McKay

Pauline Picard
David Price
Jack Ramsay
Andrew Telegdi

(16)

Associate Members

Claude Bachand
Serge Cardin
Libby Davies

Gordon Earle
Louise Hardy
Francine Lalonde

Réal Ménard
Deepak Obhrai
Diane St-Jacques

Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Charles Caccia
Rick Casson
Marlene Catterall
Dave Chatters

Vice-Chair:

Jean-Guy Chrétien
Nick Discepola
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
John Herron

Rahim Jaffer
Joe Jordan
Karen Kraft Sloan
Walt Lastewka

Peter Mancini
David Pratt
Julian Reed
Paddy Torsney

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Hélène Alarie
Leon Benoit
Bernard Bigras
Pierre Brien

Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin
John Duncan
Louise Hardy

Rick Laliberte
Clifford Lincoln
David Price
Nelson Riis

Guy St-Julien
Peter Stoffer
Stéphan Tremblay
Daniel Turp

FINANCE

Chair:

Maurizio Bevilacqua

Vice-Chairs:

Nick Discepola
Richard Harris

Carolyn Bennett
Scott Brison
Roy Cullen
Ken Epp

Roger Gallaway
Albina Guarnieri
Sophia Leung

Yvan Loubier
Richard Marceau
Lorne Nystrom

Gary Pillitteri
Monte Solberg
Paul Szabo

(16)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
Rick Borotsik
Pierre Brien
Serge Cardin
Joe Comuzzi
Odina Desrochers
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé

Paul Forseth
Christiane Gagnon
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Monique Guay
John Herron
Dale Johnston
Jim Jones
Jason Kenney

Gary Lunn
Peter MacKay
Alexa McDonough
Bob Mills
Gilles Perron
Pauline Picard
Charlie Power
Karen Redman

Nelson Riis
Benoît Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Alex Shepherd
John Solomon
Stéphan Tremblay
Daniel Turp
Tony Valeri

HEALTH

Chair:

Yvon Charbonneau
Reed Elley
Christiane Gagnon
Gurmant Grewal

Ovid Jackson
Keith Martin
Bill Matthews
Ted McWhinney

Vice-Chair:

Réal Ménard
Lynn Myers
Bernard Patry
Karen Redman

Paul Szabo
Greg Thompson
Rose-Marie Ur
Judy Wasylycia-Leis

(16)

Associate Members

Carolyn Bennett
Bernard Bigras
Serge Cardin
Jean-Guy Chrétien

Libby Davies
Pierre de Savoye
Michelle Dockrill
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold

John Herron
Grant Hill
Sophia Leung
John Maloney

Bob Mills
Pauline Picard
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:

Diane Ablonczy
Peter Adams
Bonnie Brown
Paul Crête
Libby Davies

Jean Dubé
Raymonde Folco
Christiane Gagnon
John Godfrey
Dale Johnston

Vice-Chair:

Judi Longfield
Larry McCormick
Rey Pagtakhan
Karen Redman

Andy Scott
Stéphan Tremblay
Maurice Vellacott
Bryon Wilfert

(18)

Associate Members

Yvan Bernier
Bernard Bigras
Serge Cardin
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Bev Desjarlais
Michelle Dockrill

Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
Maurice Dumas
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold
Yvon Godin

Peter Goldring
Deborah Grey
Monique Guay
Wendy Lill
Patrick Martin

Réal Ménard
Lorne Nystrom
Diane St-Jacques
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp

INDUSTRY

Chair:

Pierre Brien
Gerry Byrne
John Cannis
Brenda Chamberlain

Antoine Dubé
Jim Hart
Marlene Jennings
Jim Jones

Vice-Chair:

Walt Lastewka
Gurbax Malhi
Ian Murray
Charlie Penson

Jerry Pickard
Nelson Riis
Werner Schmidt
Susan Whelan

(16)

Associate Members

Hélène Alarie
Gérard Asselin
Bernard Bigras
Chuck Cadman
Serge Cardin

Pierre de Savoye
Odina Desrochers
Jean Dubé
Christiane Gagnon
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold

