

Broadcasting House Proceedings

shall move too many worlds. Let me say first of all, however, that I approve the attempt by the government and the House to introduce a system of broadcasting and televising our proceedings, as do a number of other members of the party to which I belong. We may not all be of the same mind. We do not follow the herd principle as do other political parties. It is my view that issues of this kind, like issues having to do with the rules, are the property of the members of the House and not of political parties, and it is for hon. members to listen to their conscience on this issue and decide as they see fit. Parties have a considerable role to play, but an issue of this kind is one which should reflect the views of hon. members.

I agree with a good deal of what was said by the hon. member who just resumed his seat. Some of the reasons for which he indicated that members on this side would not favour the measure will not, in my opinion, be borne out. But even if he is right in his assumption, I believe members on this side would have far more to gain from television. No one who has been in this House for the last two or three years and observed the litany of shame which has dogged the footsteps of the government, from the illegal tendering practices of the CMHC in connection with Rochdale College in Toronto right up to the time of the CANDU sales, will have failed to observe an aura of scandal around the periphery of the government and its officials. It can only remind me of a prehistoric monster bogged down in primeval slime and lifting one foot to get out, only to be bogged down in more of a mess. I suggest that any objective observer would conclude that Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition has far more to gain from watching the operations of the kind of government we have seen here.

As for the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) who said, in effect, "Let us get on with this without spending any more time on it", I would say such an attitude is the trade mark of the socialist party which has been trying for years to construct a socialist heaven without any measure of success. They remind me of a contractor who builds a 60-storey apartment building starting from the sixtieth floor and trying to reach down to the foundation.

As I say, I am in favour of such a motion as this, but we have to look at it carefully. I support it for a number of reasons, many of which have been stated by hon. members who have spoken previously. But this does not mean we ought to sit idly by and let the measure pass without expressing certain concerns which we feel, or offering suggestions for dealing with the serious impediments which face the House or which would face any legislative body attempting to introduce a method of communicating its proceedings to the public through the electronic media.

The future is rife with difficulty. Many have suggested that this country is in trouble because all too often we have passed, too readily, ill-digested legislation without giving consideration to the consequences. Time and time again we have been obliged to introduce amendments in an attempt to make good what looks bad, to remove difficulties and make a bill or a project work. The hon. member asks us to pass this quickly and then, presumably, forget about its implications. Mr. Speak-

[Mr. Baldwin.]

er, it is our responsibility to understand that this is a serious and important step which the House is being asked to take. I want to make sure that it works and that it is not left in the position of so many of the things we have done—things which were ineffective and which did nothing either for this House or for the people of Canada.

There are certain conditions we ought to consider. I hinted at some of them in the course of the remarks I made during the procedural argument. At the present time the House has a written *Hansard* based on a statute of the United Kingdom passed in 1840, and supplemented as to the rights of members, as to what they can say in the House, as to the right of the media to print or broadcast what we say, and as to the rights of the public. All too often the rights of the public are forgotten in debates of this kind. It is my intention, before I complete what I have to say, to affirm that the public has rights and that we would be delinquent in our duty if we failed to enjoin the committee which is to be established to take into account this consideration.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock?

• (1700)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Lavoie)—Manpower; the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway)—External Affairs; the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn)—Government Administration.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Hon. members will have noticed that Bill No. C-210, in the name of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway) has been appearing on the order paper since the opening of this session. It reached first place at an earlier date and was stood at the request of the government. There has been some agreement to proceed with the bill today, but before doing so the Chair must enter a caveat with respect to the procedural acceptability of the measure, since it provides for the establishment of classification boards after negotiation between the federal government and the provincial government for the control of obscene literature. In the opinion of the Chair, this would constitute a charge on public funds,