



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Young, S

Title:

Press photography and visual censorship in the Australian parliament

Date:

2018-03-01

Citation:

Young, S. (2018). Press photography and visual censorship in the Australian parliament. *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 64 (1), pp.112-128. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajph.12429>.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/311534>

Press photography and visual censorship in the Australian Parliament

Abstract:

Still photography is an important medium for visually communicating—and scrutinising—the power of elected representatives however, it has been severely restricted by parliaments. Surprisingly, the photographs taken by press photographers have been viewed as a larger threat to parliamentary dignity than other seemingly more powerful media, such as television. This article analyses parliaments' 'extraordinary sensitivity to photography' (*New Zealand Herald*, 2007) by conducting a comparative, historical examination of press photography in five national parliaments—Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States. The article discusses historical milestones in media access for each of these parliaments, but focuses particularly upon the unusual case of the Australian Parliament and its rules on still photography. The author draws upon interviews conducted with Australian press photographers, as well as an analysis of primary material—including parliamentary guidelines on media access, photographs, newspaper reports, parliamentary debates, inquiry reports and submissions.

Keywords: Parliament, Press Photography, Newspapers, Broadcasting, Censorship.

Parliaments in mature liberal democracies around the world have proclaimed the importance of their proceedings being open and accessible so that citizens can be informed about the work of the parliament and so their representatives can be held to account. This reflects one of the fundamental principles of parliamentary democracy—that parliamentary deliberations should be carried out in public (Uhr, 1998: 96-7).

As social norms and technology have changed, parliaments have adapted how they open proceedings to the public. In the nineteenth century, the two key methods were public galleries where visitors could witness proceedings, and parliamentary reporters such as Charles Dickens who wrote rapid shorthand transcriptions of parliamentary debates at the British parliament in the 1830s (Hessell, 2012: 11-5). Once recording and printing of parliamentary proceedings were taken over by parliaments themselves, *Hansard* became a key method for finding out what politicians had said. In the twentieth century, larger, more formal, press galleries were created to accommodate representatives from commercial media companies. With varying speed, many parliaments later allowed radio and television broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings. More recently, on the

cus of the 21st century and in its first decade, many parliaments began live webcasts of proceedings on parliamentary websites.

Many of these reforms took time to achieve, some were hotly debated and sometimes fiercely resisted. However, the overall historical pattern has been one of increasing media access to parliamentary proceedings in democracies. This makes the consistent omission of one particular form of media all the more significant—parliaments have been surprisingly reluctant to allow the scrutiny of the still photograph. Since the invention of the camera in the 1830s, and particularly from the 1880s—when the half-tone block process made it easier for photographic images to be published in newspapers (Raetzsch, 2015)—parliaments have been persistently unwilling to allow newspapers to regularly take still photographs of the workings of parliament.

Remarkably, parliaments have granted greater access to broadcasting in the second half of the twentieth century than they have ever granted for press photography. To this day, photographers are still not permitted regular access to take photographs of national parliamentary chambers in the United Kingdom or the United States, making these two older parliaments the most restrictive parliaments of the five parliaments studied (Table 1). In the UK, media outlets must apply for permission to photograph in the parliamentary chambers but are warned by the parliamentary officials that ‘Permission

is not normally given to photograph or film Peers, Members and others in the Chambers...’ (Parliament UK, 2007). Despite the US Congress being the earliest adopter of new technologies (Table 2), and despite its First Amendment rights representing notions of open government and freedom of the press, photographs are prohibited in the US Senate. Even for a ceremonial photograph to be taken in the Senate Chamber, the two leaders (Majority and Minority) must submit a resolution on the floor to temporarily suspend paragraph 1 of Rule IV applying to the Senate (which prohibits photographs) (Moore, 2015). In the House of Representatives, some accredited photographers are given limited access on special occasions only, such as the State of the Union address (Press Photographers’ Gallery, undated; Moore, 2015).

[[Table 1 about here]]

The younger dominions have been more permissive in allowing photographers’ access to parliamentary chambers, although restrictions still remain. In Canada, regular access for photography was permitted from the early 1980s but allows for only two photographers and they must remain behind the curtains on each side of the House during Question Period. In New Zealand, photographers were admitted in 1999 but, even into the 2000s, television was allowed in to film debating whenever the House was sitting, whereas photographers still required permission

from the Speaker first, and the rules relating to photography have been stricter than those applying to television (see also Table 1) (House of Representatives (New Zealand), 2000: 4970; *Evening Post*, 2000; *New Zealand Herald*, 2007).

One parliament stands out compared to these other parliaments in its fellow Commonwealth countries and its close ally, the United States. One of its previous Speakers noted that the Australian parliament has ‘probably the most generous guidelines extended [for photography] around the globe’ (CPA, 2000). The Australian parliament granted press photographers regular access in 1992 and Table 1 shows how unusual that concession was. The change made the Australian parliament comparatively the most open to photography, even though it too it retains many rules and restrictions including, until 2016, that photography in the Senate was more restricted than in the House of Representatives.

The power of the still image

Prior to 1992, Australian press photographers were only granted occasional access, arranged on a case-by-case basis, to photograph significant events such as the opening of parliament. This was similar to rules in the US that are still in place for the House of Representatives. In Australia, the catalyst for allowing photographers into the chambers

was the introduction of television broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings two years prior. Still photographers argued that this gave television broadcasters an advantage over newspapers and, although this argument was principally about commercial media competition, it swayed parliamentary officials who agreed to allow access so that newspapers were not disadvantaged (Surtees, 2007; HRSCP (Australia), 2005: 16). Similar concerns led the Canadian House of Commons to allow photographers into the chamber on an experimental basis in 1979 (House of Commons (Canada), 1979: 557). However, the introduction of parliamentary broadcasts did not have the same impact in the United Kingdom, the United States or New Zealand. Table 2 outlines key milestones in parliamentary broadcasting and shows how radio broadcasting was permitted in all countries except the UK by the 1940s, while television broadcasts were regularly occurring in Canada and the United States from 1979, and in the UK from 1992. Still photography was not afforded the same access.

