

continued from page 7

Time Canada And P.M. Diefenbaker Hit It Off Well..... So Well

But it notes that while these two sectors of communications have received strong government support, the linear media have been left out in the cold.

Both these recommendations, if they go through, will destroy the Time Lobby. They endanger these men by opening up the possibility of new publications all over Canada, adding many more voices to what is now only the booming voice and echo of the publishers in the Lobby and the Magazine Advertising Bureau.

When the same battle was fought ten years ago, the Lobby won, and Canada went into a long night of dying publications, arid magazines, and stilled voices.

Nationalism is frequently a question of expediency. That's why it is so often embraced by the disenfranchised rich. So when Grattan O'Leary's Royal Commission on Publications was convened on September 16, 1960, the Canadian publishers began to sing a lusty song of nationalism, with a sober refrain that they, the struggling chickens, would be devoured if foxes like Time and Reader's Digest were allowed to stay in the coop.

Effusive compliments had been exchanged between the Prime Minister and the Editor-in-Chief at a Chateau Laurier reception and luncheon.

Oliver Clausen, who was working for Time in Ottawa in 1959, recalls in a Globe and Mail article one of the first breaches in the romance, illustrating also Time's solicitous concern for the favors of the Prime Minister:

"The story (Clausen's) noted that it had taken Diefenbaker nearly three months to appoint a successor to the late External Affairs Minister Sydney Smith and reported that, partly as a result of the procrastination, Canada's stance in the world had come under questioning.

"... I... was summoned to Diefenbaker's office and roared at furiously for an hour...

"The Prime Minister saw the evil hand of U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles behind the story — although Dulles had died 10 days ago — and charged Time was trying to control Canadian thinking. He threatened to denounce Time in Parliament for yellow journalism.

"I finally staggered out to phone Toronto and Lawrence E. Laybourne, then Time's managing director for Canada. The call sent Laybourne scurrying for the first plane — and camping outside Diefenbaker's office door the next morning to dissuade the Prime Minister from carrying out his threat. He succeeded but things were never the same again."

By 1963, the once-ardent romance was clearly over. Time jolted Diefenbaker, writing of "his discredited administration." During that year's election campaign that brought Lester Pearson to power, Time sneered at Diefenbaker, "his self-martyrdom wearing thin," and chided "the Alice in Wonderland twist" of his campaign. Of Pearson's victory, it sang "an able man was offered a chance to do what he asked."

"Canadians had fallen in line behind a miracle man in 1958," Time wrote, calling the kettle black, "but he had not worked miracles." Time reported the change of power under the heading "The Air is Cleaner."

Behind the cooling of the romance was a group of Canadian publishers, who had become alarmed at the friendly attitudes of the Diefenbaker government towards the Luce empire, and even more at some disturbing developments in the U.S. publishing world.

Word that McGraw-Hill, the U.S. business magazine empire, was planning to print Canadian editions of its publications sent terror into the Maclean-Hunter board room. With Maclean-Hunter's profits resting on a stack of business and trade publications ranging from Canadian Grocer to the flagship of the company fleet, The Financial Post, an influx of U.S. business magazines with Canadian sections threatened to pull the bottom out from the whole show. And of course, other U.S. publishers might get the same idea too. A stop had to be put to this.

Out came the Red Ensigns, the dusty speeches about offended sovereignty, and the wounded howls for protection from the American whale. Diefenbaker, faced with such displays of patriotism and the powerful publishing lobby's pressure, had no alternative but to trundle out crusty old Grattan O'Leary and his Royal Commission. It's mandate: "to enquire into and make recommendations concerning the position of and prospects for Canadian magazines and periodicals."

Maclean-Hunter appeared before the O'Leary Commission dressed in rags (it then had assets conservatively estimated at \$15,000,000 — with the largest part of its preferred stock

But time heals many wounds, and the way to a Canadian businessman's patriotism is through his pocket-book, so it was a soft song of brotherhood and modera-

tion that the Canadian magazine publishers hummed all years later, at Keith Davey's Mass Media Committee hearings in February.

William Nobleman, the publisher of Saturday Night declared that his magazine could not survive it it weren't for Time's presence in Canada. So he urged that the Committee leave Time and Reader's Digest alone.

But there was a distinctly jarring note during those same hearings last February when the Committee's counsel Yves Fortier, posed a riddle to Maclean-Hunter vice-president Ronald MacEachern, the company's chief hatchet man over Maclean's magazine; ten years ago Maclean-Hunter howled that it faced extinction from U.S. magazines coming into Canada, yet now they staunchly defended Time and Reader's Digest's privileges in Canada.

Well, on the road to Damascus, it seems, Maclean-Hunter had seen the light. MacEachern answered that his firm "has learned to live with Time and Reader's Digest". Indeed it had, most lucratively.

He warned the committee of a "typhoon of criticism" if the government cancelled the privileges these magazines enjoy, scoffed at pointless "anti-Americanism", and pleaded with candor that "... the disappearance of Time and Reader's Digest would rock our applecart."