Rahim Jaffer
Richard Marceau
Philip Mayfield
Alex Shepherd

John Solomon
Guy St-Julien
Peter Stoffer
Daniel Turp

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:

Jim Abbott
Reg Alcock
Michel Bellehumeur
Carolyn Bennett

Chuck Cadman
Aileen Carroll
Paul DeVillers
Ivan Grose

Vice-Chair:

Peter MacKay
John Maloney
Peter Mancini
John McKay

John Reynolds
Jacques Saada
Andy Scott
Pierrette Venne

(16)

Associate Members

Bernard Bigras
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Pierre de Savoye
Jim Gouk
Michel Guimond
Louise Hardy

Dick Harris
Jay Hill
Richard Marceau
Keith Martin
Réal Ménard
Lee Morrison

Mark Muise
Jack Ramsay
Svend Robinson
Caroline St-Hilaire
Diane St-Jacques

Darrel Stinson
Myron Thompson
Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp
Randy White

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:

Robert Bertrand
Hec Clouthier
Gordon Earle
Peter Goldring

Art Hanger
Jim Hart
René Laurin
Judi Longfield

Vice-Chair:

Paul Mercier
Patrick O'Brien
John O'Reilly
Janko Perić

David Pratt
George Proud
Elsie Wayne
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate Members

Rob Anders
Leon Benoit
Pierre Brien

Serge Cardin
John Duncan
Monique Guay

Francine Lalonde
Ghislain Lebel
Peter Mancini

Patrick Martin
Daniel Turp

NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair:

Réginald Bélair
Gilles Bernier
Serge Cardin
Dave Chatters

John Duncan
Yvon Godin
Tony Ianno
Ghislain Lebel

Vice-Chair:

Carolyn Parrish
Carmen Provenzano
Julian Reed
Werner Schmidt

Brent St. Denis
Guy St-Julien
Tony Valeri
Joe Volpe

(16)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Hélène Alarie
Rob Anders
Pierre Brien
René Canuel

Jean-Guy Chrétien
Michelle Dockrill
Ghislain Fournier
Christiane Gagnon
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold

Jim Jones
Gerald Keddy
Derrek Konrad
Gilles Perron
Nelson Riis

Benoît Sauvageau
Caroline St-Hilaire
Darrel Stinson
Daniel Turp

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair: Derek Lee

Vice-Chairs: Marlene Catterall
Chuck Strahl

Eleni Bakopanos
Stéphane Bergeron
Ray Bonin
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

André Harvey
Bob Kilger
Gar Knutson

Grant McNally
Carolyn Parrish
Jerry Pickard

John Richardson
John Solomon
Randy White

(16)

Associate Members

Peter Adams
Michel Bellehumeur
Bill Blaikie
Michelle Dockrill

Normand Doyle
Deborah Grey
Jay Hill
Joe Jordan

René Laurin
Eric Lowther
Larry McCormick
Réal Ménard

Lorne Nystrom
Suzanne Tremblay
Ted White

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair: Larry McCormick

Bill Blaikie
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

Deborah Grey

André Harvey

Joe Jordan

(6)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chair:

Vice-Chair:

Hec Clouthier
Michelle Dockrill
John Finlay
Paul Forseth
Mac Harb

Marlene Jennings
Jason Kenney
Steve Mahoney
Philip Mayfield

Gilles Perron
Beth Phinney
George Proud
John Richardson

Benoît Sauvageau
Alex Shepherd
Elsie Wayne
John Williams

(17)

Associate Members

Roy Bailey
Garry Breitkreuz
Scott Brison
Rick Casson

Bev Desjarlais
Odina Desrochers
Christiane Gagnon
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold

Gurmant Grewal
Jim Jones
Derrek Konrad
Ghislain Lebel

Lorne Nystrom
Peter Stoffer
Suzanne Tremblay

TRANSPORT

Chair:

Stan Keyes

Vice-Chairs:

Joe Comuzzi
Val Meredith

G rard Asselin
Roy Bailey
Murray Calder
Bill Casey

Bev Desjarlais
Stan Dromisky
Claude Drouin

Joe Fontana
Michel Guimond
Charles Hubbard

Ovid Jackson
Gerry Ritz
Lou Sekora

(16)

