

Private Bills

him—over the translation system—accuse the hon. member for Carleton of having, as motivation for his interruption, the fact that he probably owns some shares in the Bell Telephone Company. The hon. member for Carleton stated specifically and clearly that he did not have any shares in this company. The hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm interjected on two occasions since then, saying "How many shares have you got?" This is a direct violation of the rules of this house and I think the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm should apologize. I do not believe any member of this house should be able to get away with accusations of that kind and persist in them, despite a denial.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: The hon. member for Victoria, Ontario, made the same interjection, and those remarks also apply to him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure it is not right for a member to suggest that other hon. members are contributing to a debate because they have a financial interest in a particular matter. I am sure the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) and the hon. member for Victoria, Ontario (Mr. Lamb) did not wish to impute motives to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Francis), and I have the impression he was satisfied with this when he rose and denied that he had a financial interest in the company in question.

Perhaps the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm and the hon. member for Victoria, Ontario will accept the suggestion I am making to them, that they did not intend to impute to the hon. member for Carleton any such motive, and we might leave it at that.

[Translation]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lothinière): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the remarks of the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon), I just want to say how surprised I am to detect an obvious incompatibility between his party's principles and the socialist doctrine—

Mr. Pigeon: Progressive Conservative.

Mr. Choquette:—which he advocated in his remarks.

Private enterprise is the system which we respect in Canada, and I think that a great number of Canadians would like to see this system of private enterprise maintained, encouraged and strengthened.

[Mr. Olson.]

Mr. Speaker, if private enterprise is successful, there is cause to rejoice. Of course, everyone is against monopolies which crush or oppress, but that is not a sufficient reason for allowing the state to increase unduly its interference and to impose controls such as those advocated by the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm.

The Bell Telephone Company of Canada is a prosperous company, everyone knows it, and I think that is to the credit of its president who is a French speaking Canadian. The service that the Bell Telephone Company of Canada gives to all its customers is excellent and I do not see how the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm can reach such radical, extremist and derogatory conclusions as those he expressed a few moments ago.

Mr. Speaker, I will not speak very long, but I could not let the rather wild remarks made by the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm go unchallenged. I no longer recognize in him the pupil of Messrs. Antonio Barrette and Maurice Duplessis, the greatest enemies of nationalization and socialization, and I wonder what happened to the pupil of Messrs. Duplessis and Barrette—

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the hon. member.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm speaks again, I take the liberty of reminding the hon. member for Lotbinière that he is also straying away from the matter in hand.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the hon. member and ask him why he bears Mr. René Lévesque a grudge for having nationalized the Shawinigan Falls company which was a very small company compared with the monopolistic Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The question of the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm is definitely out of order.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I would have liked very much to answer the hon. member's question, but if you rule it out of order, I shall abide by your ruling. However, I had a ready answer.

There is no comparison possible between the nationalization of power companies and that of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. In any case, since the nationalization of power