

showing parliament on news, public affairs and documentary programs. Looking at the longer term, the report of the standing committee dealt with possible means for broadcasting, on a national basis, as comprehensive a record of the proceedings as possible, to give the public the opportunity to view the proceedings without intermediate editing by the media. The government endorses the principle that Canadians should be given direct access to the proceedings. Of course, many technical and practical problems will have to be worked out before such transmission becomes a reality, and it is likely that this will be one of the later stages in the implementation of the resolution.

Looking ahead, then, when the motion is adopted, the committee will be set up and charged with supervising the installation of production facilities, examining the distribution needs of the media and members themselves, and reviewing methods of ensuring that the rights and privileges of parliament are preserved.

Though broadcasting would not begin the day after the adoption of the motion, televising of special occasions, such as the budget debate, by temporary equipment would be possible almost immediately, and work on installation of the permanent system should be well under way by the end of the summer recess.

I do not intend to describe at this moment the nature of the production facilities which are envisaged, since I understand other members wish to comment on this subject in some detail. Let me say simply that technological innovations in recent years have made it possible to instal a completely remote-controlled system in which neither cameras nor production personnel would be visible, and to light the House without causing the physical discomfort we have experienced on occasions in the past.

● (1530)

Finally, I should like to deal with the question of cost. The feasibility study undertaken by the CBC, and tabled in the House, estimated capital cost for installing the production facilities at \$3,269,000. The annual operating cost was estimated at \$935,000. These costs are considerable, but let us not use this as a red-herring argument against broadcasting. At present, the total annual printing bill for parliament is approximately \$3 million, \$2 million of which is accounted for by printing the debates of the House, the Order Paper and Votes and Proceedings.

Clearly, the operating cost for broadcasting, at less than half parliament's annual printing cost, cannot be considered a serious impediment. Broadcasts could reach millions, while *Hansard* has a circulation of under 14,000. In terms of percentage increase in the cost of operating parliament, broadcasting costs would amount to an approximate 1.7 per cent increase in the present total of \$56 million.

I have no doubt we will hear complaints during the debate about how broadcasting will end traditions here. Yet, while listening to arguments about privileges and rights we should bear in mind remarks of Edward Blake, a most distinguished

Broadcasting House Proceedings

parliamentarian and a member of the government that instituted the printed *Hansard*. He said:

The privileges of parliament are the privileges of the people and the rights of parliament are the rights of the people.

Now that broadcasting is technically possible, we cannot ignore our responsibility to the Canadian people—the responsibility to allow them the fullest knowledge of what is being done on their behalf here in parliament. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House can move rapidly to a favourable decision and that we can move ahead in a very fundamental innovation in the operation of the Canadian parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in the last portion of his speech the minister quoted Edward Blake. In looking across to the other side of the chamber day by day I am reminded of Disraeli who, when looking at the treasury benches, saw before him a row of extinct volcanoes. When I look across to this government, what I see reminds me of a mud flat after the tide has gone out.

I listened with some interest to the minister's speech. I am somewhat amused by this government's issuing a clarion call for openness in parliament. This, from the mouth of the government House leader, is really a blasphemy considering what the government's attitude has been toward openness in government, in parliament, in answering questions or anything else with regard to providing a look into the operations of government by we whom the government House leader described as the representatives of the people.

Aside from its dullness, the speech is a list of pious platitudes from this government which speaks in the name of openness—believe it or not, this government that denied to this House a full debate on Viet Nam during the course of the twenty-ninth parliament. When that debate, which was called by the minister's predecessor, got a little hot, it was immediately cut off. The government has asked the opposition to debate national issues such as unemployment on its opposition days. It volunteered no initiative itself. The government has not given the House of Commons and, therefore, the people of Canada, an opportunity to discuss for even one day the cold ramifications arising from our position as a nation in the world in terms of foreign affairs. The government House leader is a former foreign affairs minister. Perhaps that is the reason we have not had the debate on that point.

This move by the government at this time is just so much hypocrisy. It is shrouded in the swaddling-cloth of questionable piety, on the one hand, and synthetic rectitude on the other.

We are back, after a parliamentary recess, faced with about the same legislative wasteland that we faced before we left. In terms of the order paper, after a month there is nothing new that shows itself. It is not even worth opening. It would not even be interesting to a student of the history of this time. There is nothing that faces us in this House except the fact that it is becoming glaringly apparent that the government wasted the recess. That is not to say they did not communicate