

Privilege—Mr. Waddell

Mr. Andre: According to a *Globe and Mail* article here he “repudiates separatists”. What separatists? The NDP members are feeling somewhat embarrassed these days because of their chicanery and because they are hopping into bed with the Liberals—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I will have to ask the hon. member to please conclude his comments. He is entering into a debate and not discussing the question of privilege.

Mr. Andre: Madam Speaker, I will conclude by saying that this is certainly not a question of privilege. If anyone has a question of privilege it is members on this side who have been charged with disloyalty to Canada in the form of supporting separatism, and indeed of being separatists. We are accused of being separatists. If anybody has a point of privilege it is the members of this party, not members of the party to my left. It was quite significant that the hon. member who raised the question of privilege has not quoted from a citation in *Beauchesne* because the point he raised today cannot be considered a question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Madam Speaker, as you probably know, I have been absent from the House since it reconvened for the second part of its first session. I have been away for several reasons. First, there was the death of the president of my company, which meant I had duties to some 100 employees to keep the economic unit intact and to keep it sound. The second reason is that I have been involved for the past three years in litigation which arose out of a Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates dealing with the Post Office. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), who is so good at reading out about character, good faith and motives, knew very well that in the last week of October and in the last week of November I had been involved with that court case before the Supreme Court of British Columbia. So, while I have been attempting to defend the rights of individual members of a union, he has been accepting dictates from union bosses to malign my name.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: My reputation as a Canadian, while I have been involved in these legal processes, has been maligned. I have been insulted as an individual, and my family has been insulted. I have been called a non-Canadian on a national television show by a member of the other place, and I resent that deeply. I resent being called a separatist and a non-Canadian at any time, because I can hold up my record, and my service to this country as being equal to that of any other Canadian.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: My brother, my sister and myself served this country in the last war and have worn the Canada badge on our shoulders. I was not running around in a leather jacket with a swastika on the back, on a motorcycle.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: When I came down with my family to the centennial world fair in 1967, you cannot imagine the pride and the emotion which my family and I felt for this country during that trip to Quebec, and when coming to see the Peace Tower, walking through these halls and seeing this chamber, on a tour. The emotion went up the back and into the spine. That is the kind of love I have for this country, and to be denigrated and accused of avoiding my duties in this House when there are other matters which occasionally take priority, is something which I do not have to stand for.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: Madam Speaker, I should like to say a few words on the alleged charge of being a separatist. Since the middle of 1978 I have been writing to my constituents through the riding mailer which is the privilege of a member of Parliament. Ever since Bill C-60 of the Thirtieth Parliament came down, I have felt a deep concern about the changes that were taking place in the style and form of government in this country. I have written to my constituents at length, and practically all of these riding mailers have been published in the newspapers and even read over the radio out west. I have expressed these concerns and I have tried to educate my constituents. I have met with a great deal of appreciation and support, and I think the polls have shown that. They understand what kind of a Canadian I am.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to bear with me because the time and the hour are important in this day, and the emotions are high. I have been critical of this Parliament. I have spoken in this House and have had agreement nodded from my colleagues across the floor about the fact that I think this Parliament is not working, that the locked in caucus system does not allow the voice of the regions to be heard. The cry of the regions is not allowed to get out and be heard and understood through the cameras and the newspapers of the land.

As you so well know, Madam Speaker, the great excitement of Parliament takes place in caucus and that is where the regional disputes take place, and to me that is a tragedy. Not all members on this side agree with me on that. But, if we and the people out there understood the debate that went on, if the House opened up its processes so that we could let go the emotion and understand each other, so that the people of Ontario and Quebec understand the deep rock-bound frustration in the west, this would be a healthier country, and this form of government would be working to serve the people and the land.

● (1530)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: My frustration as a Canadian and as a western Canadian—it is part of the whole; it has always been that way—is that I did not see from the last election a mandate to change the constitution unilaterally, to escalate the