

Question of Privilege

it would be best in all circumstances, and without prejudging the conclusion of the matter, for the hon. member to cease to be a member of the government. After discussing the matter with me Mr. Dupuis submitted his resignation, which was accepted.

In the course of the past week the report to which I have referred, which is still incomplete, has been referred to the attorney general of Quebec. I am sure the house would not want me, by anything I might say, to prejudice the position of the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville or to appear to prejudice whatever conclusions the attorney general of Quebec may reach once the inquiry is completed. I do not therefore, Mr. Speaker, think it would be desirable for me to say anything further on this matter at this time.

[Later:]

I should like to table the letters, Mr. Speaker, to which I referred in my earlier statement, between the former minister of public works and myself and the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville and myself. I should like to table also a special edition of the Canada Gazette, dated February 8, which includes the proclamation of the national flag of Canada.

PRIVILEGE

MR. DUPUIS—RESIGNATION AS MINISTER
WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

[Translation]

Hon. Yvon Dupuis (St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, as I told you I would in a letter I sent to you from St. Jean-Iberville on January 29 of this year. It has to do with false interpretations given in certain newspapers after I handed in my resignation as minister without portfolio.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) for having tabled the two letters he and I exchanged on January 22, 1965 and which confirm that, after having met the Prime Minister on a few occasions and discussed the situation for some time, I agreed with him that I should resign as minister without portfolio, which I did.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the house that since I resigned as minister without portfolio, I declined to make any comments to the press because I felt it was my duty to wait until my return to Ottawa to state to my colleagues of the House of Com-

[Mr. Pearson.]

mons the reasons which prompted me to hand in my resignation as minister without portfolio.

I kept silent, but the same does not hold true in respect of some newspapers and certain persons who, by setting stories afloat about me, almost succeeded during a certain period in creating an irreversible image of my guilt.

You will agree, Mr. Speaker, that I showed a great deal of patience by not leaping with indignation and anger when I read certain scurrilous, untrue and tendentious items about me in the papers. I shall not state the names of those newspapers or quote all those false articles, but in order to convince you, Mr. Speaker, if you are not already so convinced, that my question of privilege is well founded, I shall only quote a few excerpts from press reports in order to substantiate my question of privilege.

The newspaper *Le Devoir* of Monday, January 25, 1965, published, on the front page, an article by Mario Cardinal under the following title:

Yvon Dupuis is alleged to have received from a race track promoter a \$10,000 gift.

That article was libellous, untrue and therefore slanderous. The journalist, in the same article, was bold enough to write the following:

One thing is certain: he (Mr. Dupuis) admitted having received the \$10,000.

In writing those lines that newspaperman indulges in spiteful scandal-mongering. His writing is a patent and dishonest interference with my privileges as a member of the House of Commons. I say here, before my colleagues, that I have never received the \$10,000 referred to by that journalist, let alone that I have confessed receiving such a sum.

One had to read also, Mr. Speaker, the Montreal newspaper *La Presse* of Saturday, January 23, 1965, to find out how much newspapermen can write on a matter they know nothing about. Since they were completely in the dark, they gave free rein to their vilest prejudices, their most despicable instinct and their most tendentious imagination to ruin my reputation before the public. However, in that issue of January 23 *La Presse* did not give its readers any evidence of my guilt or any valid explanations of my reasons for leaving the cabinet. After reading the countless articles published in that issue people could ask themselves: "What exactly do they have against Yvon Dupuis?" Only in