

kind of exchange in this chamber, because it brings more life into the debate. I am sorry that I provide the occasion for it tonight, and I hope that others will have their turn.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: They will.

Hon. Mr. Lamontagne: I can promise the honourable Leader of the Opposition that when he makes what he thinks is an important speech in the future I will try to meet him on the same ground.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: I shall love it. I look forward to it.

Hon. Mr. Lamontagne: What I was saying when I was so abnormally interrupted was that the power the civil servants used to have, from now on they will have to share more and more with other sources of influence and eventually, I would hope, as I will mention in a few moments, with Parliament. But for the time being I am just trying to make the point that the intellectual community more and more will have something to say about the formulation of political platforms in this country. I think that events in Canada over the past ten years have proved my point very clearly. As a result of this greater influence of the intellectual community, and also of the people, the politician himself will not necessarily be more responsible for the formulation of policy than he was before. If we are not careful he will only have new masters.

As I was saying, the new pattern for the preparation of political platforms is already set. It involves the consultation of the public by taking polls and conducting motivation surveys, in order to know the priorities of its needs and preoccupations, and also, more and more frequently, the calling of a thinkers' conference to determine how those priorities can best be met. Resolutions based on this preliminary work will then be adopted in a more or less modified form by national conventions, and become the official platform of our political parties. Thus, the public, without really knowing it, and the intellectual community will become new sources of political influence and will play an increasing role in the selection and formulation of new policies.

Another new source of political influence which is reducing the role of federal civil servants is represented by aggressive provincial governments, reinforced by their own Establishment. The active participation of provincial governments in the elaboration of federal policies, through frequent federal-pro-

vincial meetings and continuing consultation between officials, has been growing, especially since 1963, under the auspices of co-operative federalism.

There is another important new force which has been competing with civil servants to influence ministers and governments, and it is, broadly speaking, the press or the so-called mass media. If the correspondent of the *Economist*, quoted at the beginning of my remarks, was right when he said that the cabinet had become "something of an outward show", then the main objective of a minister who wanted to be successful and to remain in the show was to try to develop and maintain a good public image. Save the surface, and you save all. Hence, the growing importance for a minister to be friendly with reporters, and to have an efficient executive assistant and public relations officers.

Hon. Mr. Martin: That article in the *Economist* was written in 1947, was it not?

Hon. Mr. Lamontagne: Yes.

Here again, substantial changes have taken place. In the past, the relationship between ministers and the means of communication was quite different. Television and even radio were not established as influential image-makers before the mid-fifties. The press had a partisan approach to politics. Its owners, generally speaking, were closely identified with a political party, and they made sure that their newspapers and their reporters faithfully reflected the publisher's political views. In that context, the public image of the politician was largely determined by the good or bad relationship which existed between his political party and individual publishers. Once that relationship had been defined, ministers could do very little about their own personal image. It was not, therefore, one of their main daily preoccupations.

The philosophy of the mass media has changed drastically in the last few decades. They have become businesses, and competition among them is acute. Party affiliation has disappeared, or it barely survives in the editorial page. The number of readers and audience ratings have become the golden rule. In addition, there is the cynical assumption that the public has a strong preference for sensation.

This new situation led to a new code of ethics for reporters. From now on, they did not have to reflect the political views of their employers. Thus, they were able to transmit their own in their articles. The thing they