

*Private Members' Business*

care system. Abuse of our health care system is something that most Canadians would like to see addressed. A smart card would allow the individual to present themselves to their physician. The card would be encoded, recent medical information would be accessible which would prevent double doctoring, double testing. In fact, it would prevent some overspending of significant amounts of money. A smart card sounds like a good idea for that purpose.

• (1910)

Let us take that idea one step further. I have seen cards used in the grocery stores where an account can be debited very quickly. I heard someone say that those cards could be made smaller and implanted under the skin. It could have a significant amount of personal information on it. It would be scanned, some numbers punched in and bills could be paid that way.

I also heard it said that the little implanted chip would allow a satellite system to know someone's location at any time. Now you could never get lost. That is the final step in the use of the smart card for those of us who are too dumb to figure out where we are.

Are there pitfalls on the issue of privacy with these new computer technologies which are available to us? Are people aware and concerned about computer technology? I believe they are. I can give two recent examples. Ontario is bringing out an omnibus bill in which one of the concerns is the issue of privacy of information. The omnibus bill looks as though it will make information more available to legislators and there has been an outcry about that issue.

Bill C-7, recently passed in the House, had significant components which related to privacy. There were a number of very public concerns about the information being made available. I believe this bill has some component of public concern to it and the interest is reasonable.

When can we go overboard with information that should not be made publicly available? That is my question. When do we go overboard?

I would also like to step back a bit and say that there are times when I do not think information is made publicly available which should be made available. I would like to use two examples.

Across from an elementary school in my riding is a house called the drug house. The teachers say that drugs are sold from that house. They have watched this going on for eight years.

I went to a meeting with the RCMP, the mayor and some community activists to find out what could be done about this drug house. Apparently people arrive at the house, quickly go in and out, having made their drug deal and off they go. It is known

to the police and the principal and it is now known to the MP. Surely this can be stopped. This is not a great thing to have across the street from an elementary school. Also the junior high school is not far away.

The RCMP told me their hands were tied. My reply was that surely they could go to a justice of the peace and say that there are reasonable grounds to suspect and search this house. I was told that the rights of the individual in that house would be trampled on if we did that. I said that surely the rights of the kids in that elementary school would take precedence. I was told: "No, doc, that is not the way it works. Our legal system has put the rights even. The kids and the people in that house have equal rights". I was puzzled by that. I do not agree with that.

• (1915)

I have another example. A man raped a young woman, was caught and sentenced to jail. She in her wisdom wondered whether he could have infected her with a disease. She went to the court and asked that the rapist have a blood test because she was living in fear that she may have AIDS. His reaction was: "No chance. My rights of privacy say you cannot touch me".

I say wait a minute, if the rights of the victim collide with the rights of the criminal, and in this case they do and she has a legitimate need to know, whose rights should take precedence? The victim's rights take precedence over his.

When I tell that to students in high schools, you should see how upset they get. I challenge members opposite to ask students in high schools whose rights should take precedence: his privacy or her need to know. They will say very quickly whose rights should take precedence.

There is another side to the privacy issue, the charter of rights and freedoms, which today does not talk about responsibilities and puts those rights side by side. It needs an adjustment.

In a previous conversation there was talk about banks. Banks have information that is profoundly private. Banks want to get into the insurance business. There has been quite a lobby in that regard. They have a monopoly in the banking interests. They now want to get into the insurance business. Since Reformers are really interested in free enterprise, why would I be concerned about banks stepping into the insurance business?

If they are to step into the insurance business they had better be willing to open up the monopoly they have in other businesses. They had better let the insurance companies in there. They had better let the insurance companies have access to Interac. They had better let the insurance companies have access to the private information on an individual's account, where they spend their money, how they spend their money. It is a very unfair advantage if they are competing with the private insurance business.