

television has involved us in the events of our times—wars, riots, disasters—without involving us equally in the processes by which our problems must be resolved. We are more than ever aware of the problems of our society, but we seem little involved in their solution. In an age of total information not many of us know much about the way in which our own federal and provincial parliaments work. Even after the events of the past two years, most of us recognize that a wide gulf remains between our political institutions and the people they are supposed to serve. Yet, on these institutions rests the future form, even the very existence of our country.

The electronic media offer the means to help bridge the gap between parliament and the people, to give democracy a new visibility in Canada. A television drama, "Quentin Durgens," has stimulated public interest and perhaps led to a better understanding of our work. We have seen how exciting a leadership convention can be. Why not expose the parliamentary process itself to public view? It is true that a few hundred people each day can watch parliament in action from the galleries, but what a fragmentary view that is at best, and what a pitifully small number of Canadians ever take the opportunity. They can, of course, get reports from newspapers and newscasts, but why should they get them at second hand? They can subscribe to *Hansard*, but how many bother to do so, or wade through it if it is delivered to them? Radio and television are ideally suited to bringing the parliamentary process home to the people.

There are various views on this subject, Mr. Speaker. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) has suggested that the whole matter be considered by the committee on procedure. I believe this is a reasonable suggestion, although I would hope that some experimentation at least could proceed in the meantime. I see no reason why a start could not be made in at least one committee of the house; I think we could afford a certain daring in this regard. My own view is that parliament should permit broadcast coverage of all its proceedings with the same freedom as is accorded to the traditional press, subject only to the practical physical limitations and the usual restraints of parliamentary privilege. As at the United Nations, "live feed" or tape could be made available to any network or station under the supervision of a non-partisan person, in our case, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that radio and television editors, no less than newspaper and

Business of Supply

magazine editors, should be able to exercise their journalistic judgment in selecting what they wish to use subject, of course, to parliament's historic but barely used power to punish those responsible for breaches of parliamentary privilege.

I do not expect this perfectly logical development to come tomorrow. Fear is a formidable barrier to this kind of parliamentary development. But fear of cameras and microphones is no more well founded in my opinion than the fear which prevented the dreaded pencil being used in the reporting of parliamentary proceedings in the mother of parliaments until the last century. Parliamentary secrecy which had originated as a defence mechanism of the Crown and been preserved a defence against Crown control, continued as a guard against public interference. The struggle between parliament and the Crown became a struggle between parliament and the people. Eighteenth century parliamentarians accepted the theory that they were representing the people, but refused to acknowledge that they were responsible to the people. Why then should they inform the public of their proceedings? A party system was developing as a more practical method of changing governments than revolution or civil war, but opposition to the King's government was considered disloyal, harmful, fractious and therefore as something to be suppressed.

The issue of parliamentary reporting, which had been going on for some time as a kind of bootleg operation, came to a head in April, 1738, as a result of crusading publisher Edward Cave having published a speech before it had been delivered. It marked a setback for parliamentary journalism, as may well be imagined. The debate on the incident ended, with the following resolution:

● (4:40 p.m.)

That it is a high Indignity to, and a notorious Breach of the Privilege of his House, for any News-Writer, in Letters or other Papers, (as Minutes, or under any other Denomination) or for any Printer or Publisher, of any printed NewsPaper of any Denomination, to presume to insert in the said Letters or Papers, or to give therein any Account of the Debates, or other Proceedings of this House, or any Committee thereof, as well during the Recess, as the Sitting of Parliament; and that this House will proceed with the utmost Severity against such Offenders

Some of the arguments of the hon. members then have a familiar echoing ring today. Sir William Yonge said:

I have observed, Sir, that not only an Account of what you do, but of what you say, is regularly