

might be relevant to our thinking. We have insisted that Ministers themselves, through Parliament, should give the public all the relevant material, and we have relied essentially on private information outlets to do the rest.

This reliance of ours on private enterprise is highly significant. We believe that, if a fact is newsworthy, there will be plenty of people to pick it up and even to make money in the process of reporting it. We believe not only that this is the way things are -- it is the way things should be. We have felt that it is not for the Government to presume to tell us what is and what is not significant, and just to make sure we have denied Government the means to do so. In any event there is a feeling that there are too many Civil Servants.

The result of this philosophy is that, even when we realize that the political system and the private outlets are not adequate in some particular information medium, and when we agree that, in the national interest, private operations in that medium should be supplemented and government facilities provided, it has remained a dogma that there must be a healthy competition between government and private facilities. This has been the case successively with radio, films and now TV. What this means, in effect, is that in a given medium, if business is profitable, the participation of government agencies is limited by competition. When operations have to be undertaken in unprofitable fields, naturally enough, government participation is subject to careful scrutiny, and funds are always subject to strict rationing.

In effect, and for good reasons, I am sure, we have not been willing to provide ourselves with a national centralized, powerful, effective "image-producing" agency. If we are not willing to have such an agency for our own domestic requirements, it is unlikely that there will be one for external purposes - at least, not unless there is a fundamental change in approach and a thorough review of the whole system.

There is a third factor that I think is also relevant. I have in mind our Canadian mentality in regard to intangible and cultural pursuits. In this, we reflect our environment, our pragmatic approach to the problems of developing a new country. I find - and it seems to me that my experience is not unique in this field - that, if you talk to Canadians of building something, you talk about figures, or about schedules or requirements, and you can usually get somewhere. But when you deal with intangible and cultural problems you find immediately a different reaction. You are involved in something very different, which is bound to be confusing and difficult.

It is not only that people, in this area, are worried about provincial rights. They are at a loss as to how you account for results on an objective and reassuring measurable basis; and then, as is so often necessary, when relative judgments have to be made, the natural preference is for the familiar as against the unfamiliar, the measurable as against the imponderable. As Canadians, we are suspicious of artists, "long-haired" professors, "egg-headed" officials. They are hardly compatible with the familiar and pleasant image of our clean-cut outdoor, virile, sport-addict character who, we all know, is the typical Canadian.

In the information field, I suspect, we have been placing undue reliance on the random working together of parliamentary democracy and private information outlets, and on the results of our pioneering concentration on material and concrete operations.