

Business of Supply

of the cost of covering our procedures by television. Every time I have had occasion to approach the C.B.C.—and no doubt the C.B.C. would be the ones who would cover the proceedings if we had television in the chamber—and ask them to provide very basic coverage for part of my riding, the answer has been that they could not do it because their budget did not allow them to do so. In one instance a large area of my riding could not be supplied with the local news for the simple reason the C.B.C. could not provide the 30 cents a minute it would cost. It was not in the budget and the C.B.C. could not transmit this news to the Labrador part of my riding. Therefore, the very thought of spending hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars to televise the proceedings in this chamber is alarming to me, when so many parts of Canada do not have even the basic radio and television services. Under no circumstances could I agree to this proposal until such time as those areas lacking radio and television facilities have been serviced.

We must remember that we have 264 members in this house. They were sent here at very great expense to the Canadian taxpayer. *Hansard* is produced, again at very great expense to the taxpayer. We have newspapermen sitting up in the gallery—a bevy of them.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Do you call that a bevy?

Mr. Peddle: Let us not kid ourselves, they are here at the expense of the taxpayer because they work for newspapers. Newspapers are supported by advertisers, and advertisers are supported by their customers. So, eventually again, it is the taxpayer who pays. We have television and radio coverage of parliament at the present time. They broadcast newsworthy items, and so on, or what these gentlemen regard as newsworthy items. Even the private stations are supported at the expense of the taxpayer. In my humble opinion, before we give any further thought to increasing the burden on our taxpayers, television and radio coverage should be universal in this country.

I suppose it is only natural that politicians should be conscious of their image. I know some politicians who spend most of their waking hours devising means to get before the bright lights. There are others who cringe at the very thought of it. I think I come somewhere in between; I could live with it or without it. But I do not think it would do this parliament or the people of the country any

[Mr. Peddle.]

good if our proceedings were televised. I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that these are just initial reactions. I like the idea of a study in this field if it would not cost too much. My opinions are subject to revision and change. However, at the moment this is how I feel.

When I think about television, I always think in terms of sponsors. A few amusing things come to mind in this respect. In order to offset the cost of televising our proceedings, perhaps we could have sponsors who would sponsor different speakers on different days. For instance, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Hellyer), who is responsible for housing, might be sponsored by the Ottawa Valley Lumber Company which would give a special discount of 11 per cent this week on all building materials. This would offset the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) stubbornly refuses to remove.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) might be sponsored by Belvedere cigarettes—"I smoke them because I like them". This is the type of thing we might encourage. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) might be sponsored by Flower Shops Incorporated—"Flowers around the corner or around the world". On alternate days perhaps he might be sponsored by Max Factor, the kiss-proof lipstick people.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Peddle: I do not want to make light of this matter, Mr. Chairman, but I cannot restrain myself. These are the sort of things that come to my mind. I think the suggestion at this point in time is rather ridiculous.

Mr. Allen B. Sulatycky (Rocky Mountain): Mr. Speaker, this is an important and purposeful debate. I have listened to all hon. members who have spoken and it seems to me that the consensus of the house is that television and radio should be allowed in the house, with certain restrictions. I particularly noted the fact that virtually every speaker who supported our eventually allowing television into the house insisted that certain restrictions be placed on it; that is, that the office of the Speaker or some other office would determine what would be allowed to be shown to the viewers of the country. In my opinion, televising the proceedings of the house would be of lasting and significant benefit to parliamentary democracy in Canada. Indeed, it might be the very life blood of parliamentary democracy in Canada.