

*Bell Canada Act*

**Some Hon. Members:** On division.

Motion No. 1 negatived.

**Mr. Speaker:** The next question is on Motion No. 3A standing in the name of the Minister of Communications (Mr. Masse). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed please say nay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it

*And more than five Members having risen:*

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 114(5), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 5 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed please say nay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five Members having risen:*

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 114(5) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal)** moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-19, be amended in Clause 7 by striking out lines 6 and 7 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"7. Neither the Company nor any affiliate of the company shall directly or"

She said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss Clause 7 which deals with the broadcasting prohibition. As originally constituted, Clause 7 continued a prohibition against Bell from holding any form of broadcasting licence. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, when this prohibition actually took place. In 1968 Parliament inserted in the Bell Canada Special Act a specific subsection, namely subsection 5(2), which precluded Bell Canada from holding a broadcasting licence as that term is defined in the Broadcasting Act.

Let me remind Hon. Members what a broadcasting licence is. It means a licence to carry on a broadcasting undertaking. A broadcasting undertaking includes a broadcasting transmitting undertaking, that is, television, radio, cable television and pay t.v. It also includes a broadcasting-receiving undertaking, which is cable, as a common carrier and a network operation located in whole or in part within Canada, on a ship, on an aircraft registered in Canada.

When you look at the definition of a broadcasting undertaking, radio, television, cable et cetera and the network and then you look at broadcasting policy, it talks about undertakings with respect to responsibility for program and program content. There are taxes so that we can now have the kind of Canadian content built into the programming that we want. All of these are included when you look at the very slight number of words recommended for change by the amendment brought by the Government, and subsequently in the reason for my request to strike out lines 6 and 7 on page 3 and substitute:

Neither the Company nor any affiliate of the Company—

Let me explain. First, we are dealing with the reassertion of the right of the CRTC to regulate Bell Canada. Bell Canada at that time was in a sense a holding company. It had a series of corporate empires under its mandate, such as Northern Telecom, Bell Canada Enterprises, Bell Canada International Management Research and Consulting, which sent the team to work in Saudi Arabia, Telesat Canada, Bell-Northern Research, Tele-Direct, Tele-Direct Publications, Bell Communications Systems. Now with the reorganization, Bell Canada becomes just one of a myriad of affiliates to Bell Canada Enterprises. It has very few subsidiaries to which it is responsible.

What has been done with this amendment is to allow the introduction of a potential for Bell Canada to go into competition with the cable industry, the television industry and all the broadcasting industries. The fact that we did not want that in the original concept of the Bell Canada Act was amply demonstrated by our action in 1968. At that time the cable industry saw the threat by Bell to control the local distribution plant. It is just one of the examples of many public policy reasons for inserting that original subsection 5 in the Bell Canada Special Act. These concerns still exist today. Perhaps they are more valid than ever. They are applicable to BCE and its subsidiary companies as they were to Bell Canada.

The Canadian Cable Television Association fears that with this clause as it now stands it could be wiped out by the Bell group. That means concentration of power, Mr. Speaker. It means a diminution of jobs, potential for creativity and the role of small and large business on the part of some of our cable operators. They have expressed their fears to the Minister. I might cite the letter and bring the attention of all Members of this House to what the Canadian Cable and Television Association has had to say.

The CCTA believes that it is very significant that the CRTC in its April 1983 report to Cabinet on the proposed