The broadcasting milestones varied in both format and content. Some broadcasts of parliament were narrated by a reporter, others were not. Some broadcasts were live, others were pre-recorded. Many of the milestone broadcasts were of ceremonial and special events rather than parliamentary debates. For example, in the US, the first radio broadcasts of Congress in 1923 were of its opening and the President's State of the Union Address. The first live televised broadcast in 1947 was of the State of the Union

Address by President Truman (United States House of Representatives Radio-Television Correspondents' Gallery, 2015). In Canada, Winston Churchill's address to the parliament was broadcast in 1941 while the first telecast of the 'Opening of Parliament' occurred in 1955 (CBC/Radio Canada, undated). Parliamentary officials' greater willingness to allow vision of ceremonial and special events is also evident in the rules regarding still photography (Table 1). It is media access to regular parliamentary debates that has been more difficult to obtain.

[[Table 2 about here]]

Some parliaments were especially reluctant to allow broadcast access. In the UK, as a UNESCO report has noted, 'it was a major and lengthy struggle to get the cameras and microphones into Parliament' (Raine, undated: 4). By contrast, the US Congress was a consistent pioneer in allowing radio and television access which makes its continuing restrictions on still photography all the more puzzling. A milestone experiment in broadcasting did not always immediately lead to a regular pattern of access and different media were embraced at different speeds. Canada was comparatively quick to adopt television and was the first Commonwealth country to televise parliament live (Raine, undated: 3), but the Australian parliament was quicker to embrace the internet.

New Zealand was an early pioneer in parliamentary radio broadcasting but was a late adopter of internet coverage.

MPs and parliamentary officials in each country particularly debated the merits of allowing television access. Proponents argued that televised broadcasts of parliament would improve public understanding, would help the public be more involved in parliamentary proceedings and potentially, would make politicians more accountable. Opponents feared that television broadcasts would trivialise the workings of parliament and could distort perceptions of it. They also worried that politicians might focus on playing to the cameras instead of having a constructive debate and feared the equipment could be too intrusive (Raine, undated; Surtees, 2007 and Ward, 2014: 157-76).

The relative youth of Australia's parliamentary building encouraged greater acceptance of the physical demands of television and still photography than in other parliaments. Australia's new Parliament House was built in the 1980s as a replacement for the provisional parliament in Canberra which was used from 1927 to 1988. Unlike older parliaments such as at Westminster in the UK, or the Capitol Building in the US, the Australian Parliament's designers were fully aware of television as a medium and designed the chambers so that television coverage was possible. When the new Australian parliament opened in 1988, camera alcoves were embedded into the chamber

walls. Eight fixed cameras in each chamber meant the camera operators could ‘cover just about any angle from a technical sense’ (HRSCP, 2005: 80). The chambers were also much larger and more spacious than, for example, the British parliament which was built over a hundred years earlier (Shepherd, 2012). More space in public and media galleries made the physical presence of photographers in Australian parliamentary chambers more tolerable.

Broadcasting versus still photographs

The conventional wisdom has been that television is a far more powerful medium for politics than either printed words or still images (Postman, 1985; Kellner, 1990 and Dahlgren, 1995). But the treatment of photography by parliaments suggests that photographs have a power that politicians are very aware of, but that may have been underestimated in scholarly accounts of political communication.

Because television has both audio and visual ‘moving images’, and can provide continual coverage, it would seem to present the greatest threat in terms of relentless scrutiny and the capture of candid moments which could damage a politician’s public image. But the image that results from a still photograph is powerful precisely because

it freezes time and shows an isolated, solitary moment that can then be interpreted, described, captioned and editorialised.

At the heart of why the two media are treated so differently in parliaments is the issue of control. As in other jurisdictions, the televised broadcasts of the Australian parliament are conducted by parliamentary staff, not by journalists or commercial media organisations. The resulting footage *is* broadcast by other media companies, including snippets shown on public and commercial television news, as well as Question Time broadcast on the public broadcaster the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC), and other portions of parliamentary proceedings—including committees—broadcast through the pay television provider Sky News (Young, 2009: 401-16). However, the footage all of these media companies rely upon comes from the fixed, robotic cameras embedded in the walls and operated by parliamentary staff.

In making decisions about what to show, the parliamentary staff are required, in the words of one camera operator, to do ‘what the House has requested of us to do’ (Barrett quoted in HRSCP, 2005 Appendix C: 82). Their focus is not upon what is newsworthy, or what an audience would want to see, but on making a report of proceedings as directed by parliamentary guidelines. The staff use footage from all of the cameras embedded in the chamber walls and edit it to create a composite feed of proceedings. They tend to closely follow their employer’s rules on broadcasting and, because there

are eight cameras in each chamber, select footage that meets their requirement to uphold the dignity of parliament, a priority in both their work and the guidelines they operate under. As a result, their broadcasts tend to protect MPs and parliament. By contrast, photographers who work for commercial newspapers—not parliament—have tended to challenge the rules because their priority is not to represent parliament in a dignified manner but instead to capture newsworthy events.

When a protester jumped from the public gallery onto the floor of the House in 2000, photographers took photographs, thereby breaking the rules regarding showing disturbances, whereas the parliamentary broadcast complied with the rules and did not show the man. In 2015, after then prime minister Tony Abbott was deposed by his own party in an evening coup and replaced as prime minister by Malcolm Turnbull, Abbott did not attend the House of Representatives the next day. The television footage of the House did not show his empty chair whereas the press photographs took pictures of it to highlight its symbolism (Meares, 2015b).

Still photographs are not as controllable as broadcasts conducted by parliamentary staff but photographs also have some medium-specific features which make them potent forms of representation. Counter-intuitively, the constant scrutiny of television coverage makes the public less likely to pay attention. Hours-long broadcasts of parliamentary

debates and committee meetings are not popular viewing. They only reach a very small proportion of the population (Raine, undated; Young, 2010). One newspaper editorial expressed it bluntly that: 'For most people, parliament is matched only by watching paint dry as a source of informative entertainment' (*Australian*, 2003: 10). Ironically, the broadcast of many hours of unedited raw feed of parliamentary activities therefore protects members from public scrutiny because it overwhelms viewers. A photograph, on the other hand, can be very powerful precisely because it only captures a fragment, one moment, and magnifies the importance of that event through its selection and its prominence, on page one of a newspaper or the top of a website, for example.

