

Privilege—Mr. Broadbent

argument of the Hon. Member of the New Democratic Party and it could be the subject of disagreement, that the fact of the matter is that he has used unparliamentary language and he cannot excuse—

An Hon. Member: So has the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Mr. Ouellet:—cannot excuse his conduct, by pointing, as an excuse, to the conduct of another Member of the House. What is the question here is the abuse of the Leader of the New Democratic Party in his language. Whatever may be his reasoning, it is not anyone else who is under scrutiny at this time; it is his own wording. I have known him for a long time. I know he is a good parliamentarian. I know his Party has very strong views on the Crownsnest legislation which is before the House. I believe that the attitude of that Party in recent days, and the attitude of the Leader of that Party today, show that they are going to try to use every trick to delay the passage of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Ouellet: Surely, the Hon. Member will withdraw his words.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Again, I would ask the Hon. Member for Oshawa, for whom I am sure all Hon. Members of the House have a high regard in terms of his integrity and spirit, whether he would withdraw a remark which is clearly unparliamentary.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said as a person who has respected the rules of this House and throughout my political life have shown, I hope, greater respect for the truth than even for the rules of this place. If you want to hold your judgment and hold your ruling, I will respect that, in order to give the Prime Minister time to withdraw his comments. But I repeat, if there is not a withdrawal on the part of the Prime Minister, there will be no withdrawal on my part.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the point is not whether or not a Member has misinformed the House, but whether the language used by a Member is or is not parliamentary. The issue is quite straightforward, and I think the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) knows by experience that this is strictly a matter of procedure—as simple as that. He says that the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) used unparliamentary language. That is not true. The Prime Minister did not say anything unparliamentary. I suppose what the Hon. Member meant was that from the Hon. Member's point of view, what the Prime Minister said did not conform to the Hon. Member's view of reality. The Hon. Member for Oshawa is entitled to disagree with what someone else says. He is under no obligation to agree or disagree. The point is that he reacted by saying

that the Prime Minister lied, and it is generally acknowledged, by parliamentary practice, that this word constitutes unparliamentary language. The point is not whether the facts were or were not properly presented, but whether the Member for Oshawa has the right to accuse another Parliamentarian of lying. He may say that a Member of Parliament has misinformed the House—this is quite acceptable—but when he says an Hon. Member has lied, that kind of language is not acceptable to our parliamentary practice and our Standing Orders, and I think he knows that perfectly well.

If the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), with his parliamentary experience, insists on refusing to withdraw an expression that is obviously unparliamentary, that is a clear indication that he wants to take advantage of the situation—as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) was saying—to obstruct the proceedings, but I want to give him the benefit of the doubt. And if he is really asking—

• (1220)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Mr. Broadbent, I have to name you for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Mr. Nielsen: I wish to rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: Perhaps we can avoid the procedure which is triggered by the naming process if the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) could now perhaps respond to the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent). That would avoid a vote and salvage an Opposition day which is about to go down the drain. Would the Prime Minister perhaps respond to the invitation of the Leader of the NDP?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, though I missed some of the debate, I understand the matter is on whether Premier Pawley, yes or no, indicated that he was favourable to—

Mr. Nielsen: At 24 Sussex.

Mr. Broadbent: At your dinner.

Mr. Trudeau: Well, at the dinner, Mr. Speaker, I can only stand by what I remember to have been an exchange between ten Premiers, that the matter of the Crow was raised. To the best of my recollection, Premier Pawley—and the other Premiers present, those who participated in debate, and they included the western Premiers, indicated that they thought the Crow should be changed. I do not say they indicated any particular way. They thought the Crow was something that would have to be dealt with. I am not indicating there was any detailed discussion of the proposals made by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin). But as to the matter of the transportation of grain and other matters in the West, as to the importance of making those changes, I can only stand by what I said.