Senator Keith Davey, a man under

Senator Keith Davey says he is "not by instinct or nature a guy who deals easily with inhibitions." Content, in the following interview, raises questions which will be considered fully in the report of the Senate Inquiry into the Mass Media. Although the imminent publication date of the report made it impossible for the senator to reply in his accustomed forthright fashion, his answers indicate that his committee has a good grasp of the issues facing the media and that the report will certainly contain some straight-from-the-shoulder explanations of what's wrong and what's right with the media in Canada. THE EDITORS

CONTENT: When the committee was established last year, there appeared to be fear and trepidation on the part of some people in the media. If anything, many of the publishers dismissed the committee as so much nonsense. Would you elaborate on the attitude the Senators themselves now have about the inquiry and also on how you sense the media has responded to it?

DAVEY: When the idea of the committee was first discussed, the reaction of the publishers, by and large, was either to scoff and ridicule or to be downright annoyed, even to regard it as an invasion of a free press. In retrospect I really have learned a great deal during the hearings of things which I guess I should have known. Let me give you a case in point. The Canadian Daily Newspaper Publishers Association, we thought, was a logical starting place and so we asked the CDNPA to present the first brief to the hearing. That was really a silly thing to do because the CDNPA is nothing more than a commercial sales organization. So it was that when the CDNPA came before us, much of its presentation consisted of the president, Ralph Costello, reading us a lecture on press freedom and government encroachment thereupon and let the Senate beware lest it trample on the freedom of the press. Then the next day the daily newspapers across the country headlined "CDNPA Warns Senate of Encroachment on Press Freedom."

Well, that really wasn't what the Senators took out of that particular day. All of us really are far removed from encroachment upon a free press, and certainly didn't need that precious little lecture from the CDNPA. Indeed, the real news out of that session to the members of the committee, and certainly to myself, was that none of those people is concerned about standards or ethics in journalism. Those guys are interested in one thing only — advertising.

However, I have said many times that I think we will have to stay with the profit motive in journalism and if so, then somebody has got to sell advertising and the CDNPA recently has done an effective job. I gather, in soliciting national advertising for newspapers.

Then as the hearings proceeded, the publishers began to take us more and more seriously. I will always be grateful to certain people who came before the committee early on, who helped to establish its credibility. When it was apparent to the publishers across the country that people like Beland Honderich, like John Bassett, like Claude Ryan were taking the committee seriously, our credibility began to build rapidly. Also, when it became apparent that it wasn't a witchhunt or an inquisition — as had been suggested — but that it really was a thoughtful attempt to consider the role and function, purpose and scope of media, we had made the grade.

Now, all of a sudden, at about this time, another problem presented itself from the opposite direction. I began to get letters from the New Left saying the thing is a cop out... "that you are just a front man for the publishers... that we should have known better than to think this is going to be anything more than just one part of the establishment preparing a report card on another part of the establishment. Maybe you will gently tap one or two wrists, but over all you will report the media is in fine shape." Right now, however, as we are writing the report, I believe most publishers are going to be interested in what it says. I don't think they will be looking at it for laughs.

CONTENT: Did the Canadian public, as apart from publishers and the working press, show any interest in the hearings of the committee? Did you become aware of any kind of desire among consumers to have a better press in Canada?

DAVEY: We did a consumer study as a background research paper. There are some things I would like to say now but I think I had better beg off until that particular document is released as an appendix to our report. It will say a great deal about what we believe to be public attitudes towards the media. However, I can say this. I have never received as much mail in connection with anything I have done, as in my role as chairman of this committee. That has got to mean something. Yes, I think the public was quite interested.

CONTENT: What was the tone of this mail?

In a year that finds lists (and vice-versa) this remarkable conversation

But to do this one setting up of the Diefenbaker, and the English newsweekly all, back to a time when

When John Diefenbaker and Time magazine political-journalistic a romance surpassed Elliott Trudeau and the Diefenbaker in 1957

Time greeted the whoops of joy and reporting on Diefenbaker Washington, the magazine on him, describing the shook hands," and "said Diefenbaker responded

In 1956, Liberal Finance a 20 per cent surtax on an annual cost to Time

But Diefenbaker came surtax, after intense lobby

turning into continuing it is interesting to p

back even beyond mission in 1960 by tionship of Canada's tive governments. A

to power in 1957 into one of the swe in Canadian histo only by that of P daily Star in 1968:

Diefenbaker in 1957 of prose. As late as to John F. Kenne stowed Times acco marched up," "vigo

Walter Harris had cla ada's advertising rev 000.

rescue in 1958 and lift much flattery by T

DAVEY: Broad really two kinds of dividuals who had newspapers. In eff most regarded by ombudsmen and s very strange indee also quite serious. There were the us letters; there were obviously had ax hand, much of th who were thought media, although proportionate am only organized le from Halifax. I ar the daily newspa people connected responsible. I don

CONTENT: G you came up wit query, would you statement of Eric tent in the Cana to why it is in more ads"?

DAVEY: No, I **CONTENT:** Y **DAVEY:** Not **CONTENT:** V

DAVEY: I th port. It is a que **CONTENT:** about the CDN ize then that i not standards sounds like yo towards...

DAVEY: I u further. He att rally. And as the report an answer as aut **CONTENT:** ern at that ti ation in laur