Where television news has to take a controlled live 'feed' of parliament and make what they can of it, a newspaper (or, increasingly, a newspaper's website or its live blog of parliament), can put its own slant or interpretation on a story by selecting a photograph that highlights one particular moment. The newspaper can also give that image context by annotating it, describing it and giving it a headline (HRSCP, 2005: 7). The power of a striking image, a newspaper's ability to harness that power as media commentary, and the distinctly more analytical and partisan nature of newspapers compared to other media, are all factors which help explain why so many parliaments around the world have been so reluctant to allow still photography for so long.

There is also a physical aspect to photography which may have discouraged parliaments. Unlike silent, robotic cameras embedded in walls, when there is a photographer present, there is both a physical and human aspect to their presence. Photographers position themselves, move around behind their camera, and make decisions about what to photograph. In pre-digital times, flash photography was considered disruptive and even the click of a camera (still heard from motor driven cameras until the mid-1990s) was noisy compared to the silent television camera.

All of these factors have caused politicians in many countries to limit photography more than broadcasting but the Australian parliament has taken a relatively more permissive approach and there are some contextual reasons that help explain the relative openness.

The Australian context

The Australian parliament is not only a relatively new and large building, it is also unique in terms of the relationship between media representatives and politicians. As Nick Haggarty (2015a) points out, 'Unlike in any other Western democracy, Australia's Press Gallery has always been housed in the same building as the politicians'. Reporters who cover the Australian parliament can work from Parliament House on a full-time basis. Ministers and members of parliament also work mainly from their Parliament

House offices when they are in Canberra. This close proximity leads to greater formal and informal interaction between media reporters, parliamentarians and their staff than in other parliaments. Media-politician proximity was even closer in ‘Old Parliament House’, which was in use until 1988, because that building was very crowded and inadequate office and meetings spaces encouraged close contact between reporters, MPs, Ministers and staffers in the corridors, offices, shared bathrooms, and in the Non-Members bar (Lloyd, 1988; Sinclair, 1996: 37-39 and Grattan, 1996: 217-35). The design of the new Parliament House has led to greater segregation however, working in the same building, with a history of close proximity and interactions, had likely made Australian politicians and parliamentary officials more aware of, and amenable to, media access requests (Bennett, 2008).

There is also a broader history to media-politician relations in Australia that is relevant. Australia has the highest concentration of newspaper ownership of comparable countries (Tiffen and Gittins, 2004: 182). Powerful Australian newspaper owners have exerted significant influence over the conduct of politics and traditionally had close links to particular politicians (Tiffen, 1989; Chadwick, 1989 and Griffen-Foley, 2003). It is therefore fully consistent with newspaper-politician relations in Australia that MPs would be open to an argument about the impact of broadcasting parliament on the

commercial interests of newspapers and that this would be the basis for allowing newspaper photographers access to parliament (Harris, 2003; Surtees, 2007: 8).

The Australian parliament has also needed to be more open to public access than other parliaments because of its geographic isolation and its location in what is a manufactured city. When Canberra was chosen as Australia's national capital in 1908, it was essentially a sheep station, sparsely populated, inland and away from the major coastal cities (Pegrum, 1983). Senior politicians wanted it to be embraced as the national capital but needed publicity to achieve that so, from its beginning, newspapers were important to publicising the new national site of politics and parliament (E.g. *Courier*, 1928: 13). Isolation and lack of facilities in Canberra in the 1920s were also the catalyst for the press gallery being granted accommodation within Parliament House.

The development of political ideas in Australia has also shaped attitudes to parliamentary access. When Australian federation was achieved in 1901, it reflected nineteenth century movements for democratic reform 'heavily influenced by both Chartist and Benthamite ideas' (Sawer and Brent, 2011: 2). For Bentham (1821), publicising parliamentary deliberations was an integral part of democratic process. Early extensions of the franchise in Australia to marginalised groups and reforms such

as compulsory voting (unusual by world standards), were heavily influenced by the value of equality (Sawer and Brent, 2011: 4). A tradition of egalitarian and utilitarian values underpinned a belief that Australian parliaments should be open and accessible. Australia has also historically had a reputation for being a ‘pioneering democracy’ and an ‘international innovator in terms of opening up the electoral process’ (Sawer et al and Farrell and McAllister quoted in Ward, 2014: 159).

Political press photography is also shaped by political and media cultures in different countries, as well as relationships, working conditions and practices (see Anderson and Young, 2016). In the UK, parliamentary photographs are heavily restricted and British newspapers have to rely on high resolution stills taken from video of parliament. From the perspective of Australian press photographers—who fought for such access and won it in the 1990s—that seems acquiescent. However, the competitive, private-life and scandal-focused British press has a paparazzi element where many political photographs are taken outside of parliament, including unflattering and covert photographs. That paparazzi-style is not common in Australian political photography, where the focus has been on gaining access to politicians through official settings and official means, including rule changes within parliament. To a British press photographer that official focus may seem acquiescent.

In the US, Congress created separate press galleries by medium including a Radio-Television gallery, a Periodical Press Gallery and a Press Photographers' Gallery (Ritchie, 2006). As noted, photography is not allowed in the Senate and is extremely limited in the House. Members of the Press Photographers' Gallery sign written agreements and abide by specific rules so that American political photography tends to be more ordered, organised and pre-arranged than in Australia. Australian press photographer Andrew Meares, chief photographer at Fairfax, who has worked in Parliament House Canberra since the 1990s, observes that, while his American colleagues take high quality photographs, he does not see them produce critical images. They are, he believes, less critical and 'more complicit in the mythmaking' that surrounds the President and power (Meares, 2015b. See also Dunlap, 2011).

Photography in the Australian Parliament

Although Australian press photographers have greater access to parliament than their counterparts in many other countries, their access is still tightly controlled. This again demonstrates the fairly unique status that still photography has developed in political communication. Only members of the Federal Parliamentary Press Gallery or Auspic (the official government photographic service) whose names are registered prior to parliamentary sittings can take photographs of members of parliament in the House of

Representatives and the Senate (Parliament of Australia, 2008). Visitors and members of the public are not permitted to take cameras into the chamber galleries during proceedings. They must leave any photographic equipment such as cameras, mobile phones or iPads at a cloak room near the chambers. Even members of parliament are forbidden from taking photographs in the chambers (Wright, 2012: 121). In 2013, a newly-elected independent MP tweeted a photograph of herself sitting on a bench in the chamber against the rules (Ireland, 2013).

