

Privilege—Mr. Waddell

When a member rises and seeks to talk about legitimate grievances, whether they are about the west, the central part of the country or the east, and then calls for a Parliament for that region, what does it mean if it is not, as the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway described it, aiding and abetting—

Mr. Waddell: The forces.

Mr. Broadbent:—aiding and abetting the forces of separatism? If anyone has any sense of impartial judgment, that is precisely what is involved. If I were a western Canadian and I had grievances, as indeed the west has, and I heard someone rise in the Parliament of Canada and say, "If we do not get our improvements, we need a Parliament of western Canada", then surely that is the same kind of tactic which supported René Lévesque in the province of Quebec, an independence movement in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: What did you do about it?

Some hon. Members: Where were you?

Mr. Huntington: Oui.

Mr. Broadbent: I listened with interest, I listened in silence. I will reply to the obvious, little emotional concern in the Conservative party. During the debate on the referendum in the province of Quebec, we made it—

Mr. Nielsen: Where were you?

Mr. Broadbent: If the member listens, he will hear the answer right now. The New Democratic Party was on the record in the province of Quebec, and with its leader it went into the province of Quebec, as aptly as the Leader of the Conservative party (Mr. Clark), and spoke clearly for the federal side in that debate. There is no question about it; it is part of the public record.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: But I want to return to the essence of the problem. If, during the great debate about the future of the province of Quebec, members of the Liberal party, the New Democratic Party or the Conservative party said, "Oh, well, Quebecers have legitimate grievances, I guess we should form a Parliament of Quebec", the Tories would have been the first in the House of Commons to rise and say, "You are aiding and abetting separatism", and they would have been correct!

● (1540)

If they had gotten up and said what is really needed, because of their grievances, is an entirely different representative system—that is precisely what the member for Capilano has done, in my judgment—I would agree with proposals which ought to be implemented in the House of Commons to deal with the legitimate concerns of western Canada. How-

ever, rather than speaking about that he raises—and to use the words of the member for Vancouver-Kingsway, he aids and abets—the separatist option. He talks about a western Parliament. Surely that is what is being done.

There are forces now in western Canada calling for independence. In those meetings they will be able to quote Conservative members of the House of Commons who say that what we need, perhaps, is a parliament of western Canada. If aiding and abetting the forces of separatism means anything, it seems to me that is what it means. Therefore, when the member for Vancouver-Kingsway made the accusation I think he made it with intellectual and moral honesty.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Broadbent: Members to my right may differ, but I think he was dead on. If we had members in the House of Commons at the time of the Quebec referendum, or prior to it, who went around saying that what we need is a separate parliamentary system, entirely different from the one we now have in the province of Quebec, the Tory party would have been calling that, I repeat, "aiding and abetting the forces of separatism."

So, Madam Speaker, I say that our member has a legitimate question of privilege. When the member for Calgary Centre gets up and says that he was indulging in McCarthyism, which means he was distorting beyond the level of evidence, beyond the point which evidence would support—in blunter terms, that he was lying or was imputing bad motives—then I think the member for Vancouver-Kingsway has a legitimate question of privilege. It is inappropriate for one member of this House to describe another member's remarks or speeches in the way the member for Calgary Centre has done.

I conclude by saying that the Conservative party does this country no good by repeating the kind of statements that the member for Capilano has made. I support them 100 per cent in this House when they state western grievances, or grievances from any part of Canada. I for one in this party will take a very definite stand for a united Canada. I will not aid and abet, by the use of exaggerated statements such as the ones which have been made by members of the Tory party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: I take it the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) wishes to speak on this question of privilege. The Chair is becoming quite informed through the arguments which have been made on this question of privilege. Some of these arguments have been repeated several times. I have allowed the three hon. members concerned to speak on this question of privilege. I have allowed the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) to intervene as well, since he is the leader, and also because in his intervention the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) referred to him. Therefore I have allowed the hon. member for Oshawa to reply. I will also allow the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition to speak, but I will cut the debate off after that. I appeal