

At no time did I indicate that Canadians needed a kick in the gut. In fact I indicated that it had been administered in the United States.

When we brought this information to the attention of the CBC, they checked out the true facts, and this morning they apologized on the radio. When we brought this to the attention of the *Ottawa Citizen*, where the story had its birth, they put a correction in the newspaper today.

My responsibility, as Minister of Employment and Immigration, is to get across to the unemployed of this country that I am concerned. As a son of an individual who was laid off and unemployed, and as an individual who has suffered unemployment when working my way through school, I have a feeling for the unemployed. That kind of thing is important to me in acting as the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

I have received two apologies from the media. I think the very least I could expect from my colleagues is an apology that they made an error.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure what member the minister had in mind when he was making his comments.

Mr. Goodale: You.

Mr. Broadbent: I hear one of his backbenchers answering for him. Evidently the minister expects to receive apologies from this side of the House. He referred to the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) and myself. I thought perhaps he would refer to the Deputy Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. MacEachen).

● (1522)

If the minister looks in yesterday's *Hansard* he will find some interesting quotations, not coming from this side of the House but coming from his own side.

The minister raises an important question which pertains directly to what he has brought before us, as well as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), members of the Conservative party, and some from our party, namely, questions that are raised in the House about quotations that are attributed to people outside the House. I want to tell the minister that questions were raised yesterday from this side. I moved two motions under Standing Order 43. In my motion I used the phrase "alleged statement," and subsequently during the question period I sought some clarification. The word "alleged" was used from time to time by members of the Conservative party and indeed by the Deputy Prime Minister, but sometimes it was not. Yesterday the Deputy Prime Minister said, as reported at page 1583 of *Hansard*, that he was dissociating himself—

An hon. Member: Apologize, Broadbent.

Mr. Broadbent: —that it is not stated government policy. He said:

Privilege—Mr. Cullen

... I find much in his statements and comments with which I agree such as, for example, his statement that it is not the total obligation of the government ... to provide jobs.

Further on he said, with reference to the statement which he took for granted was uttered:

They were general comments relating to what the minister conceives to be the lifestyle of Canadians,

My point is, and I want to stress it, that before I raised the issue in the House I saw not one newspaper but two, with two different stories, one a CP story and one a story by a reporter under a by-line in the *Ottawa Citizen*, presumably differently written stories—it could have been the same story but the paragraphs are quite different, the sequence is different—and in both stories the quotation is attributed to the minister. It seems to me that it is quite responsible for members on this side of the House to raise such questions.

At least when you use the word "allegation" there is a strong reason to believe—when you have two news stories before you in two different papers, presumably written by two different reporters attributing the words to the minister—that the story is true. But I want to go further, that if the minister really thought he had a case, as he says he has before the House now, yesterday morning he could have conveyed through his parliamentary secretary to members of the House of Commons—the story in the *Ottawa Citizen* is two days old—that he has been misquoted and we would have accepted his word. He could have conveyed this also to the Deputy Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Apologize.

Mr. Broadbent: I am saying—oh, shut-up over there!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) had put questions to the minister today which were deferred because the minister had indicated his intention to raise this question of privilege, and I think it is appropriate that the hon. member should have the opportunity to make his remarks.

Mr. Broadbent: If the minister thinks he has a question of privilege on this, the least he could have done before making accusations against members on this side of the House was to have informed his parliamentary secretary yesterday morning that what was alleged to have been said was not said, and he could have told the Deputy Prime Minister the same thing. As everyone in the House knows, yesterday the Deputy Prime Minister believed that the quotations were accurate and he was doing his best to disassociate the government from them. If the minister was so incensed about the opposition, why did he not ensure that the Deputy Prime Minister himself knew yesterday that he did not utter the words?

I will reply to what I think is not a question of privilege at all and end up my comments by saying that the minister has withdrawn his statement—and I accept his word entirely. He says he did not say Canadians deserve a kick in the gut, and I