

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, February 19, 1954

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MACINNIS—REFERENCE TO REPORTED
REMARKS BY MEMBER FOR BROADVIEW

Mr. Angus MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of privilege based on a news item in yesterday's *Ottawa Journal*. The article is headed, "Hees Charges Deal to Kill Private Bill". Then follows the report of an address that the hon. member for Broadview made at London, Ontario. I should like to read the report and make my point of privilege. It reads in part as follows:

Last Wednesday in the House of Commons a private member's bill for setting up such a research committee was due to come up for debate. A day or so before a senior member of the government made a deal with the C.C.F. to debate the bill preceding the research bill to such length that the research bill could not be brought forward. Because that was the last day for private bills, the research bill was killed for this session and cannot be brought forward again until next year.

I rise on a question of privilege now because, although my name was not mentioned by the hon. member for Broadview, the private member's motion which was debated at that time stood in my name. Eleven members spoke on the motion of whom only three were members of the C.C.F. party. Their speeches occupy about six and a half pages of *Hansard*, not more than the space taken by one 40-minute speech, a rather poor effort for a party that had made a deal to talk out a motion.

May I say further that after the opening of the house on that day but before the debate began I spoke to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and told him that as far as I could ascertain there was no opposition to my motion and that if the house were agreeable I would be glad to withdraw it after there had been an expression of opinion by the several parties. I wish to say most emphatically that I did not enter into any deal to talk out the motion either with a senior or junior member of the government.

Mr. George H. Hees (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I learned from sources usually unassailable that such an agreement had been made. If I am wrong, I withdraw the remarks and apologize for having made an incorrect statement.

(Translation):

MR. POULIOT—REFERENCE TO ARTICLE PUBLISHED
IN "LE DEVOIR"

Mr. Jean-François Pouliot (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. A friend of mine has brought to my attention an article published yesterday in a Montreal newspaper *Le Devoir*. The article is entitled:

Mr. Pouliot echoes the voice of his master Mr. Duplessis in attacking trade unionism.

In reply to that article written in bad faith, I wish to say that I have only one master, who is neither in Ottawa nor in Quebec, that it is the electorate of the constituency of Temiscouata; my chief is the leader of the Liberal party, the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. St. Laurent), who is at present replaced by the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Howe), but I am perfectly entitled to have friends to whom I am faithful. I have never struck them in the back.

As far as Mr. Duplessis is concerned, he is one of my friends, we are of the same age, we were admitted together to the bar, and I am not ashamed of this friendship, no more than I am ashamed of having friends among all political parties.

As to my so-called attack, I did not attack trade unionism, I condemned the labour leaders; but there certainly was bad faith on the part of the parliamentary correspondent, because, the previous day, I had made in this house a double correction, and he had no excuse for not knowing it.

The article ends thus:

In Quebec parliamentary circles, they know very well what to think about it. They know that Mr. Jean-François Pouliot is Premier Duplessis' spokesman in the House of Commons . . .

Which is absolutely false, because I am here only as spokesman for my electors, who have honoured me with their faithful support during 30 years.

. . . when he wants things said that neither Conservative nor independent members from the province would want to say.

That is another ignominious lie.

It is a well known fact that he was instrumental in bringing about the victory of the Union Nationale candidates in Riviere du Loup and Temiscouata at the last provincial election . . .