

see what they are saying. We want to know what the bankers' association is saying to the government about the Bank Act. We want to be there when these lobbyists are making their representations to the government and to know exactly what is being said. Let us open up the processes of government by introducing tough, effective sunshine legislation.

Last year at this time when a similar bill was introduced, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) symbolized our approach to the Conservative bill, as it was then, by presenting a rose in a dump truck. Well, the rose is slightly wilted and the dump truck we need is perhaps a bit bigger than it was last year; but the principle is the same. The rose symbolizes our acceptance of the fundamental right of Canadians to information and to privacy, and the dump truck recognizes that there are still some very serious loopholes in both parts of this particular bill.

As I say, we welcome the principles which underlie the bill, but we have a number of serious concerns with it. Naturally we will be elaborating on these concerns when we get to committee, but I should like to take this opportunity to elaborate on a number of the more serious concerns. Of course, a number of these concerns were dealt with in the course of the remarks of the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

When we talk about the fundamental right of access to information and the right not to have one's privacy unreasonably interfered with, surely it is not a right which should only be extended to Canadian citizens, for it is all residents of Canada who are affected by the actions of government. For example, I need only point to the question of product testing or environmental testing. How can one possibly suggest that it is only citizens of Canada who are affected by possibly hazardous products, or that it is only citizens of Canada who have the right to a decent, clean environment or at least the knowledge of how that environment may have been affected? We will be proposing that this right should be extended to all residents of Canada and not restricted to citizens of Canada, a right which, incidentally, is extended in the United States and Sweden under freedom of information legislation.

We have a number of other concerns; I do not intend to elaborate at any great length on them. I acknowledge the assistance of the lobby group, Access, on this question. I should like to highlight some of its recommendations regarding areas where the bill needs improvement. For example, we believe that the right of access should extend specifically to all government institutions. If an institution is to be exempted, it should be specified by the government. We want to ensure that the indexing system adequately deals with the concerns which have been raised by Access and by other individuals and groups in this area. There must be efficient and prompt access to government records. We have some concerns about the time limits contained in this bill. We want to ensure that the poor as well as the rich have access to information, that it is not restricted to the corporate sector. We want to ensure that the fees involved in obtaining access to information are not excessive.

Access to Information

The Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition raised many concerns which we share about the sweeping scope of the exemption clause. I do not intend to repeat his remarks. We associate ourselves with many of those concerns. I would merely like to highlight one of them today, and that is the exemption with respect to product and environmental testing. I strongly urge the government to consider very seriously substantially tightening the provisions with respect to product and environmental testing because, as they stand now, they are completely unacceptable. Back in 1976, the kind of information which has been kept from Canadians so far and which, if the provision is to be retained in its present form, may continue to be kept from Canadians, was pointed out. I should like to give a couple of examples. Federal inspectors found ground beef padded out with pork and bags of fertilizer which were as much as 12 pounds underweight. They refused to release the names of these products. Surely Canadians have the right to know this. The reports of our health inspectors who check working conditions in mines to ensure they meet occupational safety standards are not made public. Councils have refused to disclose the names of stores which may be selling contaminated goods. The results of tests done on beer, which perhaps can be obtained in Germany or the United States, are denied to Canadian citizens. The provision with respect to product and environmental testing must be substantially strengthened.

I want to repeat our very serious concerns about the judicial review provisions in this bill. There are two standards of judicial review, not one as there should be. We recognize that the government has had to take a major leap forward in its consciousness in accepting the principle of judicial review. We welcome the acceptance of that principle, but to then in turn water it down when dealing with a number of very fundamental exemptions is unacceptable. There must be the right to full *de novo* review on the part of the Federal Court. This reasonableness test must be eliminated and there must be an objective opportunity for the Federal Court to examine for itself the documents in question to ensure that these important principles are indeed reflected in the decision of the government.

Other concerns have been raised. The minister referred to certain representations by a number of groups. For example, we share the concerns of the Canadian Historical Society with respect to the archives provisions. I hope the minister will be open to amendments which would reflect their concerns, and that we are not in fact restricting access to information which historians already have available to them.

We share some concerns which have been raised by provincial governments with respect to possible abuses in the section on RCMP data flow. We recognize the importance of making this information available, but we want to examine very carefully whether the wording of the bill is the most effective wording in achieving the objectives which I am sure we all share. Also we have concerns with respect to a number of the provisions on privacy. We believe that the third party access which is proposed is too sweeping. We believe there are some concerns about the elements relating to transborder data flow.