Associate Members

Yvan Bernier
Rick Borotsik
Serge Cardin
Dave Chatters

Paul Cr te
Maurice Dumas
Ghislain Fournier

Rick Laliberte
Lee Morrison
John Solomon

Suzanne Tremblay
Daniel Turp
Elsie Wayne

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the House of Commons:

Mark Assad
Roy Bailey
Marlene Catterall
Hec Clouthier
John Finlay
Deborah Grey
Mac Harb
Jim Karygiannis

Raymond Lavigne
Wendy Lill
Rick Limoges
Philip Mayfield
Paul Mercier
Louis Plamondon
David Price
Karen Redman

(16)

Associate Members

Libby Davies
Maurice Dumas

Suzanne Tremblay

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chair:

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Mauril Bélanger
Eugène Bellemare
Brenda Chamberlain
Pierre de Savoye
Raymonde Folco
Yvon Godin
Grant Hill
Bob Kilger

Raymond Lavigne (16)
Inky Mark
Dan McTeague
Ted McWhinney
Val Meredith
Mark Muise
Louis Plamondon
Benoît Serré

Associate Members

Maurice Dumas
Paul Mercier
Daniel Turp

Lorne Nystrom
Suzanne Trembaly

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chair:

Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Mark Assad
Paul Bonwick
John Bryden
Bill Casey
Joe Comuzzi
Paul DeVillers
Ken Epp
Gurmant Grewal
Ghislain Lebel

Ian Murray (17)
Lorne Nystrom
Jim Pankiw
Gary Pillitteri
Jacques Saada
Pierrette Venne
Tom Wappel
Ted White

Associate Members

Michel Bellehumeur
Michelle Dockrill

Michel Guimond
Suzanne Tremblay

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panel of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Deputy Prime Minister
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of Transport
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Health
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. Don Boudria	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
The Hon. George S. Baker	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Robert D. Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Maria Minna	Minister for International Cooperation
The Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau	Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
The Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Jim Peterson	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)
The Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
The Hon. Gilbert Normand	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
The Hon. Denis Coderre	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Gar Knutson	to Prime Minister
Denis Paradis	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
Stan Dromisky	to Minister of Transport
Paddy Torsney	to Minister of the Environment
Brent St. Denis	to Minister of Natural Resources
Mauril Bélanger	to Minister of Canadian Heritage
John Cannis	to Minister of Industry
Roy Cullen	to Minister of Finance
Robert Bertrand	to Minister of National Defence
John Maloney	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Yvon Charbonneau	to Minister of Health
Jacques Saada	to Solicitor General of Canada
Carolyn Parrish	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Tony Ianno	to President of the Treasury Board
Beth Phinney	to Minister of National Revenue
Bonnie Brown	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Reg Alcock	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Bob Speller	to Minister for International Trade
Derek Lee	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Joe McGuire	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Lawrence O'Brien	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Judi Longfield	to Minister of Labour
Bob Wood	to Minister of Veterans Affairs
David Iftody	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Eugène Bellemare	to Minister for International Cooperation
Andrew Telegdi	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration

CONTENTS

Friday, October 22, 1999

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act

Bill C-6. Third reading	537
Mr. Manley	537
Mr. Kilger	537
Motion	537
(Motion agreed to)	537
Mr. Manley	537
Mr. Forseth	539
Mr. Brien	544

