

interest the people there. We must make a hit with the national reporters in order to get back east on CBC. If the reporter is not aware of the problem, it falls dead.

This money could be better spent on improving TV service in such areas as mine. Certainly if the area I represent does not get coverage on the CBC, we will not get it with edited tapes. Televising the proceedings of the House would make sense if we were to slot it in a network each day at a set time.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why bring TV in when it will not benefit all of the people? In particular I have in mind a part of the country such as mine. Let me just explain to the House that in some parts of my constituency we get radio and TV from another province. These are only radio and TV stations affiliated to the CBC. We do not get any forecasts in that area or any of the other items which relate to the area. The CBC coverage from Halifax is minor and in most areas in my constituency nonexistent.

I am not opposed to the use of TV in the House. In fact it is one of the best methods of accurate reporting because the people can see for themselves what is happening. In my opinion, based on a study of the motion, a daily serial will not provide it, and someone will still be able to edit the taping and feed it to the networks. If it is a question of records, the records can still be kept by the existing system of *Hansard* and tapes. If it is a question of education, schools and universities are not at present knocking on doors to obtain copies of *Hansard* so as to understand the parliamentary process better, nor will they use videotape because they lack the necessary facility to use it, particularly in my area.

If we must have TV to provide additional information on committee and House sittings, why not leave this process to the existing broadcasting networks, as they are the ones who will make the decision under this motion as to whether or not they will use the tapes of the proceedings of a committee or a House sitting? Therefore they should cover the expense of implementing this service. This method would not only reach more people but would be less costly insofar as capital and operating costs are concerned, because networks are only interested in televising what is of interest to the people.

Any one wishing the written word, could obtain a copy of *Hansard* which could and should be more widely distributed to schools, libraries and individuals. Perhaps the allocation of *Hansard* copies to members of parliament should be increased to see if it would become a best seller.

I do not see how this resolution will educate the public. The daily workload of a member of parliament involves not only attendance in the House of Commons but committee work—which may not interest a reporter—and constituency matters. These latter two are only of interest to the constituents of the individual member of parliament.

In my opinion members will have to posture for the TV, yet may never be seen across Canada. This will waste more of the time of the House of Commons. Think of the members speaking on the same point in one debate. Our House rules leave a lot to be desired and are the cause of much wasted time. In my opinion televising the proceedings of the House will not

Broadcasting House Proceedings

increase public information on how decisions are made. Decisions are often made outside the House and outside committees.

However, one area which might be improved by full TV coverage is the rules of the House. Certainly the people of Canada would not put up with this type of debate for very long.

I am not opposed to the substance of this resolution, Mr. Speaker. However, I am concerned about its timing and its cost, as well as the lack of interest of the general public. I am equally concerned about the fact that the House of Commons should remain the focal point of public concern at the federal level and that the ministry should be held accountable to the House on a daily basis.

I agree that modern mass communication and the increased role played by the government in the lives of ordinary people make it necessary for ministers and other prominent members of the House to be seen regularly on television. But I do not like the decline in interest and in the reporting of what has been said in the House. What we see or hear is what has been re-enacted in the corridors, or personally interpreted by a reporter.

I am not opposed to TV in the House or in committees but it should be seen unedited on a daily channel. All committees should be given an opportunity to be seen unedited. As all members know, committee work is very important, yet if committee proceedings were to be edited, most people would be deprived of the area of debate which interests them. Indeed, I hold that communication between this House and its electors is the most important function of a private member of parliament and is essential to the functioning of ministers. I have communicated to my own constituents the events that take place here—a central point in the few years that I have spent here.

All that having been said, I would like to say that this House has much practical work before it at this time on bills whose passage will be as important to the people of Canada in the short term, such as the unemployment legislation, income tax amendments, and the long-awaited human rights legislation, as may be the ultimate installation of television facilities in the long-term.

Of course I would not want my concerns to affect adversely the considered view of the House on a matter in which partisan considerations have no place. I did, however, want to state for the record the concerns I have about this resolution as it relates to the people I represent, and the inadequacy of the existing TV facilities which they have to put up with. I do not feel that the public is fully aware of exactly what we are about to do here and I believe that most people in my constituency will not benefit from this resolution.

● (2040)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, to my mind, the speech we have just heard expresses the dilemma which faces many members of the House because of this motion which touches upon the right of members but which