When photographers were permitted regular access in the chambers in 1992, they were permitted on the basis that they would abide by the rules that applied to broadcasters. Today, there are specific rules for photographers and those rules have developed and changed over the years (discussed below). However, many of the principles remain the same and are also common to other countries' rules on parliamentary broadcasting. The key rules are designed to uphold the 'dignity of parliament' including prohibiting satire, ridicule or any commercial use of footage or photographs (Parliament of Australia, 2008: 9.)

If there is a 'disturbance' or 'disruption' in parliament—for example, if an MP tried to grab the lapels of another member (as happened in the UK) or a protester jumped onto the floor of the House (as happened in Australia)—the broadcasting rules in both the

UK and Australia require that the cameras not show the disorderly scenes but instead focus upon the Speaker. The photography rules also forbid photographs of ‘disturbances by visitors or any other persons, or unparliamentary behaviour’ (Parliament of Australia, 2008: 9.). One of the major arguments parliamentary officials have advanced for this rule is to prevent copycat occurrences because publicising protests or demonstrations could encourage others. In theory, the rule means that, even if an assassination attempt were to occur on the floor of the parliamentary chamber, Australian photographers would have to ignore it and focus their cameras on the speaker. In practice, news values would likely prevail. As then president of the press gallery, Malcolm Farr told a parliamentary inquiry in 2004, ‘if someone jumps over that wall, all bets are off. We are going to report it’ (HRSCP, 2005: 20).

There are also rules designed to allow members of parliament to go about their work unimpeded and to ensure their privacy. There are restrictions about photographing in private areas and corridors of Parliament House, a colour-coded map outlines where photographs can and cannot be taken. In the chamber, photographers cannot photograph members of parliament any closer than ‘head and shoulders’ distance (Parliament of Australia, 2008: 9). Photographers are also prohibited from using telephoto lenses ‘to inspect or take photographs of Members’ documents or computer screens’ (Parliament

of Australia, 2008: 9-10). A similar prohibition on television cameras zooming in on members' papers is in place in the British parliament (Raine, undated).

The priority for politicians and parliamentary officials to ensure that media access 'upholds the dignity of parliament' has often been enforced by requiring television cameras to focus upon the member of parliament who is on their feet and speaking, who 'has the call'. This has traditionally been a requirement in parliamentary broadcasting as well, including in the UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. This requirement means that viewers cannot see things that a person sitting in the public gallery would see such as MPs sitting, yawning, sleeping, whispering, shouting out, drinking water, reading their notes or looking at their mobile phones.

Until 2016, there were different rules for the House and the Senate because the presiding officers of each chamber (the Usher of the Black Rod in the Senate and the Serjeant-at-Arms in the House of Representatives) are responsible for determining the rules in their chambers. Photography was far more restricted in the Senate. From 1997, press photographers could take a picture of anyone in the House chamber at any time but, in the Senate, for the next nineteen years, only the Senator who had 'the call' could be the focus of photographs (Parliament of Australia, 2008: 11). Veteran photographer Alan Porritt (2015) who photographed politicians for various Australian media

companies between 1976 and 2014, commented that: ‘They’re very precious in the Senate’. Andrew Meares (2014) noted that the ‘call’ rule meant Senators could not be shown sitting down – ‘something they spend a great deal of time doing’ - but instead would only be seen on their feet and speaking, conveying the impression that they were always working hard. Another said that Senators did not want to be photographed doing something embarrassing like ‘falling asleep, nodding, yawning, picking their nose, or eating their earwax’ (Anonymous a, 2015) (this last point is a reference to former prime minister Kevin Rudd who, as a backbencher, was captured on parliament’s television cameras—not by photographers—putting his finger in his ear and then putting it in his mouth).

Australian press photographers tend to view the stated desire for ‘dignity’ and ‘privacy’ as censorious and designed ‘to spare MPs from embarrassment’ (Steketee, 2000).

Political journalist Malcolm Farr argued in 2004 that, ‘in large part, the dignity of parliament is in the hands of the members and you should not be blaming photographers or journalists if the lack of dignity is exposed’ (HRSCP, 2005 Appendix C: 77). One MP candidly expressed his fears in 2007:

‘If unrestricted access is allowed.... It is inevitable that photographs could be taken showing [members] in awkward positions-with their eyes closed, having a

cat nap... I would like to have a still photographer follow the parliamentary press gallery around for 24 hours a day, seven days a week, monitoring them while they are stuck in their workplace for the 18 hours a day that they might work, with a view to taking a picture of someone falling asleep or picking their nose or doing whatever... None of us is immune from tiredness. The parliamentary press gallery certainly are not... I ask those who bleat because they do not have [unrestricted access] whether they would accept that sort of intrusion into their workplace...' (Melham cited in CPA, 2007: 142).

Contrary views have been held by parliamentarians on where responsibility for dignity lies. Then Speaker Harry Jenkins, argued that, 'if a Member is down in the chamber and nodding off and there is a photograph of that then that is something the Member has to wear. I would see that as a legitimate part of the proceedings of the parliament' (CPA, 2007: 139). Mark Latham, then Labor Party leader, argued similarly in 2004 that: 'Surely the Australian people have the right to see what happens in this democratic chamber in every conceivable way at every conceivable opportunity' (CPA, 2004: 24916). Another Labor leader Kevin Rudd, added that there is 'no valid reason for censorship of photographs or vision...' because 'It's the people's parliament and... they should see everything that we get up to – good and bad' (Cole, 2004: 2).

Views prioritising democratic access to parliament over MPs' privacy in their workplace, have tended to be more influential in Australia than elsewhere, even though restrictions still apply. For photographers, the alignment of Senate rules with those in the House has been a significant improvement because the Senate 'call' rule was viewed as arbitrary and as a form of visual censorship. Rules matter because a photographer's access to parliament is at the discretion of parliamentary officials and can be withdrawn for any breach of the rules. Further, if a photographer breaks the rules, a ban can be applied not only to them as an individual but extended to their outlet's bureau so that all of the press gallery reporters working for the same newspaper could be banned from parliament. This is a matter of significant stress and concern for photographers (Porritt, 2015; Anonymous a, 2015).

