

been acquired and will serve as a swing building, for offices of members. The Parliament Buildings on the House of Commons side as well as on the Senate will have to be refitted within the next ten years. And what will happen to all the capital equipment which will have been installed? We have an idea of the cost of the equipment which is to be installed; so I say that we are in for another *Bonaventure* affair. The money will go down the blessed drain, or at least a good portion of it.

Let me now say a word about the role of the committee over which Mr. Speaker is to preside and which is to supervise the implementation of the motion. The argument I made this afternoon which, with the greatest respect, nobody has countered so far, is that the committee, in its supervisory role, shall not and must not act as a sidewalk superintendent. It will need to come back to this House with recommendations regarding the law of libel and with other recommendations concerning technical problems of implementation arising because of the expansion of the membership of this Chamber. It will also have to come back with recommendations involving, as I said previously, the refit of this building. That is why the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton was so important.

● (2110)

All these problems in committee might have to come back to this House. Remember, Mr. Speaker, the facilities in this House affect hon. members. This does not affect the expertise of the administration of government. This affects hon. members here and in the Senate. Who is going to consult members of the Senate?

This committee on the basis of this resolution as it now stands will be able to do whatever it wants. Being a special committee under Mr. Speaker, what will be the position of hon. members who wish to make representation to that committee or appear on that committee and speak? The amendment proposed the House procedure committee which has always been open to every member of this House. Members can appear and speak. They can even be put on the committee. However, with a special committee under Mr. Speaker charged with this one task, you might as well butt your head against a brick wall. Hon. members may not have any input unless there is some extraordinary position taken by the chairman of the committee.

That might change. I am not going to close the door on that. However, I can well see where the whole proceedings with regard to the televising and broadcasting from this House, insofar as members are concerned, if this motion passes may be a closed book.

As far as televising is concerned, one can always do special events. One can twist the arm of the CBC and CTV to bring their mobile units here. If the new president of the United States were to reciprocate the visit of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), we could have a reproduction of an address to the joint Houses of this parliament. However, we do not need a resolution like this for that purpose.

Broadcasting House Proceedings

By the end of two years, and it will require two years, we will have an expenditure which will top \$5 million. It is estimated by the President of the Privy Council that the operating expenses will only be \$900,000 a year. What rosy glasses has he been looking through? Let him look through the transcripts of evidence before the committee in 1972. He will see that his projections are away out. It was going to cost nearly that then.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, this envisages a staff for the House. It does not mean that the networks will come in. There will need to be an additional staff of nine, ten, or maybe a dozen people. There will have to be a collection of technicians. There will be producers. This staff will work stated hours as they do in the broadcasting business. Just watch.

In 1972 we were told that a producer's minimum scale of pay was \$25,000 a year. The parliamentary secretary shakes his head. That view was from the broadcast industry. They said that was what was required to pay these people. The hon. member can shake his head, but let him read and be instructed. I would say that the salaries now and in the future will be considerably higher. Not only do we need a producer, but an assistant producer, and then another assistant producer—backups all the way.

I am laying down in what I think are realistic terms what it will cost, and what will be the implications of this program. The House is going to make up its mind. However, no one outside my colleagues, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, has dared talk about the costs and other implications.

I raised another point this afternoon. Who on earth is going to carry this stuff that comes out of here and for how much? Do you know what happens in the province of Alberta today? With a great deal of fanfare, television was introduced into that House in 1971. There are only six members of the opposition. They are in the corner. There is a great gap on the side behind them. There on a platform sits one camera from which the media take clips. However, the camera faces only the cabinet. All it shows of members of the opposition is their backs and receding hairlines. There is no way that a statement by the Leader of the opposition can be put on camera.

Members from Nova Scotia know about the noble experiment conducted there. Neither the legislators nor the public want any part of it. In Saskatchewan there is radio. In Queen's Park television came in this year. Does anyone ever see private members on there? For how many minutes a day are there clips in either the national or the local news? There is nothing, but nothing, on cable.

The hon. member for Saint-Jacques said this material could be distributed on cable. Who is going to pay for it? Are we going to be part of a production of some brewery, automobile dealer, furniture salesman, K-Tel records, or what have you?

The hon. member for Saint-Jacques suggested this could be done on an experimental basis in the Ottawa-Hull area. What? For \$5 million on an experimental basis it will be seen