

understood, unless it is that he has been heard and understood so well by the government opposite that this exercise we are engaged in is a completely cynical one, and I suspect that might be the truth.

I should like to quote McLuhan himself on the subject of control. He said:

No society in history has ever known enough about the forces that shape and transform it to take action to control and direct new technologies as they extend and transform man. But today, change proceeds so instantaneously through the new media that it may be possible to institute a global education program that will enable us to seize the reins of our destiny—but to do this we must first recognize the kind of therapy that's needed for the effects of the new media. In such an effort, indignation against those who perceive the nature of those effects is no substitute for awareness and insight.

The extensions of man's consciousness induced by the electric media could conceivably usher in the millennium—

Having heard so many speakers from the other side, that surely may be what they believe. But he warns:

—it also holds the potential for realizing the Anti-Christ. Cataclysmic environmental changes such as these are, of themselves, morally neutral; it is how we perceive them and react to them that will determine their ultimate psychic and social consequences. If we refuse to see them at all, we will become their servants. It's inevitable that the world-pool of electronic information movement will toss us all about like corks on a stormy sea, but if we keep our cool during the descent into the maelstrom, studying the process as it affects us, and learning to program and control it, we can come through.

I wish I could be as optimistic as Marshall McLuhan. Certainly the LaMarsh commission appointed by the premier of Ontario, headed up by that very good friend of the government opposite who was a cabinet minister for so long, is having a difficult time drawing any report to any kind of conclusion. When the report does come I am very skeptical that it will result in any effective control even of violence, regarding which there is a profound feeling that somehow technology and television have got well away from us.

There are other Canadians of sense on this subject. Professor Norman Ward of the University of Saskatchewan, in a cautionary letter to the Speaker of this House, says:

It is simply not true that the camera does not lie; it can lie more spectacularly than any unaided human being, and given the nature of some of the House's proceedings, it is likely that members will sometimes want to help it along in that direction.

And later:

I know that *Hansard* is far from being a perfect record, but compared with the hit-and-miss selectivity of live television it is incomparably more reliable than the fleeting pictures would be; yet it is almost inevitable that the pictures would have a greater impact on the public.

It is there, Mr. Speaker, that we so often get the argument that television will let people know what is going on, or that it is the same thing as the print media and we are under no greater threat from the cameraman than we are from reporters in the gallery. But both Marshall McLuhan and Norman Ward warn us about this.

I could also quote Robert Fulford who talks about Peter Gzowski's shift from the medium of radio to television. He says:

As I saw the first show, it again occurred to me that the nature of unrehearsed entertainment TV makes every subject trivial. Television, unless it's prepared

with the greatest care—as in good drama, comedy, and documentary—turns everything it touches to dross.

Again, from the performances opposite it would not take much of a turn, but nevertheless for those who hope that the unstructured televising of this Chamber will result in great television, I think they are caught up in a powerful illusion.

Robert Fulford goes on to say:

What Johnny Carson knows about TV—and the people who are hoping for a repeat of This Country don't know—is that it needs to be entertaining all the time, *all* the time.

This is the secret Johnny Carson knows, and that's why he never stops pushing, jiggling, tickling his fellow performers; we've taught him to fear our finger on the ChannelMaster, and that's why he's a nervous wreck. That's also why nothing of any permanent interest gets said on his show.

● (2130)

We can turn to the latest Chayefsky film, a film that has not reached Ottawa yet, called "Network". I would suggest very seriously, Mr. Speaker, that the Speaker of this House ought to arrange a private showing of that film for all members, because the technology has been around really for quite a long time now. There are people in this 20th century who are pretty conscious of the effect it can have and who are sounding warnings to us that we are paying no attention to at all.

Anyone who dares to stand up and say he is opposed on principle to televising this House is charged as being, at best, a red neck and, at worst, a dinosaur or Neanderthal, and those terms are used here with the suggestion that we are being dragged kicking and screaming into this century. The warnings are coming from this century, and they are coming from people who look ahead. They are truly prophetic people.

Television takes an illusion and makes it truth, and I think that's irresponsible and destructive. The worst thing is that the public takes it all seriously.

He also said:

To me, television is the symptom of something awful that could turn into something worse.

Ponder that, hon. members, because we have been told repeatedly already today that this place is something awful. But, believe me, televising it and the effect of televising this place could be something still worse, and we should remember that Chayefsky says:

I won't say television is any more corrupt than any other media of communication—movies, newspapers, even politics—but it does have a scope others lack . . . it comes right into your living room and pounds its message into your brain.

Of course the character in the film played by the late Peter Finch says:

Television is not the truth . . . Television is a—

I will bleep out the next word in true television style and continue as follows:

—amusement park. Television is a circus, a carnival, a travelling troupe of acrobats, story tellers, side show freaks, lion tamers and football players. We're in the boredom-killing business.

At this point one could fairly ask where the demand for televising the House originates. Certainly it does not originate with the general public. I asked the then President of the CBC, Laurent Picard, a year or so ago whether the CBC was under