

sharing, for all our friendships, we *are* somebody else. Our national purpose, as enunciated in the B.N.A. Act, is "peace, order and good Government," a becomingly modest ideal that is beginning to look more and more attractive. *Their* purpose is "the pursuit of happiness," a psychic steeplechase which has been known to lead to insanity.

How did the newspapers, radio stations and television stations across this country greet the report? I think it is fair to say that the coverage, as I am sure you realize, was extensive, and I would dare to believe that on balance it was favourable. Each medium tended, of course, to be rather parochial; that is, the daily newspapers focusing in on the comments we had to make about newspapers, the radio stations concerning themselves with our comments about the radio stations; the weeklies worried about what we said about weeklies; each medium tending, with the exception I suppose of the daily newspapers, to ignore by and large the comments we have made about other media.

I am sure honourable senators will realize that some of the newspapers were extremely parochial in their coverage and in their comments. There was inordinate interest in the very limited box score we supplied to newspaper, radio and television stations across the country.

For example, the Montreal *Star* found it reassuring to assure its readers, in a box on the front page, that the Senate Committee on Mass Media thought the *Gazette* was a mediocre newspaper.

The Vancouver *Sun*, on the day we tabled our report, had this rather astonishing headline:

Press probe (blush) likes The Sun

And the ticker across the top:

Aw Shucks, Senator Davey

The leading paragraphs in the story say that the committee recommended that more newspapers in Canada should be like the Vancouver *Sun*—a statement which I have not been able to find anywhere in the report. The interest in this box score phenomenon rather surprised us because wherever we spoke specifically about a specific newspaper or radio station or television station we carefully said that these were examples. It was apparent from the response of the media people across the country that there is a good market for some one, I suppose, annually to probe the reputation of the newspaper, radio and television stations across the country. It would be tempting, indeed.

There is only one comment about this so-called box score that has been referred to by some, which I think I should insert at this time. A great many of the smaller newspapers—those not in Toronto and Montreal—responded by saying: It is fine to talk about the excellent newspapers in Toronto and Montreal, but how can you expect us to be like they are; how can we, for example, perform like the Montreal *Star*?

The answer to that, of course, is that the comparison which should be made is not with some big city newspapers—the Toronto *Star*, the Montreal *Star*, The *Globe*

[Hon. Mr. Davey.]

and *Mail*—but rather with newspapers of cities of comparable size elsewhere in the country, with excellent newspapers, for example, of the kind we have in London, the kind we have in Kitchener, which are examples of excellent small city newspapers.

Television coverage was, of necessity, inadequate. I am talking now not about the response to the report in terms of editorial comment—I will return to that in a moment—but rather about the coverage the tabling of the report received.

Television coverage was barely adequate. Canadian Television did a more effective job than the CBC. That should be said, in fairness. Doug Collins in the new publication *Content* rather effectively summed up television coverage. He said:

Television's performance was abysmally bad. Neither network gave the report enough space, and with what space it gave, CBC did a worse job than CTV. One would expect more from the public network. But it didn't even have an interview with Davey (CTV did), and it compounded this omission with the gratuitous suggestion that there wasn't too much interest in the report since only twenty or so reporters turned up for the press conference. Obviously, somebody didn't know or care that the multitude arrived at 8 a.m. to get the report and remained locked up with it for six hours. Also, both networks played the Vancouver *Sun*—Charles Lynch game. CBC *had* to mention the great news that if it didn't exist it would have to be invented, and CTV *had* to mention that its nightly newscast was "credible".

I do not think we could seriously expect that television, in the nature of that medium, could cover this kind of document in a way that would be meaningful.

As I am sure you will realize that in order to understand the report properly it really must be read. However, before I leave television, is it not a mind-boggling thought to realize that it is clear, in one of these studies in Volume III, that for the majority of Canadians, television is the first source of finding out what is happening in the world.

I wonder if these people regard themselves as well-informed citizens of Canada. I am sure most members of this chamber will realize, it has not been roses, roses all the way, all the editorial way.

Before offering the following observation, I want to stress that I have absolutely no quarrel with the editorials written in a free press and a free society by people who are outraged or outrageous.

In any case, most editorial writers across Canada retained their dignity as well as their equilibrium. However, those who did not, I am confident, will get their second wind and look at themselves, as well as at me, critically.

Halifax understandably has been an especially interesting case in point. I have here the December 10 front page of the Halifax *Mail-Star*. As you will see,