

The Senate report devoted several pages to the community press. They were critical of CWNA in certain areas. But let's not be like so much of the fourth estate today, particularly the daily press which when under criticism always wants the last word in self-defence.

What analysis of comment of the weekly newspapers across Canada could be complete without some reference to Ma Murray? I have here the December 17 issue of the *Bridge River-Lillooet News*. As some of you no doubt know, each issue of this paper has in the centre of it an editorial entitled "Ma Says". In this particular issue Ma was talking about our report. Before she came to the nub of her remarks she gave this lead:

According to the Senate, it's the people of Canada who let the press 'let them down'. Report good, but won't help, now the barn door is locked. Senate now takes the cue. God knows there's lots more to investigate.

This is a long article and I will read only the opening paragraph or two. It says:

For 50 years, the public of Canada have been condemning the Senate.

The Senate, or Upper House means just that; to hold a brake on democratically governed people—and thus it had a reason to be there.

We'd say, that the recent Senate committee on the mass media of the country ought to whittle a decade of criticism off that august body for doing it.

The last 25 years, there's been out and out black-guarding of the Senate, partially sparked by the Socialists, but pursued by the press.

Now the Senate can go on and investigate other abuses of public interest and not blush for the audacity of attacking something that is cheating on the confused and distracted people of Canada.

Canada is not the only country that has let the reins of government get wrested out of the hands of the people. The people let themselves be hoodwinked out of a natural heritage when they let greed and avarice hide the real objective of democracy.

This Senate committee was headed by Keith Davey, a youngster in the realms of the Senate procedures, but young enough to see and courage enough to admit that there was a great need for the public eye to be turned on his own profession, the press!

It took a year to compile the Senate press report and anyone who listens or reads is now hearing a good deal about it. It cost the people a couple million, maybe!

Ma's estimate is about four times too high.

It is bulky and will be no best seller but the virtue of it is the Senate had enough fortitude to act, and only the Government could draw such information out of the tycoon-publishers and get away with it.

[Hon. Mr. Davey.]

Regardless, well intended and now completed, the media report is too late to correct much of the iniquity now entrenched in the press and electronic distributors of the news. It was costly perhaps but not in vain, as well as the Senate now finding a use for itself. This investigation should agree with every taxpayer and should not now stop. The Senate can engage in many such public services and find out what makes the system tick and this would justify the Senate in the public mind. The people cannot abolish the Senate, tho to read the critics, it would seem a push-over. In the implementing of democracy, the Senate will have to remain.

I was grateful to Senator Yuzyk, who took the section of the report dealing with the ethnic press and had it specially prepared and distributed to every ethnic editor in the country. I am sorry he is not present this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Martin: He is at the meeting of the Special Joint Committee on the Constitution in Montreal.

Hon. Mr. Davey: I hope he will learn of my remarks.

Honourable senators, one measure of daily newspaper thrust and acceptance in Canada is the fact that most Canadians still look first to the written press when it comes to measuring any kind of editorial response. How did the daily newspapers treat this committee editorially? First of all, they were more favourable than you might have imagined. Perhaps, I could give you one or two examples, because for the most part it was judged to have been a useful exercise. One or two quotes will suffice. The *Calgary Herald* on December 10, 1970, had this to say:

No reasonable person can object to constructive criticism and advice from responsible quarters.

On December 10, 1970, Christopher Young of the *Ottawa Citizen* put it this way:

It is good to have our shortcomings and failures set down by objective men who sympathize with our problems, share our goals and seek what we seek: a better performance in the public interest.

The *Montreal Gazette* of December 11 states that the report was presented in the spirit of constructive criticism.

Claude Ryan of *Le Devoir* wrote on December 12 concerning our report, but I do not have the English translation and I should not like to attempt the French. Let me just say that Mr. Ryan had many favourable comments to make about the report, its timing, and its value.

Hon. Mr. Martin: May I ask Senator Davey a question? He mentioned Claude Ryan of *Le Devoir*. I understand that in the Province of Quebec a press council has been or is to be formed. Can Senator Davey say whether there is any relationship between that and the views of the Special Senate Committee on Mass Media?