

Suprisingly enough, our proposal for a press ownership review board found support from the press. The *Ottawa Citizen* of December 10 finds it "a positive proposal," which would provide "machinery at once more specific and more flexible to deal with the special problems of press ownership than that which is now available under the Combines Act". The *Globe and Mail* of December 10 finds the recommendation "a good one", and Claude Ryan was in favour of this particular recommendation. The *Toronto Star* of December 10 explains its support in the following terms:

The proposal—does not stem from any conviction that chain newspaper ownership is necessarily bad. The committee finds the arguments for and against chains very closely balanced, and believes as the *Star* does that a chain newspaper is better for a city or town than no newspaper at all (which is sometimes the alternative).

As far as our recommendations on *Time* and *Reader's Digest* are concerned—and with which I shall deal in some detail in just a few moments—the *Toronto Telegram* was one of those who came out flatly against curtailing the advantages, though the discussion on this issue was not widespread, and carried three items dealing with it. It is a curious posture for the *Telegram* when one considers the position on broadcasting taken before the committee. However, Ron Haggart and Dalton Camp both commented favourably on removing these privileges.

Our recommendation, however, was endorsed by the *Edmonton Journal* of December 11 in these words:

Many feel that this would give Canadian magazines a new opportunity to get on their feet and this newspaper has supported this position.

This particular recommendation was also supported on December 11 by the *Ottawa Journal* in the following words:

But in general there is a welcome atmosphere of help for the underdog in the report. We admire its endorsement of Grattan O'Leary's support nine years ago of small Canadian magazines against *Time* and *Reader's Digest*.

The *Calgary Herald* of December also supported our recommendation in these words:

The committee is on more solid ground in advocating removal of special tax privileges for *Time* magazine and *Reader's Digest*—certainly, this form of competition for Canadian advertising dollars can be considered inimical to successful domestic magazine publication.

Needless to say the *Toronto Star* supported the proposal for their oft-repeated nationalistic reasons, both in their main editorial on December 10 and again in a special editorial on December 14, but the *Globe and Mail* came out particularly strongly in favour of this recommendation, not for nationalism's sake, but "to attack special privilege". They have, they say, fought these privileges since they were first proposed, and feared that

the measures would be ineffective. They quote the following figures in favour of their argument:

Ten years ago *Time* and the *Digest* accounted for 43 per cent of the advertising revenue received by all major consumer magazines in Canada. By 1969 they had built their share up to 56 per cent. And it wasn't just the national Canadian magazines that were under fire. *Time* was publishing 12 regional editions on a regular basis, so that it was skimming off not only national advertising but local advertising that might have gone to regional Canadian magazines. The legislation designed to protect Canadian magazines had been vastly more effective in protecting *Time* and the *Digest*. Indeed, by executing their U.S. competitors, it had placed them in the unique position of being the only magazines in the country which got most of their editorial matter cheap, from across the border, and thus were in a unique, preferred position to compete with Canadian magazines. To oppose this was not to favor nationalism but to attack special privilege.

That, of course, could be considered an example of some of the more positive newspaper editorial comment from across the country.

I wish now to turn to the debate on this report which has already taken place in this chamber. I intend to comment specifically on some issues and some speeches, and most especially those that were critical of the committee or of its recommendations. I will content myself with only three general observations. The first is comment on the quality of the debate in this chamber.

As far as I am concerned it has been most encouraging. Keen insight into the workings of the media has been evidenced by many speakers. I was also encouraged by the degree of involvement. About 20 per cent of our membership have participated in the debate. I am also extremely grateful for the many generous remarks which were made in my direction.

I wish Senator Flynn were in the chamber. Perhaps Senator Macdonald will assure him that I was flattered by his description of me, of which he has the copyright, as a slave driver.

I have read each speech given in the debate and I have read most of them several times. Although it is tempting to comment on each speech, this obviously would not be possible. Senator O'Leary is well aware of my profound respect for him. I have mentioned it on a number of occasions and in a number of places. Also, although he may reject it on the spot, he has my affection. For that reason I was especially pleased that he began his remarks in the debate in the way that he did. I remind the house of what Senator O'Leary said in his opening remarks:

—my first word must be to say that I think on the whole, the inquiry undertaken by Senator Keith Davey into the Mass Media has been a good thing. I think it has been a good thing because, on the whole, it rescued the press from a state of complacency and euphoria in which it had dwelt all too long. Socrates once said that the unexamined life was unfit to be