

the future to disapprove the very thing it has approved in the first paragraph of the motion.

It is because of the removal of the actual implementation language that I am left with the difficulty. I feel, therefore, that on the ground of that citation I must indicate that the motion as amended would be inconsistent with its own terms. Surely the effect has been achieved, and that is consistent with all the remarks that I made in which I have indicated my sympathy with the position of the hon. member who wishes to support the motion, but at the same time expresses concern for the matters raised by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, that there may be negotiations between House leaders to see whether or not a proper addition to the existing motion might be achieved which would take care of those concerns.

Certainly, it is valid to say that any committee over which I would preside would want to take all those considerations into account before advancing any implementation. However, further to such negotiations, I am sure it is not necessary to say that, having examined the wording of this ruling and the arguments that have been put forward at this time, not only are such negotiations open as the debate continues but it is open to other members to put forward other amendments which, if the negotiations fail, may make another attempt to achieve the same result.

● (1610)

Mr. Max Saltzman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, normally I would be quite sympathetic to some of the arguments put forward by hon. friends on my right about the need to delay, scrutinize and not just to accept the resolution, because televising is a most significant and historic step. However, I have a tremendous sense of urgency about what is happening in this country at the moment, and that sense of urgency leads me to believe that it is vital that we not only televise the House of Commons but that we do it as quickly as is humanly possible.

Television is a medium which has many faults. It can distort, but what medium cannot distort? Television has one unique characteristic; that is that it reaches every corner of the country. It is a way of reaching people unlike any which has ever been devised by mankind. At this time when I think our country is in serious danger of disintegration, a disintegration which may come about because of ignorance, misunderstanding or the suspicion by one part of the country for another, it is vital that the people of Canada see directly what is going on in their House of Commons. I am sure that if people saw what was going on in the House of Commons, it would be a reassuring thing: they would be proud to be citizens of this country and they would want to stay in this country.

I think the fears which have been voiced, while they are real, can be overcome. With regard to the use of television, I am quite prepared to trust Mr. Speaker to be fair with the members of this House, considering the history of fairness of Speakers of this House. Not only our present Speaker, who is highly regarded, but also Speakers before him have honoured this House with their chairmanship of this chamber. On

Broadcasting House Proceedings

occasions when the Chair may in fact not behave in a way with which we agree, there are redresses. The House has control over itself; it can change things. If we find that some things are happening with which we do not agree and which could be done in a somewhat better manner, we can certainly make changes, just as we have changed legislation and the rules of this House over the years.

The urgency is such that I think we must proceed. A great deal of work has already been done with regard to television. We have had much discussion and there has been much examination regarding the arguments for and against the use of television, but I think the urgency which exists regarding our survival as a nation is such that we have to proceed with television.

Last night when speaking to the House I made the point that the continuous televising of proceedings in the House would take this House out of the hands of the press gallery. We desperately need that to be done. Even if we say that the newspapers, radio and television of this country are doing as good a job as they are capable of doing, nevertheless the information we get from those media is second-hand, selected and very often, unfortunately, hysterical and antagonistic. We have to take that power out of the hands of the press gallery. Certainly the gallery will still have its role to play. It can go on interpreting, and perhaps its role will even be enlarged. But there has to be something besides interpretation: there has to be a direct view of what is happening in this place.

The reformed Canada Elections Act provides funds for campaigns, and I think the same kind of situation applies here. The reason those funds were supplied was to assist people running for parliamentary seats, whether sitting members or contestants. The idea was to take that funding out of the hands of the big powers and to make members of parliament less beholden to others so that they could speak in an independent way. That also now has to be done with the media. The proceedings of this House have to be taken out of the hands of the media and broadcast directly to the people of this country.

In my remarks last night I referred to one aspect only of the media. I said that it was the nature of the media to look for headlines, to be antagonistic and to be almost anti-establishment by choice. However, there is one other aspect of the media which is critical at this moment. Last night I was talking essentially about the English media. Now I want to talk about the French media. The English media sees its role in a certain way, and from what I have been able to see the French media in the province of Quebec sees its role almost entirely as separatist.

I do not think there has been any greater influence for tearing this country apart than the people in the media in Quebec, and it is important—in fact, vital—that this House be able to speak to the people of Quebec and appeal to them to stay in confederation, without having to run the gamut of prejudice and bias that exists in the French media. It is all right to say that people who work in the media, whether newspapers, radio or television, have a perfect right to be separatist if they so choose, and of course that is so, but they