

[Text]

GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT IN CROWN CORPORATIONS

Question No. 753—Mr. Stevens:

1. As of March 31, 1975, March 31, 1976 and September 30, 1976, how much had the government loaned to or invested in Crown corporations, including departmental corporations, agency corporations, proprietary corporations or any other type of public enterprise entity and, what were the 10 largest corporations or entities in which or to which the government had invested or loaned money?

2. (a) What was the (i) net profit or loss for the 10 largest Crown corporations (ii) aggregate profit or loss for all Crown corporations for each fiscal year since 1968 (b) what is the aggregate percentage of return for all Crown corporations on government investment to date?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

BROADCASTING OF HOUSE AND COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

The House resumed, from Monday, January 24, consideration of the motion of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen):

That this House approves the radio and television broadcasting of its proceedings and of the proceedings of its committees on the basis of principles similar to those that govern the publication of the printed official reports of debates; and

That a special committee, consisting of Mr. Speaker and seven other members to be named at a later date be appointed to supervise the implementation of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When the amendment was moved by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) yesterday, the Chair expressed reservations about the procedural regularity, and it was reserved until there was an opportunity to examine the matter further.

On the one hand I recognize that the motion before the House calls for approval of the televising and radio broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and for implementation by a committee without interim report to the House. An hon. member who supports both the approval of the televising and broadcasting of our proceedings and also the implementation of them, but who seeks, perhaps, implementation in a different manner, ought to have an orderly way available to him by which to put before the House an alternative proposal for implementation by way of amendment—perhaps even including some constraints, although they would have to be viewed individually at the time—so long as such amendments in the subsequent paragraphs do not introduce the possible negation of the primary paragraph of the motion as amended.

*Broadcasting House Proceedings*

On the other hand, the amendment that was offered by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, in referring the matter to a standing committee for study and report, seems to me to invite some decision by the House when the report or reports are received. Since such a decision might be negative, the effect would be that by voting in favour of the amended motion, the House had approved something in the first paragraph respecting which it was at least guarding the option to disapprove in the later paragraphs of the amendment.

Further, by paragraph 3, the amendment seems to raise a new notion of experimentation. This may be a new proposition, and an additional difficulty may be that it leaves unclear, after a vote on the amended motion, whether the House has in fact approved the implementation of the televising and broadcasting of its proceedings, or whether it has approved only a trial.

Since, after examining these difficulties, I am left with some considerable doubt, I thought it appropriate to indicate to those hon. members involved that I would invite argument on the matter at this time. I would hope to give consideration to the arguments presented and render a decision before five o'clock this afternoon.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker).

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I believe I understood what you said, but so that my argument may be directed to the exact point you raised, may I conclude from what you said that viewing the questions that were raised yesterday by Mr. Deputy Speaker, those questions are not in issue and that the issue I have to face is that raised by yourself? I wonder if I could have that matter clarified, as it would make quite a difference in the argument that I think I should put forward in answer to both points.

Mr. Speaker: To paraphrase what I said, there were two difficulties. Of course, I am inviting argument, and other difficulties may be raised by those who participate in the discussion. I see two difficulties: first, that the amendment, certainly by way of experimentation, may be raising a new proposition which entirely lies outside the scope of the original motion. Second, both by asking for a decision by a standing committee and by making reference to the possibility of a trial basis, the motion may offend the citation on page 389 of Erskine May's nineteenth edition, which reads as follows:

Every amendment proposed to be made, either to a question or to a proposed amendment, should be so framed that, if agreed to by the House, the question or amendment, as amended, would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

Therefore, the difficulties that I see are twofold: the amendment may become inconsistent with itself in agreeing to a certain proposition in its first paragraph and leaving out the subsequent disagreements in the later paragraphs, and also by introducing a new proposition by way of experimentation. That is, of course, subject to any other argument that may be raised, but that is what I am asking hon. members to comment upon.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect to our motion put forward yesterday, first you