



The Yellow Journal is an independent non-profit service to the people of Metropolitan Toronto funded by the Government of Canada's Opportunities for Youth Program. It is a non-partisan fortnightly review of the quality and accuracy of the local press. Signed articles represent the opinions of their authors. Unsigned articles represent the policy of the paper. No material in The Yellow Journal may be reprinted without the written permission of the paper. Copyright Toronto 1974

Offices: City Hall Campus, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, 10th floor, 465 Bay St., Toronto. Telephone: 363-9519 Mailing Address: The Yellow Journal, R.P.I./H-10, 50 Gould St., Toronto, Ontario,

Circulation: 2000

# ANATOMY OF A NEWS EMPIRE

BY BERNARD BIRMAN

It is not unusual for a politician to buy a newspaper. The Bassett family (Conservative party members) have owned not only a large number of dailies including the now defunct *Telegram*, but also the CTV television network. Subtly they have controlled a slice of the media for years.

A short time before the Federal election, a small community newspaper was bought for the sole purpose of furthering the aspiring political aims of a wealthy individual, Mr. Pat Bourgeois. If

such a practice spreads, this incident will have become one of the most influential precedents in Canadian media's history.

Mrs. Judy Durkee, once editor of the *Ajax Guardian*, had been put into a position where she believed she had to resign. Admittedly, during an interview I had with her, she felt Bourgeois had never made demands although he has tried to get Mrs. Durkee to lean towards the Liberals. The actions taken by Bourgeois in having Norman Cafik (the Liberal incumbent) elected convinced Mrs. Durkee that matters would

get much worse when Bourgeois decided to run for provincial parliament himself.

Before Bourgeois had purchased the *Ajax Guardian*, the public had a growing respect for the newspaper. A variety of people ranging from young people to Kinsmen had been pleased with Mrs. Durkee and the rest of the editorial staff's work. Wayne Ventree, former owner of the paper had sold it because he had debts he was responsible for and preferred to avoid a partnership with Bourgeois.

In an interview I had with the General Manager of the *Ajax Guardian*, Mr. William Nunnally, he felt that Bourgeois had bought the paper as an investment to have community news and to give people's viewpoints not normally heard. Mrs. Durkee felt that he had used the paper as a means to unfairly subject the community to his partisan opinions. Bourgeois had criticized her editorial policy of "Vote one but Vote" as being too fair. Mr. Nunnally claimed that the paper was not bought for political reasons despite a statement made previously by Bourgeois himself, to a *Toronto Daily Star* reporter that "I bought the paper for straight political reasons because I'm running for MPP next year." (July 4, *The Star*).

Mrs. Durkee claimed that Bourgeois is obsessed with politics. During a meeting concerning business connected with the newspaper he would still continually talk politics.

Mr. Nunnally stated that expecting Pat Bourgeois, president of that area's Liberal riding, to be impartial would add a credibility gap, "Like being a little bit pregnant, either you are or you aren't." Nunnally claimed that the paper was not a Bourgeois-Liberal house organ because, as a result of the editorial policies of other local newspapers, the *Guardian* was giving a voice to those not normally heard. Mrs. Durkee stated that Nunnally and Bourgeois were very discriminate in having the paper print letters sent in by known Liberals. Bourgeois wanted to hire a known Liberal supporter as a writer for the *Guardian* simply because that person was writing pro-Liberal letters to the newspaper. Before Bourgeois had bought the paper it had been in Mrs. Durkee's opinion, "a people's paper."

Mrs. Durkee had first met Bourgeois after being introduced by a journalist friend. He said that one day he was going to take over Queen's Park, so that he was not taken seriously by her at the time. After Bourgeois had purchased the paper, on July 1st, Mrs. Durkee and the rest of the staff had worked all night in

preparing an election editorial for Thursday's edition. Bourgeois was to show up at 9:00 A.M. to see it but instead came at 10:00 P.M. After looking at the finished work he decided to replace the theme of "Vote one but Vote" to "Vote Norm Cafik".

When I had asked Nunnally why he felt Judy Durkee had quit the paper, he replied that she had some personal problems to attend to and that she had a conflict of interest, since she was sitting on the Board of Directors for the *Whitby Free Press*. Mrs. Durkee replied that she had no extraordinary personal problems. She used to actually own the *Whitby Free Press* but it too is now being run by a wealthy business man. Over one and a half years ago she had left the *Whitby Free Press'* Board of Directors. She hasn't been there since and she doesn't even know who is presently on the Board.