Liberalisation and contestation of the rules on photography

As a House of Representatives' inquiry into media coverage noted in 2005, the rules for still photography have 'been a source of considerable tension over the years between the press gallery and the Speaker' and had created a 'fraught' relationship and 'a climate of distrust' (HRSCP, 2005: 16, 20). A thirty year contest between parliamentary officers and press photographers reveals the competing values of the two groups and how this affects what the Australian public are able to see in photographs.

At the Old Parliament House, photographs were usually taken on the front steps because photographers were not regularly allowed inside the chamber. Photographers were finally allowed in the chambers of the new Parliament House, opened in 1988, to take photographs in 1992. They were initially allowed in only for the Budget speech and the member ‘with the call’ had to be the focal point of all of their photographs ‘with the exception of general photographs of the chamber in which both sides of the floor of the chamber are shown’ (HRSCP, 2005: 16. See also Haggarty, 2015b). As the House of Representatives inquiry report noted in 2005: ‘The photographers were unhappy about this restriction from the start, arguing that the television coverage did not have the same restriction of focusing only on the member with the call. The photographers tried to push the boundaries on this restriction from the start.’ (HRSCP, 2005: 16). Sometimes the photographers took shots where other members were visible in the background but could be reprimanded for this (Porritt, 2015).

In 1995, Speaker Martin reviewed this condition following indications that the photographers were surreptitiously taking reaction shots—photographs of how other members reacted to what the speaker was saying. The Serjeant-at-Arms wrote to the press gallery advising that they would have to focus on the member with the call and have to take the photograph from the front. This tightening of the rules caused an

‘outcry’ among the media and the Speaker reviewed the decision and changed it to a condition that the member with the call ‘must feature as the central figure in all photographs and must be in focus...’ regardless of whether the photograph was taken from the front or back (HRSCP, 2005: 16). Liberal Party members claimed the amendment to have photographers shoot only from the front was driven by then Labor prime minister Paul Keating’s vanity about his bald spot. Keating denied this (Cole-Adams, 1995: 3), although he had, generally, been ‘reluctant’ to see photographers admitted in the early 1990s (Haggarty, 2015b).

Reaction shots have also been restricted in television coverage of other parliaments including in the UK and Canada (Raine, undated). Australian photographer Michael Jones argued in 2004 that, although parliamentary officials have not wanted reaction shots, they are a key part of debate because, in a debate, ‘someone says something and someone will react, whether that is a facial expression or in a speech itself. That is the nature of debate... The reaction shots can... [sometimes] tell the story far better than the person making the lead charge in the debate’ (HRSCP, 2005 Appendix C: 80).

In the mid-1990s, the Liberal-National parties (a conservative coalition), and especially, Peter Reith as then Manager of Opposition Business, promised to widen photographers’ access beyond the call when they came to office. Upon winning office in 1996 they

followed through with this (HRSCP, 2005 Appendix C: 89). The guidelines were changed in 1997 and Speaker Halverston removed the ‘call’ restriction (HRSCP, 2005: 17). Photographers were now able to shoot anywhere in the House chamber including photographing all MPs without the call (but not in the Senate, as discussed). They were allowed access to Question Time and ‘significant debates’ (Haggarty, 2015b).

Photographers continued to challenge remaining rules they viewed as unreasonable. In 2000, three photographers from different media companies were banned for seven sitting days when they photographed events in the public gallery (Steketee, 2000). Four Indigenous Australians, members of the ‘stolen generation’ (HREOC, 1997) had stood and turned their backs when the Prime Minister, John Howard, spoke during Question Time (Howard had refused to apologise to the stolen generation on behalf of previous governments).

Parliamentary officials argued the photographers’ actions were clearly against the guidelines and were in ‘defiance of express instructions to the contrary’ (HRSCP, 2005: 1). One of the editors who had published a photograph of the protest, the *Australian*’s editor-in-chief, David Armstrong, wrote to the Speaker, arguing the ban on photographers was ‘authoritarian’, an ‘offensive’ and ‘undemocratic assault on the freedom of the press...’. Armstrong argued that: ‘As the Members and visitors are

taking part in public proceedings on behalf of the public, the notion of privacy being protected is absurd' while 'the dignity of the proceedings depends entirely on the sense of dignity brought to bear by those participating in the proceedings... lack of dignity... arises because of the behaviour of various Members and because of your inability to control that behaviour...' (Steketee, 2000).

Aside from specific rules, it is a source of frustration for photographers that different presiding officers 'keep changing the rules... so we've got no idea where it is we actually stand' (Anonymous a, 2015). The photographers are constantly alert to make sure that any liberalisation of rules they have achieved are not wound back. In 2001, Speaker Andrew indicated he was going to tighten the rules for the House and bring them in line with the more restrictive rules for the Senate. Following another outcry, this move was abandoned (HRSCP, 2005: 17). In 2003, rules were broken by others during a visit to parliament by then US President George Bush. An unknown American journalist covering the president's visit evaded security screening and smuggled a camera into parliament. This act broke the rules about who could film in parliament as well as the disruption rules when they captured on video a scuffle that occurred on the floor when the West Australian Senator Ross Lightfoot restrained and jostled Senator Kerry Nettle of the Greens when she tried to present Mr Bush with a letter of protest.

In 2004, photographers from several newspapers were again suspended for seven sitting days when their outlets published their photographs of a man who had leapt from the visitors' gallery onto the floor of the House and had to be apprehended by parliamentary attendants (Price, 2004: 2). Newspaper editors again protested saying the ban was 'absurd', the rules were 'silly', made no sense and were unrealistic (Price, 2004: 2). The Australian Press Council also called for an immediate lifting of the ban and said the rules were archaic and prevented the public from understanding the legislature (Jones, 2004: 4). In practice, the ban did not prevent the newspapers from publishing parliamentary photographs because the news agency Australian Associated Press [AAP] had not distributed the disturbance photographs and was not banned, so the newspapers were still able to source parliamentary photos from AAP during the seven day ban (Price, 2004: 2).

While restrictions on showing disruptions in parliament still remain, when and where photographers can photograph has been broadened. As Nick Haggarty (2015b) has noted, in 2010, 'photographers were finally able to convince the Speaker that all debates in parliament are significant and they were allowed access to the Reps chamber at anytime it was sitting' (see HRSCP, 2005: 21). The press photographers were originally restricted to taking photographs from the northern and southern public galleries (Surtees, 2007: 8), as they were not allowed in the press gallery. This restriction actually

came from press gallery officials rather than from the parliamentary presiding officers (Meares, 2015b). This was later relaxed so that photographers could take photographs from the press gallery as well as public galleries, allowing them a greater range of views.

