

● (1212)

[English]

## OFFICIAL REPORT

## CORRECTION OF ANSWER BY SOLICITOR GENERAL

**Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. During the course of the question period on October 19 I made a factual error in responding to a question addressed to me by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). As reported on page 17 of *Hansard* I indicated that the commanding officer of the RCMP in Alberta had met with the attorney general of Alberta. As a matter of fact, the commanding officer of the force in Alberta met with the solicitor general of Alberta, the minister responsible for the force in that province.

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

[Translation]

## CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed, from Friday, October 21, consideration of the motion of Mr. Dawson for an address to Her Majesty the Queen in reply to her speech at the opening of the session; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Clark (p. 30).

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that perhaps the Speaker would remain in the Chair for I would like later to make a few comments on certain statements he is reported to have made during the weekend. I think the hon. the Speaker of the House will have to listen to some advice which will be given him.

This is the first time in several years that I have the chance of participating in such a debate. I have indeed been in this House for a good many years and I always have given up my turn since other opportunities were offered to me. This year however, I decided to try and catch the Speaker's eye to participate in the debate.

I would like to point out that the two young members, young in terms of seniority, who moved the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, namely the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Dawson) and the newly-elected member for Malpeque (Mr. Wood) did very well in those rather symbolic duties. Younger members are always called upon to move the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Once again, I would like to say that they did a fine job, for which I congratulate them.

However, before discussing the motion of those hon. members and the motion moved by my leader which is a non-confidence motion, I would like to comment on what is taking place in the House. As I said, it is regrettable that Mr. Speaker is not in the House because I will refer in a rather specific manner to the discussions of this past Friday when my col-

*The Address—Hon. M. Lambert*

league for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) moved the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26.

[English]

Mr. Speaker, there have been some incidents in the past week, the first in which we have had television in the House. It is a trite saying now in newspaper articles and elsewhere that this chamber is going to be greatly modified, that this is the greatest thing since the discovery of sliced bread. Well, I want to make certain observations about what has been said here in this chamber with the advent of television and about what I hope will not be the attitude of members in this House. I hope that this will scotch, once and for all, the idea which may now be growing as a result of certain things said, and may be repeated, with regard to what speeches are made and to whom those speeches are being addressed.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) startled me on Thursday last when she wished to comment on a question put by the House leader of the official opposition, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). According to the Chair, the question was out of order but the hon. minister indicated that because the House was now on television it was quite wrong to prevent her from answering or making a comment. What a nonsensical argument, that if a question is ruled out of order as containing certain allegations, as they often do, because we are on television the Chair's ruling of out of order should be set aside and a reply or comment made. That is utter nonsense, yet that was the argument of the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

In the same way, the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) has commented and attributed motives.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** The Postmaster General (Mr. Blais), too.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** I am coming to the Postmaster General because he, too, participated in these totally improper references to the conduct of members, allegedly because television is now in this chamber. Mr. Speaker, if this chamber is to become merely a podium for representatives of parties to address larger audiences, then those who allege that parliament has become irrelevant are vindicated. Incidentally, I don't know why they make these wisecrack comments, because that is all they are; many of those who make such statements have rarely been inside this chamber, and do not know how it works. But if this chamber is to become merely a speaking platform from which to reach an audience out beyond, it merely becomes, then, a method whereby a message may be put out, to what audience, one never knows. In the immediate future it may be limited to the Ottawa area, to those who subscribe to a cable system and have a converter. Those are the people who will be following—possibly—the sittings of this House.

Then there is to be a weekly wrap-up, and we have seen that in the news clippings certain ministers make certain statements in reply to questions. All I can say to hon. members is this: take a look at the performance of the province of Alberta where the legislature has been on television since 1971 or