

*Government Orders*

to the United States. If this government lasts much longer in office we are going to look like Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico may even look better.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, you can see how it could become extremely cumbersome when new definitions are introduced to deal with what is going to be exempt and what is not going to be exempt. I would suggest that if we were to follow what the CRIC is recommending on this particular issue, we would not be in the situation that we are in right now.

• (1630)

To that extent I would agree with my colleague and with the explanation put before the House by the minister and say that maybe the best solution for us is to continue with what we have before us.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** In my opinion, the nays have it. I declare the motion defeated on division.

Motion No. 1 negatived.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap)** moved:

Motion No. 6.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 7 by adding immediately after line 13 at page 4 the following:

“(b) to enhance the expression and communication of Canada’s cultural identity.”

Motion No. 7.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 7 by striking out lines 27 to 30 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

“(f) to foster increased reliance on market forces for the provision of telecommunications services and to do so primarily in the public interest and secondarily in the interest of competitors providing telecommunications services and in a manner consistent with the objective set out in paragraph (b);”

Motion No. 8.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 7 by striking out lines 27 to 30 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

“(f) to encourage regular consultation between provincial and federal governments to promote regional industrial development that will build on the strengths and potential of each province in the field of telecommunications”.

Motion No. 10.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 7 by striking out line 39 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

“privacy of individuals; and

(j) to encourage innovation in the provision of telecommunications services, including the provision of telecommunications services such as video, multi-media and interactive television.”

Motion No. 11.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 7 by adding immediately after line 39 at page 4 the following:

“(2) The objectives set out in paragraphs (1)(a), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) may not be implemented in a manner inconsistent with or that derogates from the objectives set out in paragraph (1)(b).”

He said: Mr. Speaker, these motions have been grouped together because they deal with clause 7, a very substantive clause in this entire bill. The objectives of the Canadian telecommunications policy are basically set out within the framework of clause 7. A number of motions come under the provisions of clause 7 which is understandably why they have been grouped accordingly.

It was this clause that seemed to hang up the legislative committee for some time. There was a great deal of discussion, argument and debate as to the philosophical direction or thrust the government wished to take in this particular piece of legislation, to which I took objection. I believe my colleague from Mount Royal also objected in great measure to the particular focus or thrust of the government’s proposals in many areas.