

● (1420)

It was supposed to coordinate and control the information given out by the various departments. No such control exists, and no such control is being exercised. The young people in the various departments are now sending out more than they ever sent out in years gone by, and Information Canada does not seem to know anything about it, or to care anything about it.

I do not want to make an extended speech. I have another appointment which is far more important later this afternoon, but I do repeat that we must get rid of what we have now in what we call Information Canada. It is not doing its job. It is not informing the Canadian people. It is trying to build up various ministers, as I said, as supermen, and, my God, could you make a greater mistake than that? Or give anybody more misinformation than that? What is more, before we accept the recommendations made by Senator Everett's committee, this house should go into Committee of the Whole. I should like to ask many questions of Senator Everett, and I am sure he would give me honest and intelligent answers.

No man in this house has a higher regard for Senator Everett than I have, but he is a victim of circumstances. He and his committee were asked to investigate Information Canada, and I do not think they were able to do the job that should have been done. As I say, before we go any further, this chamber should go into Committee of the Whole, if we have time, and put Senator Everett under cross-examination. His statements are too general. There is statement after statement like that in this report. I am sure they are meant well, but we have to know what they mean. There are too many generalities. He did not explore enough in depth. It was too general. He made a splendid speech, but I defy any man to tell me what it all means, or what a lot of it means.

That is all I have to say. I do hope that when the election comes, if it does come—and I do not think it is coming, as I said yesterday, and I say it again now—and if the result is what I am sure it is going to be, then I think our inclination will be to get rid of Information Canada—not the proposition itself, but as it is set up and as it has been operating. Our inclination will be to get rid of it and start afresh.

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** May I ask a question? Because you are who you are and because of your background, particularly with respect to matters as important as Information Canada, would you take a minute and draw the distinction between full disclosure and lack of disclosure, and the right to know and the limitation of the right to know?

**Hon. Mr. O'Leary:** That is not an easy question to answer, really. It is not an easy question at all. I certainly think the public has a right to know in time, but it is a question of timing. You do not have to know the next minute. You do not have to have a press conference every week, or every day of the week.

I remember, in the days of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who never gave a press conference, who never gave an interview—I went to interview him two or three times, and he said, "O'Leary, I know what your job is, I know what you are trying to do. I am an old newspaperman myself. But if

I have any answers to the questions you have asked me, I have to give them properly, in the Parliament of Canada, or in my caucus to my own party—the people to whom I am responsible." I think that is fair. But you now seem to have the situation that if anybody in the Cabinet gets a sore toe, they hold a press conference about it. I never went to a press conference. Borden, I think, held one in all the years that he was Prime Minister. I didn't want to go to these things; everybody got the information that was given then. I got my scoops, if there were scoops, in a different way. I didn't just sit there with everybody else while we all got the same information. I remember Borden coming in one day—the Cabinet had been sitting for nearly an hour over conscription—and we all sat outside waiting to hear what the great man would tell us. He came and he started by saying, "The Cabinet met today." We had waited there for two hours to see what was going to happen, and this is what we were told, "The Cabinet met today. We had under consideration the possibility of a military conscription act. No decision was come to." That was his press conference. And he was right. We had no right to say to him, "Now, look here, you tell us everything that went on in Cabinet today." I have never believed that as a newspaperman, and I don't believe it now. Frankly, and I often say this to the press, they are humoured too much. I want the press to stress responsibility and to have less stress on freedom.

**Hon. Miss Lapointe:** Honourable senators, may I make a slight correction to a statement made by Senator O'Leary in his speech? M. Jean-Louis Gagnon was editor of *L'Événement-Journal* and not *Le Soleil*.

**Hon. Mr. O'Leary:** My dear child, he was editor of *Le Soleil*, not for a long time, but long enough to oppose Franco in Quebec, which required a great deal of courage at that time.

**Hon. Mr. Choquette:** It showed his communism.

**Hon. Miss Lapointe:** Could I ask a question of the honourable senator? Is he in contradiction to his party which clearly stated that it would abolish Information Canada and never said that it would reorganize it afterwards?

**Hon. Mr. O'Leary:** My dear child, I have lived all my life in contradiction to my party. I don't just sit here and read yesterday's House of Commons *Hansard* to see what I ought to say today. I speak my mind; I have spoken it all my life, maybe often I was wrong, but never, if I could help it, on the side of wrong.

**Hon. Mr. Flynn:** Thank you, Senator Lapointe.

**Hon. Paul Martin:** Honourable senators, I am sure we all agree that if there is any man who could have greatly contributed to the work of this committee, that man is Senator O'Leary, with his long and distinguished career in journalism. He continues to be a luminary in that profession, even though he has divorced himself from the paper with which he was connected for such a long time. I cannot understand why Senator O'Leary was not a member of this committee; it is not the case that his party was not adequately represented, because we had as members of that committee Senators Grosart, Phillips, Welch and Yuzyk. And I take it that when Senator Everett spoke