

*Broadcasting House Proceedings*

At this point the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) sought permission to ask the House for its unanimous consent. Mr. Speaker then added to his comments the following:

● (1610)

Obviously there is not unanimous agreement. In any case I would hesitate to seek the unanimous consent of the House to allow a private member to table a document. I doubt whether this would be a good practice in which to become involved.

In any case, the House is master of its own rules and, as I have said, so as not to open the door to the tabling of any documents by any hon. members in the House perhaps I could make a suggestion which could be acceptable to the House. Perhaps by consent we could attach the letter to today's *Hansard*.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** I did not mean to cause a fuss, Mr. Speaker; I was only responding to the shouts from the other side to table it. I am sorry that we will not have it. If that is a suggestion that you are putting to me, sir, I will certainly withdraw the request. I would be delighted to have the letter attached to today's *Hansard*. I think it will be a very interesting document as we move into this session.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** This requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there consent to having the letter referred to by the hon. member attached as an appendix to today's *Hansard*?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** There does not seem to be unanimous consent.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**An hon. Member:** Where are the cameras?

**Mr. Alexander:** Give us your first official statement as whip, Gus.

**An hon. Member:** Spineless!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Coming back to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), it is my feeling that it might be preferable for the Chair to take it under advisement, because at first glance I am hesitant to accept it in its present form. At the same time, I might read paragraph 6 of citation 202 which reads as follows: It is not an amendment to a motion to move that the question go to a committee.

Farther on, paragraph 15 of the same citation reads:

An amendment approving part of a motion and disapproving the remainder is out of order.

I have the impression, after quickly reading the amendment proposed by the hon. member, that it might have this effect. So I would prefer to look at it more closely and give a ruling later. In the meantime, if the House agrees, I will call on the

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) to continue the debate. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I should say at the outset that I almost lost a bet. Earlier today I discussed with a colleague my concern that the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada so far has been able to go through this parliament without taking a stand on any issue. I said that I believe this will continue, and the colleague said, "No, you watch; they will come down definitively and unequivocally on the television debate issue".

I listened with great care to the House leader of the Conservative party speaking, and for the first three-quarters of his speech I said to myself, "My goodness, I have lost my bet; they will make up their minds on this issue." He gave all the arguments in favour of adopting television and radio broadcasting of the proceedings of this chamber to bring it up to this point in the twentieth century. However, I then heaved a great sigh of relief because I won my bet. The House leader of the Conservative party produced an amendment which completely contradicted everything he had said. If the House accepts the force of the amendment put forward by the hypocritical Conservative party, this committee will look into the cost of applying broadcasting to the House; it will look into its effects on the rights and immunities of all members of the House; and it will have the right to make further recommendations and, presumably, the right to kill the whole idea.

In short, what the Conservative party wants, as usual, is to have it both ways. They want to be able to trot out all the nice arguments in favour of something, but instead of having the guts to follow it through and maybe take some flack about some bad aspects, they withdraw and say, "Let us have the committee do what in fact two committees of the House have done already in two parliaments, in two sessions, that is, look into the whole issue of broadcasting the proceedings in the House." I have heard a lot of hypocrisy from the Conservative party, but they outdid themselves today. I can say that we will have nothing to do with that absurd amendment, even if Your Honour rules it is in order.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Anything like that from you is a compliment.

**Mr. Broadbent:** We hear a front-bencher of the Conservative party, who recently discovered there was unemployment in Canada, say, "Look at what the Gallup poll said". That is the gist of his comment. The implication is that my party has remained at 16 per cent and his party has gone up. Of course I want my party to go up in popularity, but I tell the hon. member that I and my colleagues were elected to the House of Commons not to play popularity games, not to be cynical on both sides of this issue, but to take a stand. We will defend the government today, and we do not mind doing that when they are right. I say to the hon. member that his party has remained in almost perpetual opposition in this century in the House of Commons, certainly since the Second World War. The fact