

gether with their local charges, we will have just as strong a Bell Canada and reasonable rates as well.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, does the Hon. Member not realize that if we have competition for long distance telephone business and if we achieve much lower rates for long distance telephone calls, the big winner will be the large corporations? The ordinary Canadian user such as the farmer or the old-age pensioner does not use the long distance system very often. Those people will not save very much money, but the large corporations will. Increases in local rates in the United States have reached 40 and 50 per cent and it is predicted that they will go to 100 or 200 per cent in the next few years. Therefore, they are the ones who will suffer from this sort of competition. We are not opposed to competition if it benefits the ordinary Canadian, but we are certainly opposed to competition if the benefits go to the large corporations which are best able to afford the kind of payments that they have had. I suggest that the Hon. Member should be concerned about the ordinary Canadian whom he and others represent.

**Mr. Hockin:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) juxtaposes large corporate interests and the individual paying his telephone bill. I say that the whole issue should be put in a larger context. First, if you take a number of industries that depend enormously on long distance for their livelihood, especially a large service industry such as the hotel industry, if you are able to moderate their rates and make them more profitable, efficient and competitive, suddenly you will create jobs. Therefore, we have to look at the fact that if certain corporations are able to benefit and become more competitive, that can create jobs. That is part of the answer. The other part of the answer is the direct level of rates that will be in store for the local telephone calls. There is no evidence that the CRTC will allow unreasonable increases to take place. The CRTC will have a mandate under this Bill as it has always had to moderate those increases. I do not think we should be scared by the spectre of huge increases to which the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North referred.

● (1630)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall)—Labour Conditions—Unemployment rate levels—Request that budget be introduced. b) Challenge '85—Wage subsidy component. c) Unemployment in Eastern Canada; the Hon.

### *Bell Canada Act*

Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Budgetary cutbacks—Request for details. b) Nature of consultations; the Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria)—The Administration—Government appointments—Remuneration levels. b) External Aid—Government position.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### BELL CANADA ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Masse that Bill C-19, an Act respecting the reorganization of Bell Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture.

**Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay-Nipigon):** Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us dealing with the reorganization of Bell Canada is an interesting example of the realities of politics and power in this country. The Government is putting forward a Bill which is a part of what the last Liberal Government brought before the House. The other part of that legislation will be coming to us later.

The Official Opposition is missing this afternoon. Having done their *pro forma* bit in recognizing what the Bill was before, Liberal Members have now disappeared to do whatever other pleasant duties there may be this afternoon. We in the New Democratic Party who are concerned about the impact of Bell Canada reorganization on ordinary Canadians are here endeavouring to maintain the debate.

Let us think a bit about the Bill that is before us. The reality of Bell Canada is that it has made enormous profits in these last few years. The reorganization of Bell Canada Enterprises has made it possible to use that cash flow and the economic power it gives the company in order to become a major operator in various Canadian endeavours. It can buy into real estate, enter into publishing and so on and so forth. It is producing a company that is on the way to becoming an enormous conglomerate. That achievement has been made at a time when so many Canadians are unemployed and when in fact the Canadian economy is in dreadful shape. This makes one wonder what exactly is going on in various areas of the Canadian economy.

Why is it possible for this company to make such inordinate gains? How is it possible for the profits to rise so sharply? On the one hand, the company pays a certain amount in the way of taxes but, as one of Canada's largest companies, it is surely also a beneficiary of the morass of tax breaks from which companies can benefit. To have the company then setting out at the beginning of this decade to reorganize its business in order to ensure that what Government regulates will be quite