The original restriction in the House on photographing only members with ‘the call’ had created equity issues and especially when photographers were directed to ensure that the despatch box was in view (Meares, 2015b). This restricted photography principally to showing the Prime Minister and the Opposition Leader and thus gave a distorted view because it made it appear as if parliament was only a two-party system with minor party MPs and independents excluded. The 2010 hung parliament led non-government MPs to be more attentive to this restriction and, after photographers were given access to the press gallery to take photographs in 2010, they could photograph the cross benchers (Meares, 2015a).

In late 2011, another test to the guidelines arose when one of Rupert Murdoch’s tabloid newspapers, the Sydney *Daily Telegraph*, published a front-page photograph of the new Speaker of the House, Peter Slipper. Slipper had been characterised as a defector, a ‘rat’ in Australian political parlance, because he defected from the Liberals to the plum job of Speaker in collaboration with their opponents, the Labor Party. The photograph of

Slipper was digitally manipulated to make him look like a rat. Because that photograph had been taken during parliament, the newspaper's photographers and reporters were threatened with expulsion and bans (Hildebrand, 2011: 4). While bans do not appear to have resulted on that occasion, three years later, a News Corporation photographer was banned from Parliament House for three days for an alleged breach of the Senate photography rules (Anonymous a, 2015).

Photographers feel that they have unfairly borne the 'brunt of [the] guidelines and rules' with television camera operators and news reporters not being subject to the same scrutiny (Bowers quoted in HRSCP, 2005 Appendix C: 92). This may partly be a result of the photographers being more visible, both physically present and observable, but also because they have by-lines on photographs whereas camera crews do not on videos. Photographers lamented in 2015 that they could not photograph a Senator unless they had the call but there were multiple television cameras in there filming Senators 'all the time'. At public hearings, the photographers 'have to ask permission before they press the button...[while] the TV guys [sic] walk in...hit go [and are ignored] because there's no "click, click, click, click"' (Anonymous a, 2015). In the 2000 incident, when Indigenous protesters made their silent gesture of protest, parliament's in-house broadcast captured the event on a wide shot which meant TV viewers were able to see it

even though the *Sydney Morning Herald* was censured for publishing a photograph of the same scene (Steketee, 2000).

In July 2014, the President of the Senate sought to reform the Senate photography rules to make them consistent with the rules in the House of Representatives. But, as Andrew Meares noted, ‘the long-awaited motion was quietly shelved’ four months later ‘without explanation’ (Meares, 2014). Alan Porritt (2015) recalls similar attempts when former Greens leader Bob Brown ‘was a Senator [and] he put up a motion [proposing] that photographers could go into the Senate at any time for pictures and shoot anyone...’ Only the first part was adopted. One experienced political photographer says: ‘It’s very frustrating for someone who...[has] an artistic eye; it’s very hard for us not to take a picture when we see that it’s there... [The people who run the Senate] can hear us [take photos]...all of us [the photographers] are always in trouble’ (Anonymous c, 2015).

But, in 2016, after years of lobbying from media companies and photographers, the Senate photography rules were finally brought into line with those in the House. As President of the Press Gallery, photographer Andrew Meares was instrumental in pushing for the change when an opportunity arose after Labor Senator Stephen Conroy—a major opponent of the rules being relaxed—resigned from parliament, and a

new Senator, crossbencher and former journalist Derryn Hinch, supported the removal of the 'with the call' rule and successfully moved a motion to abolish it.

Conclusion

In media and political communication studies, the most serious concerns about the impact of technology upon politics and public life have tended to focus upon television and the internet (e.g. Postman, 1985; Chadwick, 2006). However, the old-fashioned still photograph has an enduring power that has seen ostensibly democratic parliaments curtail photography in surprisingly draconian ways. Photography has been viewed by politicians as a much more confronting medium than print reporters describing in words what they witness from the gallery, or televised broadcasts controlled by parliamentary officials.

For over two centuries, when determining media access to parliaments, there has been an ongoing contest between the public's right to know versus the dignity of the institution. As then president of the press gallery, Malcolm Farr, said in 2004, journalists and photographers who seek greater access are 'fighting history... There are a couple of hundred years of Westminster tradition. It does not dissolve easily' (HRSCP, 2005 Appendix C: 95). Australian photographers have had more success in

dissolving boundaries than in other comparable countries but their behaviour, and ongoing anxieties about breaking rules, show that institutions exert a powerful force. While their journalistic imperative, as commercial media operatives, is to provide engaging, illustrated news for an audience, Australian photographers have actually shown remarkable restraint during the 24 years since they were first allowed into parliament to regularly photograph. Considering how often MPs either shut their eyes or actually fall asleep when they are in the chamber, such photographs are remarkably rare. Photographers have not sought to unfairly malign MPs who may have sat through marathon late-night sessions, for example. On the contrary, photographers have tended to play by the rules and have only occasionally pushed boundaries which have seen them reprimanded by officials.

Given this Australian experience—and that we live in an age of the image, an era of ubiquitous camera-enabled phones and tablet devices—the restrictions on parliamentary photography in place in many democratic countries seem both anachronistic and bizarre. It is extraordinary that citizens in many countries cannot see photographs of their MPs voting or speaking in parliament—as distinct from stills of footage taken by parliamentary officials under strict guidelines. Photographs help members of a society understand, in an accessible way, what happens in parliament and let citizens see for themselves how well their elected representatives represent their interests. As an

effective independent means of political scrutiny, restrictions on photography therefore not only limit visual information about politics, they also limit democratic understanding.

