

ing of the Information Canada bookstore. There are two things that distress me with respect to this announcement. First of all, listed in the corner is "Mass Media, Report of the Special Committee, three volumes \$13.50". What is missing is the statement that Volume I is the report, which I would hope most Canadians can read and which can be obtained separately for only \$3.50 instead of three volumes at \$13.50. If that was not enough, on the day this advertisement appeared in the three Toronto daily newspapers the report was not available at the Information Canada bookstore in Toronto.

I had a really difficult time finding out how many copies have been printed and how many sold. We found out this morning that a third printing of this report has now been completed in response, I understand, to a heavier demand than Information Canada had expected. I do know that a number of private bookstores across the country were in fact prepared to stock the report. They were not, of course, approached by Information Canada. I wonder why? Ultimately a few private bookstores in the Toronto area stocked the report because of my own initiative in making sure they received copies. It is not a very attractive track record and I hope, Senator Croll, that you will not say you have not been warned when the time comes to table the report of the Special Senate Committee on Poverty.

There is one footnote I would like to insert with respect to Information Canada. I was concerned to read the following in the current issue of *Marketing*:

The Federal Government's proposed advisory board on advertising does not intend to discourage presentations from U.S.-owned agencies with Canadian branches.

Information Canada director-general Jean Louis Gagnon said the function of the advisory panel—to be incorporated within IC—will be to guide government departments in the best possible ad spending direction.

Mr. Gagnon was asked about presentations from U.S.-owned agencies, and he replied:

If they have the Canadian outlets which can work efficiently and can provide a practical and economic service then they will not be discouraged by our panel,—

I would be curious to learn in time from the Government Leader if the Director-General of Information Canada was speaking for himself or, in fact, voicing Government policy. I hope it is not the latter, given the fact that in the report we dwell on our concern about the Americanization of Canadian advertising.

Let me say in summary that I think Information Canada is an excellent concept. It is staffed, to my understanding, by sincere, capable people who still need, however, to find some way of putting it all together.

Before I turn to the debate in the chamber it might be useful to recall what I conceive to be the posture of our report, and then perhaps turn momentarily to a discussion of how the report has been received across the country. As you know, we really had three concerns. The

[Hon. Mr. Davey.]

first of these was to achieve, and find ways and means of encouraging, a multiplication of media voices. We were concerned when our research informed us that 66 per cent of the daily newspapers in Canada and almost 50 per cent of the television and broadcasting stations are involved in some form or other of common or concentrated ownership. As I said many times, I do not believe that most owners and managers of the mass media in Canada lack a sense of responsibility or tolerance for a diversity of views. I do not believe that there is a small group of men who gather for breakfast every morning and decide what it is they will make the Canadian people believe on that particular day. Emotion often outruns the evidence of those who argue a conspiracy theory of propagandists' manipulation of the masses. On the other hand, one reason evidence is so hard to come by is that the media tend to give less publicity to their own abuses than, say, to those of politicians. The media operate as a check upon other institutional power centres in our country; there is, however, no check upon the media.

Just as it is a mistake to overstate the existence and potential for abuse, so in my judgment it is a mistake to ignore the evidence that it has existed.

With that background, as I am sure honourable senators will realize, we proceed to a series of recommendations, which included such matters as a publications loan development fund and a press ownership review board. The first part of the posture concerned ways and means of achieving a multiplication of media voices. Secondly, we wanted to bring forward ideas which would result in an escalation in the quality of all the media voices and all the messages of those voices. I think that inevitably this brought us to a very significant judgmental conclusion with regard to the quality of media voices. What, in fact, is a good newspaper; what is a good radio station; what is a good television station? As honourable senators will recall, we decided that it is one which is preparing its audience for the onslaught of social change. I would like to deal with that in just a moment or two.

However, the committee also believed that freedom of the press must be accompanied by responsibility of the press, the press being the first source of responsibility and the public the second source. Some may argue that if press and public cannot make newspapers perform as they should, then government should intervene to make sure that the press behaves responsibly. A glaring weakness in that theory, however, is that it makes the mistake of invoking government as the guarantor of freedom. Responsibility must come from within and not be imposed from outside.

One thing was very clear from our research, and that was that the media collectively and on the average, because of their profitability, possessed the resources to do much better. As you know, in Volume II we outlined these resources in considerable depth. Canada's newspapers by and large aspire to quality. Where they differ is in performance. If there is a distinction to be made in this respect, it lies in the extent to which commercial considerations affect editorial excellence. A newspaper is a business. It must pay or perish. The desire to make money and the desire to make a good newspaper are not