

The Address—Mr. Mongrain

Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) carries out his duty, which is to oppose, naturally. On the government side, of course, we think sometimes that he opposes a little too vehemently, but it is his job and that of his colleagues, and we can say that he does it very conscientiously and quite seriously.

The same is true of the leaders of the other opposition parties, the NDP and the Ralliement créditiste.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I would wish that the members of the Ralliement créditiste were as sincere and serious as their leader when speaking in the house. Although his humour and wit sometimes surprise some of the members of this house, his comments are always basically serious.

Mr. Speaker, the winners of the last election have been congratulated. But I have a complex. I am thinking of those members of all the parties who bit dust on election day. I realize that that happens in all elections, but I am thinking in particular of those who worked for years in Canadian politics and did their best and who were disappointed. I am also thinking of those who were running for the first time and who felt on that day rather like one feels the first time one is disappointed in love. I should like to offer my sympathy to those Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I had first risen on a question of privilege in order to vindicate someone who was a member of this house. A member of the opposition objected, though I knew I was interpreting rather loosely the Rules of the house. But I had risen on a question of privilege pertaining to a matter of humanity and Christian charity, and I had hoped that the house would let me get on with it. As the opposition objected I was unable to finish my statement. I would like to have a couple of minutes now, to conclude what I was saying the other day about the hon. Yvon Dupuis, who was wrongly accused and who lost the first law suit. Three learned judges of the appeal court, the honourable Montgomery, Owen and Taschereau granted him leave of appeal and unanimously agreed that he had not been given a fair trial. Therefore, he appealed and I shall now quote an excerpt from *Le Devoir*, dated April 19, 1968, reporting the conclusion that was reached on this unfortunate situation:

Counsels Raymond D'aoust and Paul Martineau were acting on behalf of the accused, now exonerated after three years of legal proceedings. The second trial began on March 12th and lasted but six minutes as both parties were agreed to submit to Judge Marc-Henri Blain some 6,700 pages of

[Mr. Mongrain.]

evidence making up 33 volumes pertaining to the first trial and to the documents that were later transferred to the Appeal Court.

In his judgement contained in about forty pages, Mr. Justice Blain asserts that in his opinion Mr. Dupuis had never received the \$10,000 and that, consequently, he must be cleared of the accusation.

I felt it was important, Mr. Speaker, that this unfortunate and nauseating story which started in this very house, with the resignation of a most promising young man be recorded in *Hansard* so that at least his acquittal be given as much publicity as the country's newspapers gave to the false accusation which was such a terrible ordeal for his family during three whole years.

Mr. Speaker, I have noted everything that has been said by the opposition about the Speech from the Throne; I like to listen to all the speeches, though they are not all equally good. For instance, I have observed that many members of the opposition find that the Speech from the Throne is rather meaningless, because it leaves certain things unsaid. It outlines only those measures which were high on the priority list. Had the Prime Minister decided to insert in the Speech the full details of all his projects, we, the poor members of the House of Commons standing at the rear and sometimes unable even to hear His Excellency, would have been waiting there, I think, for fully 24 hours. One must be reasonable however and not demand such a feat. I think that the main points of this government's program are very clearly stated for anyone who can read between the lines.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said and repeated many times that people would like to know how the Prime Minister and his colleagues will create that just society. Of course, I understand the members of the opposition and I have much sympathy for them who are in the dark about so many things. In fact, I have so much sympathy for them that I feel like offering them my condolences for being on the wrong side of the house. But we, who are on this side, know where we stand. The Prime Minister and his colleagues have told us where they are going and we are very pleased to see that they know where they are going, that they have taken positive steps to bring about a just society and our minds are fully at rest on that point.

I will go further, Mr. Speaker, and I will say that the concern shown by the opposition from the very beginning of the debate, in saying over and over again: "How is it that we do not have this just society at once", is an indication that even the opposition has