

of other countries, because very rarely is there prior notice and that element of surprise, which is peculiar to our House, will undoubtedly get people interested and bring them to listen to the question period.

I am therefore convinced that broadcasting the question period will change its style and, who knows, will perhaps give rise to questions much more relevant to the true concerns of the people. Why should we be afraid of this experience, Mr. Speaker? I do not understand the hesitation of the opposition members and I can only think that they are afraid to lose face before the judgment of the people which will certainly be merciless when they witness our debates directly.

Another aspect of our debates which will greatly benefit from broadcasting concerns our speeches. As many are aware I had a career on television and in the trade we always say that there is nothing that cannot be said in five minutes. Of course, we must know what we are saying, choose our words well and not repeat ourselves. The operation of Parliament would benefit from being much more concise and much more controlled on both sides of the House. Because of the misuse of the privileges of the House, certain members often lose sight of their subject and take the time of the House, certain members often lose sight of their subject and take the time of the House to say unimportant things. All this, Mr. Speaker, will not hold up very long on television.

Moreover, by broadcasting House proceedings, we may obtain the parliamentary reform that government members urgently request and which the gentlemen on the side of the opposition refuse because they are obviously not interested in seeing this Parliament operate efficiently. This would cause their downfall. They do not want Parliament to operate efficiently because it is not at all in their interest.

And they count on the fact that there is in the House a certain theology of consensus concerning parliamentary reforms. Well, like many others, this theology could undergo a very fast evolution in view of the impatience that the people will surely express if we continue to delay needlessly the broadcasting of House proceedings and if we continue to multiply speeches simply to kill the time required for the passage of legislation. The opposition is also opposed to parliamentary reform and, like the hon. member who spoke before me, I believe that the broadcasting of the debates of the House will probably hasten parliamentary reform, which would allow us to keep pace with the twentieth century and operate Parliament as efficiently as possible in this day and age.

Similarly, television helped bring to an end the Vietnam war. For example, the single fact that each night of the week people could see real soldiers, both Vietnamese and American, being killed on a real battlefield, very quickly caused them to beg: "Stop! You cannot go on fighting when this war destroys human beings and also countries."

Those who analyze such situations say that television helped bring to an end the Viet Nam war and forced the leaders to stop it. Television has also known critical periods such as when narcotics were very popular in the United States. They were very popular simply because each day this subject was men-

tioned and discussed on television. Because of the overexposure due to television, some events are overlapping which, more rapidly than with other media, forces those involved to take stock. I think that if our proceedings were broadcast, we would all improve very rapidly the quality of our remarks in the House and we would realize very rapidly that we should be more pertinent in the House, closer to the true concerns of the people. This we should recognize with humility; we take the habit of discussing and of talking to each other in the third person. These are things that people may not understand very well. I repeat that we will rapidly come to the conclusion that we should change our style and improve the quality of our work in the House.

As for me, I think that the broadcasting of the proceedings of the House of Commons will improve Parliament and this is the goal I want to reach by supporting the present motion concerning the broadcasting of our debates. This measure will also have the great advantage of closing the almost inevitable gap between the people and their Parliament. Our country is large, the members must spend all their time in Ottawa and those of us who live in the extreme parts of our country find it very difficult to organize their timetables so that they can be in their ridings and fulfil their parliamentary duties as well. But if by means of television we can do both we will be physically present in the House and we will also be present in our ridings, then, the people will see us work as their representatives. Consequently this inevitable gap will be closed, which becomes more and more important. By the way, we know that in many cases people are not interested at all by the work of their representatives. Consequently we will be much more present before our electorate when the proceedings are broadcast; this measure will help people better understand what we are working at, what we do in Parliament. Maybe by following our proceedings they will be able to realize how tenaciously we try to fulfil our duties and this in their best interest.

Consequently, it is difficult for me to understand the reservations of the opposition about this motion concerning the broadcasting of our debates. Their reservations sound like the old objections about *Hansard*. When the proposal was put forward to print the record, there were objections similar to those we are now hearing from hon. members opposite. But the printed record has proven altogether useful, has it not, Mr. Speaker? We are now proposing nothing more than an electronic record, a medium in agreement with current technology. Nothing less, nothing more.

Before I conclude, I would like to share with you, Mr. Speaker, the experience of a small community called Ferme-Neuve, some 100 miles north of Ottawa. When I went there to make a speech, I was told that the community television station was broadcasting the city council's proceedings. When in the course of a council session the debate became animated and expressed the people's concerns, citizens came *en masse* to the council room to set nearer to their representatives and hear them debate. To me, this is a good example of TV's possible