

Adjournment Debate

We need a far more comprehensive approach to these issues. This government has been doing the groundwork necessary to provide greater privacy protection.

I would like to ask the hon. member to consider the work that is presently being done. It is important that we look at the teeth that have to be given to any specific bill that is in the House, who will be responsible to hear and act on complaints and what resources they will have. I am suggesting that although this bill is laudable in terms of its focus on the fundamental issue of free and informed consent of the individual as a key issue in data protection, it is not clear how this would work out for other types of information and other types of business.

I commend the member. It is not often that the industry itself asks for legislation, but at this specific point in time the industry has been asking the minister responsible to pay some attention to details in this regard.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has two or three minutes to sum up.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to do that. I would first like to thank those members who took part in the debate on my private member's bill on personal information. The debate has been most instructive for me as I continue to consider this very important issue. Out of the debate I realize there are some aspects that do need amendment in the bill, particularly the area regarding sales. Leases were not mentioned in the bill.

With regard to the narrowness of the crafting of Bill C-315, I do believe if members did the same research that I did, they would find there are federal and provincial jurisdictions that limit how widely this bill can have influence. It has been purposely crafted in such a narrow manner so that it would not impede provincial influence. It is my anticipation that if this bill were passed it could be a model and a forerunner for the provinces in bringing in their own individual pieces of legislation for the protection of personal information.

I would like to ask fellow members who are being asked to keep in mind what is fair to commercial interests also to keep in mind what is fair to the people whose names and personal information are being used for commercial gain without their knowledge, without their consent and frequently to their own personal disadvantage, if not their jeopardy. While it may seem burdensome for a commercial enterprise to seek the permission of every person whose name they record, buy, sell or lease, as the case may be, why should companies be able to use this information simply because the rightful owners cannot prevent them from doing so?

In summary, I am asking colleagues to consider first the needs of the protection of their constituents as well as themselves and to support Bill C-315 at this second reading stage.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It being 7.50 p.m., pursuant to our standing orders, the time provided for debate has now expired.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: According to the order made earlier today, the vote stands deferred until tomorrow at 5.15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it was on February 16 of last year, four days after the death of Sue Rodriguez, that the Minister of Justice promised Canadians that this House of Commons would have an opportunity to vote in a free vote on the important issue of possible changes to section 241 of the Criminal Code.

The Minister of Justice said that he would be meeting with the government House leader as soon as possible to find out when he could arrange a debate and he said that they were not going to sit on it. He went on to say: "We will find a way to put the question before the House so that it is not academic. It will be meaningful and if that involves a proposal for changing legislation with a free vote, then that is exactly what we will do".

He pointed out that the Supreme Court of Canada had unanimously agreed, although it was divided on the substance of changes to section 241, that this was a matter that elected