Mr. Nunnally felt that Bourgeois would lose his credibility if he criticized the Liberal party. Interestingly enough he has already lost his credibility with his newspaper staff and some of the most influential Liberals in the riding. Bourgeois has lost his entire editorial staff. They had walked out because they did not like being dictated to. In a *Star* interview Bourgeois claimed that Mrs. Durkee and the staff had been fighting like cats and dogs for three weeks. According to Mrs. Durkee there had been no problem between her and the staff. The former owner had stayed with the sales department and had even planned to steal the newspaper accounts as a result of altercations with Bourgeois. Mrs. Durkee explained that both Mr. Nunnally and Bourgeois were passing this excuse around in order to protect themselves.

The *Toronto Star* ran a story on the *Guardian* a few days before the entire staff quit (only the former owner and the typesetter are left). There were attempts to hush this up. Nunnally commented, "We would be fools to hire anybody who wasn't a Liberal, after this has happened."

Mrs. Durkee expressed surprise that Mr. Nunnally had agreed to speak with me. If Nunnally had said something damaging to the press she felt Bourgeois would have been very vocal about it. One reason I may not have been able to speak to Bourgeois might have been indicated when Nunnally had told two former staff members that Bourgeois had made a fool of himself and has done it other times. Mr. Nunnally had left the

(NEWSPAPER EMPIRE", PAGE 2)

## Hit and run

# Sun coverage inspires fear

By SUSAN BIGELOW

Another example of sensationalistic journalism in none other than the *Sunday Sun*, has made the front page, complete with startling headlines and a full-size picture of the unfortunate victim of a hit-and-run accident. (July 14/74)

We are all aware of the dangers of the automobile and accidents of this type are not so unusual in a city of this size. According to Sergeant Macdonald of the metropolitan Toronto Police, the number of hit-and-run accidents on file for 1974 amount to 4,892 compared to 4,073 for 1973. Evidently, accidents involving hit-and-run drivers are on the increase and tragically becoming a platitude, although the *Sunday Sun* does not seem to realize that the death of 18 year old Holly Starkes is just another ill-fated mishap.

"HIT-RUN KILLER HUNTED," gives the impression of a massive police search for a maniac-murderer at large. The connotations of this caption are unhealthy. They tend to breed unwarranted fear into the minds of the public.

The *Sunday Sun's* article states that the victim was "struck with such force that it was at first thought she had been raped and murdered." The idea of a rape murder possibility turned out to be an overestimation on the part of the police. It is unnecessarily

printed in the opening paragraph. On first, a reader may not be able to differentiate between myth and reality. The fact remains that the victim was not raped and murdered, but hit by a car travelling approximately 65mph in a 25 mph zone. The damage to her body and clothes was the result of the high rate of speed at which the car

The emotional overplay of the victim's good character in the conclusion, could and should be dispensed with. The fact that Ms. Starkes, "a perfect lady," met her boss in the office a few days ago and greeted him with "a big smile" is irrelevant to the story.

In comparison, the *Globe and Mail* realizes the priority of this news piece by placing it on page 8 in a concise and factual article under the small printed heading of "Hit-And-Run Victim," although the *Globe* also sees it fit to filter in the image of a rape and murder.

The real seriousness of the matter is the idea that hit-and-run accidents do happen and only the *Star* seems to emphasize this point. Staff writer Cathy Berry includes in the conclusion of her summary, another recent incident of a hit-and-run, where Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Louttit of Logan Ave., were hit by a car while crossing at the Gerrard and Parliament intersection. In this case, however, the police were able to apprehend the driver after witnessing the accident.



Ward Seven News  
80 Winchester  
Toronto

# NEWSPAPER EMPIRE

United States to work for Bourgeois. Mrs. Durkee stated that Mr. Nunnally had been jailed in the United States for off-track betting connections and was very evasive about his past. "He has nothing in his name, not even his phone number." He has claimed he was a millionaire twice and has mentioned it several times. According to Mrs. Durkee, Nunnally had said in her presence at a wine and cheese party for Norm Cafik, that "I would kill for Pat." When she replied that this was ridiculous, and why would he kill, Nunnally stated that while he was in jail, Bourgeois had taken care of his wife and had taken his children for picnics. When she had asked Norm Cafik why he would associate with a man like that, Cafik explained that it was hard to get rid of such a man.

Mrs. Durkee stated that Bourgeois became president of the Ontario Riding Liberal Association because he stacked the nomination meeting with his friends (according to people connected to the Liberal riding). Eight or ten people quit the Liberal Committee because Bourgeois antagonized them. Mrs. Durkee continued on to say that Bourgeois spent \$50,000 on Norm Cafik's campaign. Nunnally said quite often that Bourgeois has said that "money was no problem." Bourgeois had also claimed that he has many relatives in the provincial civil service. He has said, "With all my relatives and Cafik's help, I will get elected," but he was unpopular with the Liberal party (according to highly placed local Liberals).

Bourgeois discovered that the last page of the Ajax Guardian had been sold to the Conservative candidate, Mrs. Joyce Bowerman. He threw a temper tantrum and declared that there was no way Joyce Bowerman would be on the last page of his newspaper. "Norm Cafik would have it." Bourgeois was reminded by the former owner and now member of his sales staff that the ad had been sold that way and the paper had been put in an embarrassing position to have to go back to P.C. headquarters and say they were sorry but they could not have that space. Bourgeois was reminded that the ad was paid for. It did go in but, said Mrs. Durkee, "I don't think it was on the back page." When this incident had occurred in the office, there was a dead silence in the room. The staff had realized that Bourgeois had been unfair. Mrs. Durkee then heard him say, "I can't afford the chance of the P.C.'s winning the election and not only that, there would be 1400 people that would be out of work." He may not have that many employees in his various businesses but he was trying to make amends for his dictatorial position on the P.C. ad. Bourgeois had felt, "I couldn't care if it was paid for or not."

Bourgeois wasn't interested in anything unless it concerned the election of a Liberal. One time an editorial was written about Bassett mentioning that he didn't live in this community and that he was sitting behind a polished desk in Toronto. Bourgeois thought it was about Norm Cafik who lived in Ottawa (he was originally from Pickering), since Bassett was not mentioned by name. Cafik felt that the P.C. and N.D.P. candidates should not have been mentioned in the same editorial in which he himself was discussed. He felt that the P.C. and N.D.P. candidates could not even stand up on their own merits. Mrs. Durkee was sounded out for being too liberal in her compliments to the other two candidates despite the fact that she had mentioned that Cafik was hard working. Cafik, despite being

known as a politically cool person, became angry at Mrs. Durkee. Although he told her in a telephone conversation that he felt she was a very talented writer, "I still disagree with the editorial."

Cafik was told that with Judy Durkee leaving, it would be the Guardian's loss, and he agreed. Mrs. Durkee had told him, "Bourgeois doesn't know anything about politics." Norm Cafik laughed and followed, "I wouldn't tell him this but I have to agree with you."

Even Norm Cafik's press attache resigned because he felt that Bourgeois was too strong in his editorials. When the whole staff was about to walk out Cafik phoned Mrs. Durkee to say that "Bourgeois was overenthused" over what he did and he was sorry for the mess. Before and even after the election Cafik asked Judy Durkee if there was anything he could do to help her but he has done nothing from what she could see.

Mrs. Durkee stated that Cafik can get away with having a man like Bourgeois around because "Cafik deals with people on a personal level. He knows his capabilities and he knows how to turn people on."

Finally it is interesting to have a look at the circulation of the Ajax Guardian. It is a free paper with controlled distribution meaning that it is delivered from house to house with all of its revenue coming in from advertising. Before the paper was bought by Bourgeois, its circulation was 7,000. Since he bought the paper the amount of newspapers printed has increased to 18,000, but only 8,000 to 10,000 were delivered. It is not impossible to deliver 18,000 with a much improved staff and presently Bourgeois and Nunnally are trying to cover the Whitby market. Still trying to get rid of a leftover amount of 8,000 newspapers they are presently trying to persuade Pal-O-pak into recycling them.

Mrs. Durkee and I also discussed press coverage of her resignation. Since the story made a small front page article in the Star, she has gotten several job offers at other newspapers. She felt that there was concern shown by the press in presenting what had happened. Bourgeois denied to the Star that he had printed the editorial but the reporter saw the election newspaper and found out the real truth. "The Star reporter said that after seeing Bourgeois she believed me," Mrs. Durkee commented.

