

Then there was an interjection by the hon. member for Richmond-South Delta (Mr. Siddon), after which the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway said:

The party to my right is aiding and abetting separatism in western Canada.

He accused the whole party. If the hon. member had said "The party to my right is aiding and abetting communism", that would be a precise example of McCarthyism as defined and accepted common usage. Then the hon. member said, after another interjection by the hon. member for Richmond-South Delta:

If the hon. member will give me a chance, let me ask why the former prime minister, who is the Leader of the Conservative party, has not stood up and repudiated the remarks—or denied them—which are reported in the *Vancouver Sun* of Saturday, October 25. The hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) was reported to have said—

And so forth. In the heat of debate members sometimes make remarks. There were interjections, perhaps, from this side. One might say that the hon. member simply misspoke, became overly excited or said something he really did not mean. Well, five days later, on November 26, as reported at page 5107 of *Hansard*, the hon. member said, and I quote:

I stood up in this House and asked the hon. member from Richmond, who is chattering away here, why the Leader of the Opposition does not deny the remarks made about a western parliament by the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington). Incidentally, the Leader of the Opposition heard this.

The hon. member reaffirmed that his remarks on November 21 were not an accident. He meant to use McCarthyism. He was reaffirming it on this particular date. The reason I accused the hon. member of McCarthyism in his remarks—and it is McCarthyism—stems from another definition of McCarthyism which I think is the real tragedy in what the hon. member is doing. That definition is in "Safire's Political Dictionary", an enlarged, up-to-date edition, in which Douglass Cater, apparently in a book entitled "The Fourth Branch of Government", is quoted as follows:

McCarthyism's greatest threat was not to individual liberty or even to the orderly conduct of government. It corrupted the power to communicate, which is indispensable to men living in a civilized society.

Mr. Nielsen: Waddellism.

Mr. Andre: Waddellism, perhaps, and that is the reason this had to be raised. Ironically—and he did not intend to—the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway is doing a service to this House by raising this issue so that it can be aired, because that is precisely what he is attempting to do. He is attempting to corrupt the power to communicate, which is indispensable. By accusing members of this party of fostering separatism and by talking about it, the hon. member is denying or attempting to prevent us from talking about what is a very real problem in western Canada. It has to be talked about.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has just said that he is grateful that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) has raised issues. I feel that the hon. member himself is raising issues. I ask him, as I asked the hon. member before him, to limit himself to discussing the question of privilege. I know he wants to offer definitions of McCarthyism, and I am grateful that he has done that. However,

Privilege—Mr. Waddell

because I will need to ascertain whether the word was unparliamentary, I would like him to limit himself to telling me whether or not, in his view, there was a breach of privilege.

● (1520)

Mr. Andre: I thought I was in the process of doing that, Madam Speaker. I think this is a very important question which needs a full airing. Probably the accusation should be reversed. The point of privilege should come from this party because, if this type of behaviour is permitted and we are not allowed at least to counter it by way of debate and call it what it is, that is, McCarthyism, then we are certainly interfering with the privileges of members who feel it to be their responsibility to express the feelings which exist among their constituents, the growing sense of alienation which is harming the country and causing immense disunity in the country.

Perhaps the hon. member does not like to be identified as doing what he is doing, but I think, quite clearly—and this bears repeating—as Douglass Cater said, the greatest threat is not to the individual liberty, to me as a member of Parliament or to my colleague, the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington), as a member of Parliament, but rather the corruption of the power to communicate. In fact the accusation was deliberately made in the debate, as reported at page 5121 of *Hansard* of November 27. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway is only identified as "An hon. Member", and he said "Not with the Tory separatists". I was here and I know it was the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway who made the remark. Other hon. members can substantiate this. If a member is allowed to make that remark, which is McCarthyism as defined, and we are not allowed to identify it as such, then that means that western alienation, and the feelings of frustration in the west will never be discussed because those of us who might raise this will be branded as aiding and abetting something which we all detest. When the hon. member for Capilano suggests a possible way in which westerners might give expression to the feelings of alienation that are not separatist, namely, ideas on a western parliament or a grouping of the four western provinces—

An hon. Member: What?

Mr. Andre: —to enhance the negotiating strength, if that is identified as separatism by a member who, unlike the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) whom this hon. member supports, served this country during the last war as an airman in the North Atlantic Squadron, under enemy fire—

An hon. Member: That is imputing motives.

Mr. Andre: I hear the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent) speaking up because he too is guilty of McCarthyism in its more blatant form.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!