

Business of Supply

that particular segment. I want what the Minister of Defence Production said about this, and I don't want anything else." Is that going to be adequate and in fact satisfactory to us in terms of the fairness doctrine? This, I suggest, is the thing to which we ought to apply ourselves.

Let there be no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, unless broadcasting our proceedings gets the respectability which *Hansard* now has, which is something we all accept because through trial and error we now know that this is a good and accurate report of our proceedings—we ought not to forget that this was not always the case, and that in the early days there were many arguments about the printed record of this chamber and of many other parliaments throughout the free world—then it will not be satisfactory.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to other hon. members that this will be the real question to which we will have to apply ourselves. I do not doubt we can find solutions, but I think we would also have to bring the media people in to ask them for their ideas. But in the last analysis, if we can get past that hurdle of ensuring that we are not just simply providing partisan, if you like, or a very limited kind of partial coverage, we will overcome that kind of confused situation to which the Leader of the Opposition referred earlier this afternoon. But I do suggest and agree totally that the answer lies in appointing a committee, and there let us see if we could resolve some of these serious matters because television is not going to go away. I hope we can employ it in a manner which will achieve the results that we want for the people of Canada.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have been very pleased to listen to the hon. members who have participated so far in the debate on this subject. I am sure anyone sitting in the galleries would come to the conclusion that we are going to put in television right away, and that nobody in the chamber is opposed to it. However, obviously there are still some objections to it, and some decisions will have to be made.

It is interesting to note that when the province of Ontario tried television for the first time this year in the provincial legislature it was a total disaster so far as that parliament was concerned. It was a total disaster for those who participated in it. Instead of the budget message being only a few minutes

long, as has been usual, the provincial minister of finance had to engage in a long discourse on how to collect taxes, what they were for, the ultimate goal of taxation, and how the government would go about achieving it.

The viewers very quickly became bored. The extent of their interest was that which is satisfied by the newspapers with the information that cigarettes were going up two cents, tobacco up four cents a pound, whisky up seven cents, and income tax to be increased. Once the public received information on seven or eight points like that, their interest was satisfied.

As has been mentioned, experiments have been conducted with television in parliament. The first experiment was during the Queen's visit when some of the news media were allowed to enter the Senate chamber and televise the proceedings. Anyone who watched that operation must have been struck by the crudeness of it, by the total lack of decorum on the part of the people who were involved.

This, of course, is not displayed to the viewing audience. I remember the first time I went to a television studio in Timmins and saw the backdrops for two shows, papier-mâché settings. I was shocked because I thought that these were big programs. In my opinion, television in this place could be a disaster in an esthetic sense.

On the other hand, the televising of our proceedings could be conducted with a certain amount of decorum. I endorse the remarks of the previous speaker that Mr. Speaker should be in total control of the mechanism. That is a nice word to use, mechanism, meaning all kinds of machinery. I first learned it when studying French. The mechanism in parliament will have to be under the Speaker and he will have to hire the people who operate it. We will have to supply the film. The film used in this chamber may have to be a special type because we do not want to increase the lighting capacity here by more than double. For that reason, a specific type of film could be used for continuous filming in this chamber, without depending on the temporary type of lighting required to make normal film useful indoors.

I remember when we first talked about installing simultaneous translation in the chamber. When I first became a member of this house wires were stretched across the chamber with microphones dangling from them. One got used to them after a while, but I must say I am very pleased that the