Mrs. Durkee had several opinions on the role of newspapers. "Newspapers are like a radio station but they should be a public service. A paper must have enthusiasm. It can't stand on the fence. It either goes this way or that." She believes that a newspaper must be fair and comprehensive.

Judy Durkee also had some comments to make on the fate of the Ajax Guardian. She felt that Bourgeois could have been the paper's president and still give good newspaper coverage. An amazing lack of bitterness was shown when she felt that if Nunnally and Bourgeois would give a voice to the people it would be nice, even though she was no longer with them. Unfortunately the paper went from professional to poorly done, a state she was simply sorry to see. "Bourgeois just doesn't know much about newspapers."

Mrs. Durkee has no disagreement with liberalism, "I'm against this incident going on in the Liberal party." On the paper's priorities, "If everyone knew the truth and elected Bourgeois during the provincial election, this would be fine but I

# How newspapers make mistakes

by PAMELA ROY

To what extent can a newspaper be relied upon?

The press has a responsibility to inform its readers truthfully on what is happening throughout the world. As a source of current information, it is an educating force with an immense amount of power in shaping public knowledge and opinion. Yet very few people not directly involved in journalism really know how this power is being handled. Newspaper credibility is largely a matter of trust.

The fact is that newspapers are susceptible to error. The goal of complete and unbiased reporting is impossible to achieve for a large-scale daily publication. All papers share the same weaknesses but the operation of *The Toronto Star* can serve as an example.

Some knowledge of how newspaper production takes place is necessary for an understanding of the difficulties involved. The volume and variety of material handled daily is staggering— an estimated half a million words flood *The Star's* newsroom by telephone, telegraph and cable within any 24-hour period. They represent, as former executive editor Mark Harrison has said, "A wondrous assortment of facts, opinions, rumours, predictions, propaganda and publicity." In a matter of hours, the significant material that must be sorted from the collection, edited, laid out in an appropriate part of the paper, headlined and printed.

Under these conditions, even the most rigorous scrutiny cannot prevent a certain amount of faulty reporting from going unnoticed.

Simple errors are, to some extent unavoidable. It has been estimated that in a single paragraph of factual material there are 10,000 ways of making a mistake. So when the three hundred people on *The Star* staff get together to write a completely new paper every day, there are bound to be slip-ups somewhere along the line. Editors often miss faults such as improper grammar and spelling, factual mistakes, and misquoted statistics.

Headlines are another common source of journalistic apology. It

think that the mayor and council (along with the Kinsmen club and feature articles on community people) are more important than an ambitious politician. Had he tried to sincerely put something into the newspaper other than politics and money that would be great. If he really wanted to serve Ajax-Pickering, he would do a better job by giving the people a fair and comprehensive paper."

Many of the people who have read this article have also read the Davey Report. It is imperative that people don't only read about such things going on but to actively oppose them. You must stop thinking that it only happens in a small far-away place. You might disagree with me. Perhaps you feel that Mr. Bourgeois is simply taking advantage of free enterprise but if you feel that there has been a serious obstruction of free speech, then you have been reached by this article but there is no reason to doubt that such occurrences will continue. It is my hope that you will do more than just read the article.

is not always possible to lucidly summarize the gist of a complicated article in a few words. Headlines can distort the meaning of a report, exaggerate its importance, or misrepresent the story. *The Star* has a policy of keeping punctuation to a minimum, especially in headings, on the grounds that it impedes the readers eye. This has occasionally resulted in ambiguous or misleading titles.

Authenticity may also be called into question on reports gained from sources who, for various reasons, refuse to be named. Sometimes the stories are legitimate and may incriminate the source, but there is always the possibility that the story may be fabricated. When independent proof is lacking, the credibility of a report is the editor's decision and it is published at his discretion.

Due to the nature of a daily newspaper's operation, therefore some print inaccuracies cannot be avoided. The fact remains, though that is a large amount of serious misrepresentation which can be controlled by a responsible newspaper and which can be completely eliminated.

In day-by-day coverage of local regional and national news the reporter relies heavily on his sources to supply him with correct information. All facts that are received by such channels possibly liable to error should be checked wherever possible. Negligence in this regard is not uncommon, resulting in inaccurate articles.

