

Business of Supply

would mean that each station or outlet would appear to be precisely the same in so far as the viewer is concerned. I feel quite certain we can anticipate in the event that station "A" or network "A" choose to take the taping, filming or whatever the process is in the house of a particular speaker that station "B" or network "B" will be anxious to get him so that they will be able to get a different point of view and different point of presentation. I re-emphasize this point because members should not be under any illusions that televising the house will in any sense cut down on the so-called confused state that many of us deplore on the outside.

We are embarking on a very complex kind of operation. I do not say this in any negative fashion, but merely to let hon. members see the complexity of what we are approaching. Ideally, we ought to have a television hook-up through a series of stations from coast to coast in Canada that would carry the proceedings of this house from beginning to end. This in itself is not a very satisfactory way of ensuring that the so-called fairness doctrine is maintained. In other words, if a Canadian citizen wants to be sure of getting all points and is satisfied to sit for approximately 27 hours per week, then he might be able to get a comprehensive assessment of parliament. That would be theoretically ideal; however it would be too expensive for this country to contemplate at this time. It would require, in effect, the duplication of every existing station now in the C.B.C. network which covers most of the country. It would be necessary to parallel those services. I, therefore, think it is an unreasonable expectation.

I studied this matter as a broadcaster and as a member of an earlier committee of this house a season or so ago. We discussed this informally on a number of other occasions. The real nub of the problem is, how does one ensure that the end result of our efforts is a better informed public? How do we ensure that it will not add to the distortion? The difficulty of course comes in the editing process. I wish there were more time to speak on this subject because it is a most intriguing development.

With regard to the whole concept of the role of a documentary, we are hearing some of the best and most qualified producers in Canadian television arguing it is not their responsibility to present a balanced viewpoint in a particular program.

Mr. MacLean: Like seal hunting.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

Mr. Jamieson: Like seal hunting, if my friend wishes to use that example, or on pollution, as recently occurred in Toronto. This house would have to be quite prepared to assume that out of the plurality of sources which would be using this material, the end result would be a balanced presentation and not result in major distortions.

Newsmen being what they are, I haven't the slightest doubt that if access to this house were granted to the media, the news which would get the most attention would not be the sober and dispassionate speeches which make up a very substantial part, albeit a dull part in terms of public interest, of the proceedings of this house. What would happen would be that the highlights of the question period would be presented. Is this in fact comparable to a written *Hansard*? It is an over-simplification to say that it is necessary because there are no other elements which are introduced. As Marshall McLuhan said, "The medium is the message".

There is so much that can be conveyed that it would be up to members to decide whether, over the long haul, what came out of the chosen excerpts would be representative of a fair presentation. Would it add to the totality of news available to the public?

• (5:10 p.m.)

Having said all these things which may appear to hon. members to be negative, let me say that my own conviction is that you cannot turn back the tide in this matter. Radio and television are here to stay, and it would be very wise for this house at the appropriate time to refer this matter to a committee, as has been suggested. But I think that when that is done we ought not to be under any illusions that there is any simple or short answer.

We should realize too, that certainly the control of the mechanism within this house ought to be under the direction of the Speaker, that is, that the media themselves should not be permitted to put their own cameras, microphones and the like into the chamber, and that the actual taping of what takes place in the Chamber should be done by staff of the House of Commons, staff of parliament under the control of the Speaker. That is a fairly simple thing to determine and one on which I think we could all agree.

The second matter is the one to which I referred just a few moments ago. Is it then simply a question of any representative of any medium coming in and saying, "I want