

B.C. Telephone

admit we prefer private companies. Of course, it is initiative, private initiative, Madam Speaker, which gave birth to our country while state institutions have always tended to weaken the country instead of strengthening it.

I would particularly like to congratulate the member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) for his masterly stroke in having managed to have his amendment to Bill S-11 passed even though there was nothing in the order paper on this. I guess this is due to the good will of this House and the cooperation of all members. I congratulate him and I wish, as he himself mentioned it, that all Canadian companies, whatever province they may be in, follow the leadership of those who are bilingual today. I hope that will be proof enough that all our Crown corporations as well as private companies also want to adopt bilingual names so that we can identify them. When we hear of these companies we simply say: there is a Canadian company. I therefore congratulate all hon. members and I would like to say once again that I wish that more bills could come before the House during the private members' hour so that they may be passed more quickly.

● (1740)

[English]

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Madam Speaker, I will not speak for more than a couple of minutes. I wanted to make some comments on the words spoken by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) who went to great lengths to thank the B.C. Telephone Company for being so co-operative in letting its name be put forward in the French version, in an amendment which is only proper and right. However, in all fairness he should have mentioned that British Columbia members from my party, who were in full attendance at that committee, certainly had no objection to that change.

Quite often when we are outside the House we become political and it is easy for someone to make a speech about the Conservatives not supporting bilingualism. So, Madam Speaker, I wanted to make sure that my comments with regard to our party were on the record because members from my province have a good record in this respect. In my province by comparison we spend more per capita on bilingualism, and I wanted to make sure that that was on the record.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reynolds: I also wanted to make sure that I said something about big bad capitalist B.C. Telephone Company, since my good friend in the riding next to me had something to say about people not standing for this rip-off much longer. I suggest that he speak to our premier. That might be the big issue in the next election. He will see how popular that issue is in my province.

People in my province are tired of seeing take-overs; they like to see free enterprise operate, and they like to see the type of bill that is now before us being passed in the House. I received a few letters saying that it was a good idea. I would love to see us fight the next provincial election on take-overs in my province. I do not think people in my province want take-overs. I myself have been one of the great complainers in this respect because I cannot get enough telephone lines in my riding. The only

[Mr. Gauthier (Roberval).]

problem is that we are the fastest growing province in the country and we have a hard time getting material, supplies, and so on when they are required.

An hon. Member: Who is your company competing with?

Mr. Reynolds: I would be happy to compare them with any of the publicly owned telephone companies in Canada, but they do not have to compete with anybody. Telephone companies in every province do not have to compete, but they have to buy materials from other sources. They are short of supplies such as plastic and rubber wiring, and there is a shortage of telephones. So that is not B.C. Telephone's fault but the fault of world wide shortages. They are doing a good job with what they have, and in passing the bill today we will make sure that they receive more capital which will benefit the people of British Columbia.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Reid: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been discussions through the usual channels and I think there is willingness on the part of the House to deal with the report stage of Bill C-214. This bill was only reported yesterday and has not yet been on the record for the full length of time required, but if there is unanimous consent we would like to proceed with it and perhaps to complete the report stage and third reading today.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING REASONS FOR COMMISSIONS' REPORTS

Mr. R. E. McKinley (for Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West)) moved that Bill C-214, to amend the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, as reported (with amendment) from the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. McKinley (for Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West)) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

He said: Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure, on behalf of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), to move third reading of this bill. It contains a sensible suggestion, namely that electoral boundaries commissions set up in provinces give reasons for their decisions regarding the boundaries of ridings and in what way they reached them. I am sure that, from time to time during redistribution, members as well as many constituents, candidates and county and township councils wonder how the commissioners come to the decisions they do. This bill simply states that the commissions which set up these