

Government Orders

computer and the way it is typed in and printed out. Maybe it has to do with the way the wire is put through.

• (1555)

[*Translation*]

An hon. member: No.

Mrs. Finestone: The minister says no, but—

[*English*]

Mr. Beatty: Your legal interpretation is correct.

Mrs. Finestone: Sometimes I am right, but it took a lot of learning.

I will rest my case in that way. We have undertaken a variety of amendments and a variety of clarifications for resellers to ensure they will be exempted from the law. Instead of taking an easy route with clarity we have taken a sort of convoluted route.

Maybe my colleague in the NDP who brought in this motion is right. I do not know. Maybe five years down the road we will want to revisit the whole measure. I would certainly support the motion in light of the big question mark that is out there.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to formally designate Wednesday, June 2, as the ninth and last allotted day for this supply period.

* * *

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-62, an act respecting telecommunications, as reported, with amendments, from a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture; and Motion No. 1.

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches—Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no question that Bill C-62 is very complicated in my reading of it. The hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap, our critic on communications, has

been extremely helpful in my gaining a better understanding of the legislation. The amendment the member for Okanagan—Shuswap just introduced in the House raises a concern I have that it changes the whole concept people have of their relationship with Bell Canada and other telecommunication companies in the field.

It is my understanding the bill indicates a consumer or a customer of a telecommunications company would rent equipment from that company's telephone pole in the middle of the street, that is the wire that goes from the pole to the house. Once that wire goes into the house, however, it becomes the consumer's responsibility to maintain the wiring within the house, apartment building, hotel or wherever it happens to be.

That is quite different from how customer relationships have been established over the years with telecommunications companies. If this legislation goes through without that amendment being included in the act, an awful lot of people over the next 10 years or so will have a rude shock whenever they have a problem with the wiring within their places of accommodation and suddenly get a bill from Bell Canada or some other telecommunications company for repairs.

Generally speaking Bill C-62 proposes sweeping changes to the framework surrounding the telecommunications industry. They reflect the present government's philosophy on deregulation and privatization of everything that moves, walks or sleeps.

The complexity of the bill is clearly understood when we consider the number of amendments the government has brought forward to the bill introduced for the first time on February 27, 1992. It is my understanding the bill requires such clarification that it has been changed something like 74 times from the time it received second reading to report stage. That is an awful lot of amendments, especially by a government that drafted the bill. Before it introduced it in the House I would have assumed it would have been satisfied the bill met what it intended it to do. That clearly is not the case. Considering the number of amendments that are being moved by members from both sides of the House it clearly is not a very satisfactory bill.