

Government Orders

written into the law and mandated by law that it had to be done.

I do not think that is good enough either. I think that Canadians have a right to expect that when we pass legislation in Parliament, parliamentary committees will do their jobs. If a member of Parliament honestly believes that a piece of legislation is deficient in some way, then he or she should be taking an initiative to sit down and start a review.

Certainly from the point of the government I can commit the government to constantly be reviewing legislation as passed by government to ensure that that legislation still serves the purpose for which it was intended. When the member for Kingston and the Islands says that the only way a Liberal committee would do its job is if it was mandated by law to do so and it was compulsory to do so, then I believe that is simply an abdication of responsibility on the part of that party.

This motion is frivolous. It deserves to be rejected. I think that the industry, consumers across Canada and people working in the industry all have a right to expect that this Parliament will move ahead and pass this legislation without more frivolous delay.

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and say a few brief words on Bill C-62 which is a major piece of communications legislation that has been brought before Parliament today. I would just like to say something with the greatest of respect to the minister from the government who introduced I do not know how many amendments to this legislation in committee. I was not in the committee. For the minister to suggest today that the amendments being brought forward by members of the opposition are frivolous really I think is begging a point.

I think that this minister is not one to normally take that approach in debate. I hope he will give serious consideration to our subamendment and if not the subamendment from my colleague in the New Democratic Party then certainly from the Official Opposition. I think it is important to give the discipline to any government—it does not matter what party—to ensure that the regular kind of review for legislation is guaran-

teed as important as that which is governing the telecommunications industry.

It is perhaps a cliché to talk about how the regulatory process has been slow to catch up to the changes in the telecommunications industry, but I think that is a point we all know. That industry has to be regulated. It is very difficult for any legislation to try to keep up to the changes.

I suggest that the amendment and the subamendment go some distance in applying discipline on the government or any government to ensure that those changes are made. When the minister suggests that his government is prepared to review legislation at any time, one just has to look at the promises made by the Minister of Finance about getting this government's books in order and the deficit under control. I might suggest that there is a reason to have an amendment to this legislation for some kind of review. It gives all Canadians, consumers and the industry that the minister talks about the time frame for knowing when formal legislative and regulatory changes will have to take place. This is opposed to sitting and waiting for Parliament just before an election when obviously the government wants to get some of its legislation passed.

• (1540)

I would ask the minister to give serious consideration to the subamendment and the amendment. They are both reasonable and something the government should consider supporting.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the subamendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.