

Broadcasting Act

Again, I want to say to the Hon. Minister that I appreciate the fact that she has been generous in not raising any objection to the comments which have been made.

I want to say one other thing as well, that is, that the system of consultation under which we have been operating has been working extremely well. I know that neither Hon. Member, on rising on this particular matter, would wish the general approach which we are taking not to continue. I know all Hon. Members would want to support that.

I will now put to the House all of the motions which were the subject of my ruling to the House.

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-136 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 12 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

““distribution undertaking” means any commercial under-”.

Mr. Alan Redway (York East) moved:

Motion No. 1A.

That Bill C-136 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 13 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

“taking, other than a boarding house, for the reception of broadcasting”.

Motion No. 2.

That Bill C-136 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 13 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

“taking, other than a senior citizens’ home, for the reception of broadcasting”.

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-136 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 13 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

“taking operated on a profit basis for the reception of broadcasting”.

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-136 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 13 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

“taking, other than an undertaking operated by students or youth organizations on a non-profit basis, for the reception of broadcasting”.

Motion No. 5.

That Bill C-136 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 17 and 18 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

“porary residence or to more than the total residences in a multiple housing complex;”

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-136 be amended in Clause 2 by adding immediately after line 8 at page 3 the following:

“(3) For the purpose of this Act, a multiple dwelling unit grouped as a condominium complex is deemed to be one permanent residence, on such terms and conditions as the Commission deems appropriate.”

● (1600)

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal) moved:

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-136 be amended in Clause 2 by adding immediately after line 13 at page 3 the following:

“(4) For the purposes of this Act, persons who occupy apartments, hotel rooms or dwelling units situated in the same building are part of the public and a transmission intended to be received exclusively by such persons is a transmission for reception by the public.”

She said: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since the first motion is the motion of the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young), would it not be normal that he speak to his motion?

Mr. Speaker: The motions are grouped together. I am in the hands of the House.

Mrs. Finestone: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to defer to the Member for Beaches (Mr. Young) if he would like to start the debate. It would be my pleasure to do so.

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the critic for the Liberal Party and to my colleague, the Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), for allowing me to say a few words first on this portion of the debate.

The reason I moved this amendment to the Bill was due to the great concern of condominium owners that this Bill changes their status from what it was previously.

Mr. Ernie Loader from York Condominium Corporation No. 76 appeared before the committee on behalf of the Canadian Condominium Institute to express those concerns to the committee. He did an excellent job in doing so.

Prior to Mr. Loader’s appearance before the committee I was informed that the Minister told the committee that the concerns of condominium owners were not real concerns and that the status of condominium owners would not change under this Bill.

I read the minutes of the meeting where the Minister said this, and she was clear in what she said. However, I became concerned when I looked at what some of the officials began to say after the Minister had given these assurances to condominium owners. When one reads what the Minister’s officials said in response to questioning at that committee, one can understand why Mr. Loader and his colleagues remained concerned.

Their concern is that while the Minister’s assurances are accepted by me and by others, they do not mean too much when one considers that at some subsequent point the CRTC may very well make a ruling that condominium owners do indeed have their status changed under the new legislation. I share that concern.

I can understand the argument made in the legislation about signals being used for commercial and profit purposes, but not as it relates to condominium owners who have a satellite dish