

will be a catalyst for change. Those of us who want change and progress in this institution, who want it to evolve toward a more businesslike and efficient procedure, will welcome television because it will assist us to that objective. It would help to show the public what are the hurdles and obstacles in the way of progress in parliament. It would help us to explain to our constituents the problems which confront us in our day-to-day work. It would demonstrate the weakness of MPs in trying to influence the government and the executive.

More than 20 countries already broadcast their proceedings. Cameras have already been allowed to broadcast selected government events. There is no reason why we should not allow them in here for good. The UN and the Council of Europe have long been accustomed to cameras recording their proceedings.

I wish to say a few words about a fear that some have, namely, that grandstanding will begin and our proceedings will be changed. In my opinion, the buffoon would be exposed as a buffoon. Experience in Germany has shown that the stars are not the flowery orators, comic performers or the buffoons. They are those members of the Bundestag who know what they are talking about. However badly they may deliver their speeches, and however inadequate they may be as orators, if they know what they are talking about and if what they talk about finds an echo in the experience of their audience, they become the stars of that program. There would be more opportunity for members who are now never invited to appear on television—people who know their subject very well but who have to demonstrate their knowledge in committee rather than on the floor of the House. It is no excuse for keeping cameras out to say that viewers would misunderstand what is happening—empty benches, for example. Viewers would quickly discover and understand what happens in parliament.

Broadcasters are responsible people and have shown themselves to be so. Broadcasters would do a better job than the press does now. Being an electronic medium, it is more prone to show the truth because it shows things as they happen. If we think that television will distort parliament, we should ban the press from parliament. Who in this House is ready to do that? Television has a much better record of impartiality than does the press, for the reasons I have mentioned. You cannot play too much with the media.

How will we know whether televising parliament is good, or bad, if we do not carry out an experiment? We should move now while cable channels are available. With the exception of Toronto, in most cities across the land they were empty a couple of years ago. They are now crowded in Toronto and will soon be crowded in Montreal and Vancouver. If we want to move in this direction, we should move now. Otherwise it will be too late.

[*Translation*]

And finally, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member who spoke before me, I would like to call upon Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to review their position, to support the motion in order to better serve democracy and Canadians as a whole. If they were right in their repeated suggestions in this House that

Broadcasting House Proceedings

the Liberal government have such a poor performance, that our policies are so bad, why in heavens are they afraid that Canadians see what goes on in this House? The whole nation could observe the government develop their policies. If the Progressive Conservatives are right in their analysis, they would have a tremendous political interest in allowing television.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the hon. member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) allow a question by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert)?

Mr. Guilbault: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, in the event that the proceedings of the House and of its committees are broadcast, could the hon. member tell me who would be responsible for broadcasting not only from a technical point of view but on a national basis? Who would carry the cost? Will they be broadcast on a regular basis or will broadcasting be limited to small parts of our proceedings, on national news reports?

Mr. Guilbault: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to tell the hon. member that I am indeed a parliamentary secretary but not to the President of the Privy Council, and I am not aware of everything which happens there. One thing is for sure, the committee which will be set up by the House will make recommendations which will be submitted to Parliament and which will provide a better answer to hon. members' questions.

If the hon. member wants to know what I think of it, I am prepared to give him immediately my true opinion. In my view, a parliamentary body should be responsible for recording and production. If a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Speaker must be responsible for the implementation of this resolution, I suggest that this committee should designate people to operate the machinery and it would seem desirable that those be employees of the House of Commons. On the other hand, I would say that there are numerous ways of broadcasting. I referred earlier to cablevision. I, for one, have made in-depth research in this area. I know for instance that CBC would not be able to broadcast a large part of our proceedings because they would have to reorganize completely their programming. I know that already. It would probably be the same in the private sector. Therefore, the options at our disposal as regards distribution are probably cablevision, and then other means that we could decide to set up but which would probably be more costly. This is the answer I wanted to give the hon. member for the time being.

● (1650)

[*English*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes which are left before five o'clock I do not suppose I