References

- Anderson, F. and Young, S, 2016, *Shooting the Picture: Press Photography in Australia*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Publishing.
- Anonymous a, interview with the author, date undisclosed to protect confidentiality, 2015.
- Anonymous b, interview with the author, date undisclosed to protect confidentiality, 2015.
- Anonymous c, interview with the author, date undisclosed to protect confidentiality, 2015.
- Australian*. 2003. Smiling for the candid camera. 30 October: 10.
- Bennett, S. 2008. Research Paper No. 29 2007–08: Parliament House and the Australian people. Canberra: Parliamentary Library, Parliament of Australia.
- Bentham, J. 1821. *On the Liberty of the Press and Public Discussion*. London: William Hone.
- Canadian Parliamentary Press Gallery. undated. *Canadian Parliamentary Press Gallery Handbook*, URL: <[http://presse-parle.gc.ca/Html%20Section/PDF%20Documents/Canadian%20Parliamentary%20Press%20Gallery%20Handbook.pdf](http://presse.parl.gc.ca/Html%20Section/PDF%20Documents/Canadian%20Parliamentary%20Press%20Gallery%20Handbook.pdf)>. Consulted 20 October 2015.
- CBC/Radio Canada. undated. Our history. URL: <<http://www.cbc-radio-canada.ca/en/explore/our-history/>>. Consulted 27 October 2015.
- Chadwick, A. 2006. *Internet Politics: States, Citizens, and New Communication Technologies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chadwick, P. 1989. *Media Mates: Carving up Australia's Media*. South Melbourne, Victoria: Macmillan.
- Cole-Adams, P. 1995. Back and side pictures banned. *Canberra Times* 21 September: 3.
- Cole, M. 2004. Privileges committee to question media restriction. *Courier-Mail* 20 February: 2.
- [CPA] Commonwealth Parliament of Australia, House of Representatives [*Hansard*]. 2000. 29 August.

- 2004. 17 February.
- 2007. 26 March.
- Courier*. 1928. Common centre: Australian nation: Prime Minister defends Canberra. 31 May: 13.
- C-Span. undated. Milestones. URL: <<http://www.c-span.org/about/milestones/>>. Consulted 27 October 2015.
- C-Span. undated. About. URL: <<http://legacy.c-span.org/about/company/index.asp?code=MILESTONES>>. Consulted 27 October 2015.
- Dahlgren, P. 1995. *Television and the Public Sphere: Citizenship, Democracy and the Media*. London: Sage.
- Evening Post*. 2000. Speaker bans *Post* cameras. 14 August.
- Dunlap, DW. 2011. Photographing presidential broadcasts. *Lens*, *New York Times* 1 June. URL: <http://lens.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/06/01/photographing-presidential-broadcasts/?_r=0>. Consulted 7 January 2016.
- Grattan, M. 1996. Sharing the same kennel: The press in Parliament House. In: J. Disney and J.R. Nethercote, eds. *The House on Capital Hill*. Sydney: The Federation Press.
- Griffen-Foley, B. 2003. *Party Games: Australian Politicians and the Media from War to Dismissal*. Melbourne: Text Publishing.
- Haggarty, N. 2015a. Behind the scenes: Canberra's Press Gallery gives up its secrets. ABC, 9 July. URL: <<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-07-09/federal-parliamentary-press-gallery-history/6607852>>. Consulted 27 October 2015.
- Haggarty, N. 2015b. Federal Parliamentary Press Gallery: History. URL: <http://pressgallery.net.au/?page_id=294>. Consulted 27 January 2016.
- Harris, I. 2003. Submission to the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Procedure (Australia). *Media coverage of House proceedings including the Chamber, Main Committee and committees*. Canberra: House of Representatives, Procedure Committee.
- Hessell, N. 2012. *Literary Authors, Parliamentary Reporters*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Hildebrand, J. 2011. RATS! Now they're trying to ban the *Tele*. *Daily Telegraph* 29 November: 4.
- House of Commons (Canada). 1979. *Debates*, 24 October: 557.
- House of Commons (Canada). 1983. *Debates*, 25 January: 22194.
- House of Commons Commission Bulletin (UK). 2011. *Commission bulletin* 15 December. URL: <<http://www.parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/offices/commons/house-of-commons-commission/minutes/commons-commission-bulletins-to-members/bulletin-15-december-2011/>>. Consulted 18 April 2016.

- House of Commons Information Office (UK). 2010. Broadcasting proceedings of the House. August. URL: <<http://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-information-office/g05.pdf>> Consulted 12 April 2016.
- House of Representatives (New Zealand). *Hansard*. 2000. vol.586, 8-24 August.
- House of Representatives (New Zealand). 2007. 'Television coverage of the House: Report of the Standing Orders Committee. URL: <http://www.parliament.nz/resource/en-nz/48DBSCH_SCR3798_1/61e2660e0c8de5a1502798283898e9caae18ba63>. Consulted 12 April 2016.
- [HRSCP] House of Representatives Standing Committee on Procedure (Australia). 2005. *Media coverage of House Proceedings including the Chamber, Main Committee and committees: Final Report*. Canberra: House of Representatives Procedure Committee.
- [HREOC] Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. 1997. *Bringing them home: Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families*. Sydney: HREOC.
- Ireland, J. 2013. No pictures allowed: New MP Cathy McGowan learns her lesson. *Sydney Morning Herald* 15 October.
- Jones, C, 2004. Press Council raps photography rules. *Courier-Mail* 26 February: 4.
- Kellner, D. 1990. *Television and the Crisis of Democracy*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Lloyd, C. J. 1988. *Parliament and the Press*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Meares, A. 2005a. Interview with the author. Canberra, 17 February.
- Meares, A. 2005b. Phone interview with the author, 6 October.
- Meares, A. 2014. The 19-year fight to publish uncensored photos from Australia's Senate. *Sydney Morning Herald* 5 December.
- Moore, H. (Photo Historian, US Senate Historical Office). 2015. Email correspondence with the author, 5 and 7 November 2015.
- New Zealand Herald*. 2007. Sensitivity makes MPs look foolish. 28 June.
- [NPPA] National Press Photographers Association. 2013. Open up the oval. 21 November. URL: <<https://nppa.org/node/64152>>. Consulted 17 April 2016.
- Parliament of Australia. 2008. Guidelines for filming and photography and general media rules in Parliament House and its precincts. Canberra: Parliament House. URL: <<http://www.aph.gov.au/~media/06%20Visit%20Parliament/61%20Planning%20a%20Visit/FilmPhotoGuidelines.pdf>>. Consulted 17 April 2016.
- Parliament of Canada. 2009. *House of Commons procedure and practice* (2nd ed). Ontario: House of Commons.

