## J. Y. Interpretation No.122 (July 5, 1967) \*

**ISSUE:** Does the Constitution provide legislative immunity for a speech or debate given by legislators of the local governments during their attendance at a legislative session?

## **RELEVANT LAWS:**

Interpretation Yuan-je Tze No. 3735 (司法院院解字第三七三五號解釋).

## **KEYWORDS:**

legislators (議員), unlawful speech (不法言論), the legislative session (議會會議), legislative affairs (議會事項), legislative immunities (議員言論免責權).\*\*

HOLDING: The Constitution does not explicitly provide legislative immunity for a speech or debate given by legislators of the local governments during their attendance at a legislative session. Thus, the Interpretation Yuan-je Tze No.3735, which states that county legislators will be held liable for an unlawful speech they give during their attendance at a legislative session even if such a

解釋文:地方議會議員在會議時所為之言論,應如何保障,憲法未設有規定。本院院解字第三七三五號解釋,尚不發生違憲問題。

<sup>\*</sup> Translated by Li-Chih Lin, Esq., J.D.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Contents within frame, not part of the original text, are added for reference purpose only.

249

speech was irrelevant to the legislative affairs, remains constitutional and valid.

**REASONING:** The Constitution does not explicitly provide legislative immunity for a speech or debate given by legislators of the local governments during their attendance at a legislative session. The Interpretation Yuan-je Tsu No.3735, which states that county legislators will be held liable for an unlawful speech they give during their attendance at a legislative session even if such a speech was irrelevant to the legislative affairs, refers to those legislators who intentionally abuse their legislative immunity during their attendance at a legislative session. Thus, the Interpretation Yuan-je Tsu No.3735 remains constitutional and valid. If members of the provincial council, county councils and city councils do not intentionally abuse their legislative immunity, a speech or debate they give during their attendance at the legislative session will be protected.

解釋理由書:憲法對於地方議會議員在會議時所為之言論,應如何保障,並未設有規定。本院院解字第三七三五號解釋,係對縣參議員在會議時濫用言論免責權者而發。尚不發生違憲問題。省縣市議會議員如無濫用情事,其言論之保障,自不受影響。