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Burlington

Ms. Torsney	546
-------------------	-----

Doukhobor Russians

Mr. Gouk	546
----------------	-----

Windsor Public Library

Mr. Limoges	546
-------------------	-----

Potato Industry

Mr. Easter	546
------------------	-----

CJCS

Mr. Richardson	547
----------------------	-----

Agriculture

Mr. Benoit	547
------------------	-----

Children

Mr. McCormick	547
---------------------	-----

National Co-op Week

Mr. Mercier	547
-------------------	-----

Ezra Levant

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	547
--	-----

Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Month

Mr. Charbonneau	548
-----------------------	-----

Manitoba's Francophone Community

Mr. Alcock	548
------------------	-----

Grain

Mr. Solomon	548
-------------------	-----

Peacekeeping Day

Mr. Laurin	548
------------------	-----

Crime Prevention

Mrs. Jennings	549
---------------------	-----

Child Pornography

Ms. St-Jacques	549
----------------------	-----

Peacekeeping

Mrs. Longfield	549
----------------------	-----

Pay Equity

Mrs. Ablonczy	549
---------------------	-----

YWCA

Ms. Lill	550
----------------	-----

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

APEC Inquiry

Mr. Strahl	550
Mr. Gray	550
Mr. Strahl	550
Mr. Gray	550
Mr. Strahl	550
Mr. Gray	550
Mr. McNally	551
Mr. Gray	551
Mr. McNally	551
Mr. Gray	551

Audiovisual Productions

Mrs. Tremblay	551
Mr. Gray	551
Mrs. Tremblay	551
Mr. Bélanger	551
Mr. Dumas	551
Mr. Bélanger	551
Mr. Dumas	552
Mr. Bélanger	552

APEC Inquiry

Mr. Proctor	552
Mr. MacAulay	552
Mr. Proctor	552
Mr. MacAulay	552

Fisheries

Mr. MacKay	552
Mr. Dhaliwal	552
Mr. MacKay	552
Mr. Dhaliwal	552

Child Pornography

Mr. Reynolds	553
Mr. Maloney	553
Mr. Reynolds	553
Mr. Maloney	553

Genetically Altered Foods

Ms. Alarie	553
Mr. Vanclief	553
Ms. Alarie	553
Mr. Vanclief	553

Pay Equity

Mrs. Ablonczy	553
Ms. Robillard	554
Mr. Mayfield	554
Mr. Gray	554

Genetically Altered Foods

Ms. Girard-Bujold	554
Mr. Anderson	554
Ms. Girard-Bujold	554
Mr. Anderson	554

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Gouk	554
Mr. Gray	554

Mr. Duncan	554
Mr. Dhaliwal	555
Genetically Altered Foods	
Mr. Tremblay	555
Mr. Vanclief	555
Health	
Mr. Jackson	555
Mr. Charbonneau	555
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Elley	555
Mr. Nault	555
Mr. Grewal	555
Mr. Dhaliwal	556
Water Exports	
Mr. Riis	556
Mr. Anderson	556
Mr. Riis	556
Mr. Anderson	556
Housing	
Mr. Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	556
Mr. Gagliano	556
Mr. Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	556
Mr. Gagliano	556
Health	
Mr. Graham	557
Mr. Charbonneau	557
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	557
Mr. Nault	557
Bill C-6	
Mr. Brien	557
Mr. Manley	557
Gasoline Pricing	
Mr. Solomon	557
Mr. Manley	558
Fisheries	
Mr. Herron	558
Mr. Dhaliwal	558
Health and Safety	
Ms. Leung	558
Mrs. Longfield	558
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Grewal	558
APEC Summit	
Mrs. Lalonde	558
Mr. Gray	559
Airline Industry	
Ms. Desjarlais	559
Mr. Collenette	559

Presence in Gallery	
The Deputy Speaker	559
Mr. Riis	559
Human Rights	
The Deputy Speaker	559
Points of Order	
Question Period	
Mrs. Jennings	559
Mr. McNally	559
The Deputy Speaker	559
Mr. Benoit	560

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Order in Council Appointments	
Mr. Lee	560
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Lee	560
Petitions	
Taxation	
Mr. Elley	560
The Senate	
Ms. Desjarlais	560
Immigration	
Mr. Benoit	560
The Senate	
Mr. Solomon	560
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lee	560

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act	
Bill C-6, Third Reading	561
Mr. Brien	561
Mrs. Lalonde	563
Mr. Riis	565
Mr. Peterson	569
Mr. Riis	569
Mr. Brien	569
Mr. Riis	569
Mr. Brien	570
Mr. Riis	570
Mr. Jones	570
Mrs. Jennings	573
Mrs. Jennings	574
Mr. Brien	575
Mrs. Jennings	576
Ms. Girard-Bujold	576
(Division deemed demanded and deferred)	578

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,
45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9