- Parliament of New Zealand. 2011. Protocol for interviewing members, filming, and photographing in Parliament Buildings May 2011. Wellington: Parliament of New Zealand.
- Parliament UK. 2007. Photography, filming, sound recording, painting, sketching, mobile telephones and pagers in the Palace of Westminster. URL: <<http://www.parliament.uk/documents/CPA/CPC2011/Photography-Leaflet.pdf>>. Consulted 10 February 2017.
- Porritt, A. 2015. Interview with the author. Canberra, 9 March.
- Price, M. 2004. Press fights House photography ban. *The Australian* 17 February: 2. Press Photographers' Gallery. Undated. Coverage Guidelines. Washington DC: US Capitol. URL: http://www.pressphotographers.senate.gov/?page_id=83. Consulted 10 February 2017.
- Pegrum, R. 1983. *The Bush Capital*. Sydney: Hale and Iremonger.
- Postman, N. 1985. *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. New York: Viking.
- Raine, M. undated. Broadcasting parliament spreads throughout the Commonwealth. UNESCO. URL: <portal.unesco.org/.../10545342414Parliamentary_Broadcasts.../Parliament>. Consulted 19 December 2015.
- Raetzsch, C. 2015. Real pictures of current events. *Media History* 21(3): 294-312.
- Ritchie, D. A. 2006. *Reporting from Washington: The History of the Washington Press Corps*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sawer, M. and Brent, P. 2011. Equality and Australian democracy: Democratic Audit of Australia discussion paper. October. URL: <http://democraticaudit.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/sawer_brent2011.pdf>. Consulted 17 February 2016.
- Scoop Media. 2007. Live webcasts of Parliament begin today. URL: <<http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO0707/S00175.htm>>. Consulted 16 December 2015.
- Shepherd, R. 2012. *Westminister: A Biography*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Sinclair, I. 1996. Changes in the Ministry. In J. Disney and J.R. Nethercote, eds. *The house on Capital Hill*. Sydney: The Federation Press.
- Steketee, M. 2000. Banned! Photo-shy MPs snap back. *The Australian* 4 May.
- Surtees, C. 2007. Parliament's relationship with the media. Australasian Study of Parliament Group Annual Conference. 23-25 August, Adelaide.
- Tiffen, R. 1989. *News and Power*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Tiffen, R. and Gittins, R. 2004. *How Australia Compares*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- United States House of Representatives Radio-Television Correspondents' Gallery. 2015. Broadcast milestones in the House. URL:

- <<http://radiotv.house.gov/about-the-gallery/broadcast-milestones-in-the-house-of-representatives>>. Consulted 16 April 2016.
- US Senate Press Photographers' Gallery. 2015. Press photographers' guidelines. URL: <http://www.pressphotographers.senate.gov/?page_id=83>. Consulted 12 February 2016.
- Uhr, J. 1998. *Deliberative Democracy in Australia: The Changing Place of Parliament*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Ward, I. 2014. Parliament on 'the wireless' in Australia. *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 60(2): 157-76.
- Wright, B. C. (ed). 2012. *House of Representatives Practice* (6th ed). Canberra: Department of the House of Representatives.
- Young, S. 2009. Sky News Australia: The impact of local 24-hour news on political reporting in Australia. *Journalism Studies* 10(3): 401-16.
- Young, S. 2010. Audiences and the impact of 24-hour news in Australia and beyond. In: Lewis, J. and S. Cushion, eds. *The Rise of 24-Hour News Television: Global Perspectives*. New York: Peter Lang.

Table 1: Still photography rules in the chambers of five national parliaments, 2015

	Press still photography	Who can take photographs?
Australia	Regular access has been permitted since 1992. ^(a)	Only accredited press gallery photographers and Auspic (the official government photographic service).
Canada	Since circa 1983, a photographer has been allowed behind the curtains on each side of the House of Commons during Question Period. ^(b)	The two pre-authorized photographers are employed by news service agencies which supplies other news organizations under a pooling arrangement. Only these photographers, and the official photographers employed by the House of Commons, are authorized to take photographs of the Chamber while the House is in session.
New Zealand	In 1999, photographers from the five metropolitan newspapers were permitted access.	Press Gallery members can take photographs in the Chamber subject to protocols, rules and any ruling or direction given by the Speaker.
United Kingdom	Not permitted.	Due to strict prohibitions on photographing debates, newspapers tend to use stills from television footage to illustrate parliamentary proceedings.
United States	Not permitted.	Taking of photographs is prohibited in the Senate. In the House, admittance on special occasions such as the Joint Meetings of Congress or the State of the Union address is limited and requires special credentials.

Notes: ^(a) ‘Regular access’ is defined as access without photographers having to request or receive special permission from parliamentary officers. It does not necessarily indicate, for example, full access to all debates and committees. ^(b) A trial was held in 1979. By 1983, access was permitted on the terms described.

Sources: Canadian Parliamentary Press Gallery undated: 6; House of Commons (Canada) *Debates*, 1979: 557; House of Commons (Canada) *Debates*, 1983: 22194; Haggarty 2015b; House of Commons Commission Bulletin (UK) 2011; House of Representatives *Hansard* (New Zealand) 2000; HRSCP 2005; Parliament of Canada 2009; Parliament of New Zealand 2011; US Senate Press Photographers’ Gallery 2015.

Table 2: National parliaments’ broadcast media reporting milestones, 1936-2002

	First radio broadcast of parliament	First televised broadcast of parliament	Regular television broadcasting begins	Regular broadcasting on the internet begins
Australia	1946	1974 – both houses	1990 – Senate 1991 – House of Representatives	1999
Canada	1941	1977 – House of Commons	1979	2003
New Zealand	1936	1962 ^(a)	1990 ^(b)	2007
United Kingdom	1975	1985 – House of Lords 1990 - House of Commons	1992	2002
United States	1923	1947	1979	1997

^(a) First question time broadcast was in 1986. ^(b) Some sources suggest 2007 should be considered the milestone as this is when the in-house facility for televising full debates and proceedings in the House began. The 1990 date reflects guidelines initiated that year to broadcast and the intermittent broadcast of material by broadcasters such as TV3 (House of Representatives *Hansard* (New Zealand) 2000; House of Representatives (New Zealand) 2007: 3).

Sources: CBC/Radio Canada undated; C-Span 2015a; C-Span 2015b; House of Commons Information Office (UK) 2010; House of Representatives (New Zealand) 2007, p.3; Scoop Media 2007; Surtees 2007; Ward 2014.