

*Private Bills*

these terms, but it is the only language I can use in the light of the hon. member's own words, though it is language of a kind which hon. members of this house should refrain from using whenever possible. The head of this company is, I believe, a man whose native tongue is French. Lately the company has undertaken a program of public relations in an attempt to deal fairly and squarely with these issues, and I hope that when the board of directors is enlarged, representation will be given to the particular parts of this country in which its business is conducted.

**Mr. Lamb:** How many shares have you got?

**Mr. Francis:** I am not a shareholder in the Bell Telephone Company, and I will tell the hon. member that right away in response to his inquiry. But if the hon. member who made that interjection is thereby expressing agreement with the remarks made by the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm, I hope he will have the courage to get up and say so, because I think the people of Canada would like to know if he is a party—

**Mr. Pigeon:** I wish to ask a question. I would appreciate very much if the hon. member could name, around the world, another monopoly like the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

**Mr. Francis:** Again I do not like to answer in elementary terms, but the understanding of the hon. member is very limited. It seems there is a public authority which regulates telephone rates. Public utilities are often given franchises, which means that because of the technical nature of the service offered it is recognized that only a limited number of organizations can operate it. The procedure then is to regulate rates and charges. If the hon. member feels that the board of transport commissioners, or whatever authority is regulating the rates is not doing its job, his proper course would be to complain to that authority. If he does not think this is the correct remedy, I wonder what he hopes to achieve by these diatribes, these attacks on the integrity of an organization which, as far as I am concerned, is conducting its business reputably and honourably as a good citizen of our community. I do not intend to sit back and allow this kind of irresponsible, ultra-nationalist, socialist thought to be placed on record in *Hansard* without an answer being made, because I will have no part of it in any way, shape or form.

**Mr. Pigeon:** How many shares do you have?

**Mr. Francis:** For the record, I am not a shareholder in this company, nor is my wife nor are my children nor, to the best of my knowledge, is any member of my family. But if I were, I would be proud of it.

[Translation]

**Mr. Côté (Longueuil):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

In the course of his remarks, the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) said that I was speaking at the same time as he was. Now, I do not wish to discuss the principles he set forth, but I simply said that I find it strange that the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm should want to trade bilingualism within the Bell Telephone Company for large profits.

In fact, he said: We are prepared to let the company make tremendous profits, provided there is bilingualism in its administration. Those are the remarks to which I object.

**Mr. Pigeon:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Perhaps I could make a ruling now on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Longueuil. I think there was no question of privilege.

**Mr. Pigeon:** Mr. Speaker, as far as the question of privilege is concerned, the hon. member for Longueuil made a serious charge against me. He misquoted my remarks. I said that until such time as the provinces which wish to, will take their responsibility, and more particularly the province of Quebec, to nationalize the service of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada within their territory, the Bell Telephone Company should give more encouragement to bilingualism in the province of Quebec and favour the promotion of French Canadians.

**Mr. Côté (Longueuil):** Mr. Speaker, on that same question of privilege—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm is groundless. Perhaps some hon. members should explain their remarks, but such explanations do not really constitute a question of privilege.

[Text]

**Mr. Olson:** I rise on a point of order. When the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm was speaking I distinctly heard