

*Broadcasting House Proceedings*

however should not give rise to a partisan debate. However, this afternoon the hon. member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) made a particularly violent speech which was nothing more than peanut politics because he was proposing certain points of view to the official opposition as a party. Now, he has just heard a speech from one of his own colleagues who expressed as well as possible points of view which I entirely share.

I also have heard the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé), the hon. member for Ahuntsic, give us a fairly naive speech as the hon. member for Saint-Jacques did this afternoon; so I heard that we are going to witness a change in the communication of the Parliament of Canada; but we simply hear about the House of Commons; nothing is said about the Senate. The Senate is a part of the Parliament of Canada and I want the government members to be very careful, because, to my mind, two-thirds of them do not know "in entirety" what I have here in my hand . . .

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** Entirely . . .

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** What do you mean: Entirely or "entirety", because this is a report? Nobody takes care of the crows on the back fence! What they can say can be summed up in just a few words. Mr. Speaker, a committee of the House has presented a report a little more than four years ago; it was presided over by a member which had much more experience than some of those who are shouting at this very moment and who, quite frankly, I know very well, know nothing entirely—"in entirety" if they want—about the report which I have here. It is a report signed by the former member for Grenville-Carleton, now Justice Gordon Blair, setting out all problems related to this issue, and several of my colleagues have raised some, but I know very well that government members, even some members of my own party elected after the 1972 election and also some who have a lot of experience, have not read this report. And I must say that the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Sharp) former leader in the House . . .

**An hon. Member:** The Postmaster General.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** . . . the Postmaster General (Mr. Blais) and others who support this resolution without any reservation, with enthusiasm, have not read this report. It is not an old report, it has not been out very long, and . . .

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** The word "entièreté" is not in the Larousse dictionary!

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** All right. You are correcting me and the next time you speak English I shall correct you. Several of my colleagues here now are French speaking, that is why I express myself in French. If my French is imperfect, I apologize. Perhaps that is one thing they do not do when they speak English.

[*English*]

Having said that, I suggest that before this House resumes tomorrow afternoon, hon. members should read the pertinent parts of the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization in 1972.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

My colleague, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), raised the matter of libel and the privileges of members of this House, and I heard people up in the press gallery and others say "poo, poo to the privileges of members", but the funniest thing is that those simpletons—many of them are being simpletons in this matter—ignore the question of the extension of the laws of libel with regard to members, with regard to interpreters, and with regard also to those who publish. They ignore that, but in Britain, for instance, the decision as to whether they should televise their proceedings or not has been a very serious matter. They have decided not to do so. Years ago in Australia a special amendment had to be passed to the laws governing libel in order to protect broadcasting by radio.

Let me say right away that if we had protection similar to that which is outlined in this report, for those who wish to read it, I would have no hesitation in suggesting that radio stations take a feed from our loudspeaker system tomorrow, if it were adequate. There are, however, technical changes which would have to be made to this system in order to bring it up to broadcasting quality. There would be no problems, provided there is protection under the laws of libel for everyone concerned, not just for ourselves but also for the public. But no, these people say, "Full speed ahead, and damn the torpedoes." They are not even thinking about this, yet the committee, under one of those distinguished members, raised it.

I would like to refer hon. members to page 4, column 27, paragraphs 103, 104 and 105. I will read certain excerpts. In paragraph 103 it says:

On the evidence and advice available to your Committee it is not therefore clear what protection would be available under existing laws to members of Parliament, to broadcasters of parliamentary proceedings, to interpreters of such proceedings, to witnesses giving evidence before parliamentary committees, and to others involved in or affected by parliamentary broadcasting.

In paragraph 104 it says:

It seems, therefore, that there would be a need for Federal legislation to protect Members, broadcasters, interpreters and others.

I will read from paragraph 105 as follows:

As a number of legal uncertainties seem to exist the House might well consider the desirability of passing a special Act if an affirmative decision were taken with regard to the broadcasting of its proceedings. Prior to the drafting of such an Act it would appear desirable that the law officers of the Crown should study the complexities and implications of this question.

There is not one tittle of evidence that that has been done, yet the government has come forward with this motion, and hon. members opposite and on this side of the House have swallowed the bait, hook, line and sinker. They want to go ahead, in the face of this considered opinion of a committee of this House, unread by the majority of members, who do not seem to give a damn.

● (2050)

**I continue reading:**

On the basis of the evidence available to your Committee, however, it seems that the Act might reasonably include the following provisions: