

lishers, journalists, politicians and people. There seemed to be a uniformity of opinion that the Press Council had significantly improved British journalism.

I well recall, as I am sure Senator Petten will, the day that we had lunch with Lord Thomson in the dining room of the *Times*. Lord Thomson, whom I had known in Canada in his earlier days as a friend, was indeed a gracious host. He received us very well indeed. I remember when the luncheon was over and the plates were pushed back the discussion began and Lord Thomson said, "I know why you fellows are here. We want to give you some of our views and ideas. First of all, this idea of a press council is utter nonsense. Surely you are not going to propose that for Canada? It has not worked here." There were 18 of his colleagues present. He asked the gentleman on his right, whose name I do not recall but who was a senior person in the Thomson organization, if he agreed, and the reply was, "No, Your Lordship; I do not agree. I think the Press Council in the United Kingdom has been singularly effective and welcome." The other gentlemen present disagreed with his Lordship, and each said that the press council has been effective. Lord Thomson, of course, calmly picked up the ball and said, "You see, senator, that demonstrates the freedom of opinion that exists within this organization." Indeed it did, but it also was a further demonstration that most journalists in the United Kingdom think that that particular Press Council does work.

We say at the completion of the section of our report which deals with press councils:

A sensible place to begin would be at the next annual meeting of the Canadian Daily Newspaper Publishers Association.

That meeting, of course, is taking place this very week. The paragraph continues:

The better financed such an organization is, the better are its chances of achieving something. We have already noted that Britain's Press Council operates on less than \$60,000 per year. We hope the Canadian industry—whose daily-newspaper members in 1968 had total revenues of \$295 million—can find it in its heart to do a little better than that.

As I say, the meeting which is now taking place in Toronto, about which I will speak in a moment, may in fact make progress in this direction. If it does not, then the ball will be back in the court of concerned Canadians such as the Consumers Association of Canada, who may very well take this kind of important initiative.

Senator Desruisseaux, whose absence I regret and acknowledge, is, of course, a gentleman in every sense of the word. He is understandably one of our most popular colleagues. He is able, articulate, informed, a friend of each one of us, and I certainly know that I am included. In this debate he delivered one of the most widely publicized of his speeches in the Senate, and one of his most intemperate. At page 427 of the *Debates of the Senate* Senator Desruisseaux is reported as follows:

The report on mass communications is, as Michael Barkway said, glib, wordy and subjective.

[Hon. Mr. Davey.]

Many Canadians have said there are questionable sweeping judgments on some ill-defined criteria, with little stated evidence. Men in the trade, including many serious journalists and experienced administrators, brand it, as have some other Canadians, irresponsible, amateurish, self-indulging, tacky and flabby, lacking of discipline, purely subjective judgments, pretentious, pseudo-mod, and ghost pop writings.

I trust that honourable senators will understand, as the honourable Senator Desruisseaux will when he reads my comments in *Hansard*, that while my response is as tough and frank, I can assure you and Senator Desruisseaux that it will be no less cordial.

One of the causes of the senator's unhappiness derives from the fact that he was taken off our committee. He says so in so many words in his speech. Not so much that he was removed from the committee, but that he heard of it not from the chairman of the committee but from a third party—another senator. Not seeing Senator Desruisseaux at the time was, of course, unforgivable, although I did try to see him. Of course, he will know the difficulty each of us has had in getting together during the ensuing months. There is no excuse for not notifying Senator Desruisseaux personally of our decision. I can only apologize which, of course, I do. However, I most certainly do not apologize for the fact that the senator was removed from the committee, notwithstanding his solid background in media. Indeed, this self-same solid background in media was substantially the reason for his removal.

Let me explain. Very early in our deliberations, indeed before our hearings even began, the committee, for practical reasons, was reduced from 18 to 15 senators; three had to leave. While I concede that the senator's admitted expertise in media would have been useful on our committee, one rule of the Senate was explicit and very clear. Rule 84, which has since been amended, at the time read:

No senator who has any pecuniary interest whatsoever, not held in common with the rest of the Canadian subjects of the Crown, in the inquiry to be entrusted to any Select Committee, shall sit on such Committee, and any question of interest arising in the Committee may be determined by the Committee, subject to an appeal to the Senate.

In the course of the debate Senator Desruisseaux confirmed, as we knew at the time, that his one-time extensive media holdings had been substantially reduced, but at least a limited amount of what he has since divested himself did in fact remain. We had access to the Parliamentary Guide at the time, which listed, I believe, four separate media involvements of the senator. Perhaps some would argue, and perhaps Senator Desruisseaux might argue, that some fine question of timing entered into the picture, some determination of which media interest was dropped and when. Frankly, some of us felt differently.

First of all, given the nature of the study, what was the fact also had to appear to be the fact. Whether or not committee membership would have embarrassed