Hidden bias in a supposedly objective news report is more to be condemned than any flaw of a technical nature. The political and social power of the press to influence public thinking can be abused by unethical reporters through techniques subtle enough to escape detection by the average reader. When this sort of corruption is practiced, the paper ceases to function as an educator and becomes an instrument of propaganda.

Apparently objective news stories can manipulate the reader by means of inference and innuendo, stereotyping and facts loaded to favor one side of an issue. Mild examples of all of these occur in the most responsible papers, and some cases have been published in the *Star*. It is to the *Star's* credit however that it has pointed out many of them itself.

Basically, editors have to trust reporters and syndicates to research thoroughly and to write honestly. And basically.

The quality of the newspaper is dependent to the extent to which this trust is fulfilled.

Accuracy in international news is mainly beyond the direct control of the newspaper. A large percentage comes from news agencies such as the Associated Press, United Press International, and Reuter, or the news service provided by newspapers such as *The Washington Post*, *New York Times*, and the *London Observer*. Although they are highly respected organizations, the authenticity of reports derived from such sources cannot be verified by using their services.

Foreign affairs are generally difficult and sometimes impossible to check for accuracy. War reports in particular are notoriously distorted. The statistics released are invariably in favor of the side that is reporting. War correspondents are often unable to confirm details gathered under conditions of stress and turmoil.

# To probe, but not to pry

By definition, celebrities are the object of reader interest. Politics, the arts, communication, and high finance are fields in which there is no escaping the public view. One cannot enter those fields, or any demanding public exposure, without "living in a goldfish bowl".

While in Australia, Frank Sinatra, gave vent to his negative feelings toward the fourth estate.

Sinatra is a golf buddy of another critic of the press, former Vice-President Spiro Agnew. Where Agnew left off with antagonistic alliteration Sinatra has carried on with gutter language. Characterizing reporters as parasites and female reporters as "hookers of the press" Sinatra gave as good an impression as any of the "Ugly American". Apparently the act did not go over well down under. Australian trade Unionists held Sinatra virtual hostage, refusing fuel for his airplane or even room service.

This row is the latest in a series of demonstrations of contempt on Sinatra's part. It was just a couple of years ago that the middle aged crooner threw two dollars into the drinking glass of columnist Maxine Cheshire calling her a "two dollar broad". The reason for his rage was somewhat unclear then, as indeed it is now.

It is something of a dilemma that celebrities, especially in show business, harbor so enormous a resentment toward the press. It is that same press that they cultivate so tenderly during the long climb up the ladder. It is that same press which is often responsible for success. The expression "Sharper than a serpent's tooth" comes to mind.

It is this schizophrenic nature of celebrities that is most galling. Sinatra, for example has never shunned news coverage when it has suited his purpose. To the contrary he has sought it avidly. High priced public relations men find a place on his payroll for that very reason.

Of course, Sinatra is not the only entertainer to have a hypocritical attitude toward the press. He is merely chairman of the board.

Not all seek publicity. Some shun it. Who can forget Howard Hughes, sneaking out of back entrances, disguising himself and even being transported in a crate to avoid publicity? Newsmen were vigilant in pursuit. One could only feel sorry for Hughes. Wildly eccentric, he was wildly pursued in the face of his greatest eccentricity- his seeming pathological fear of public exposure. For a while it seemed he would never be left alone, as the media chased madly after a story that nobody else seemed to care about.

The press fascination with Hughes was as eccentric as Hughes himself. On the other hand, his extreme attempts to avoid publicity probably brought more of it than any other factor.

Not only individuals are objects of massive press exposure. Sometimes are harassed. That is uncalled for and unfair.

Probably no family has received as much publicity as the Kennedys. When one is in politics, that is to be expected. But by no means does all of the publicity related to the Kennedys involve politics. President Kennedy's administration captured the imagination of the public. The family has retained it. In many ways this is a misfortune for the heirs to Camelot.

It is rare for a dangerous driving conviction (fine-\$50 to \$100) to result in a notice in Time Magazine. But when you are a Kennedy anything is possible. In September 1973 Joseph Kennedy III age 20, learned this.

It is not only the printed word which plagues the Kennedys. A few years ago Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis found it necessary to go to court in order to restrain freelance photographer Ronald Galilee. Galilee seemed to have a fetish for photographs of Mrs. Onassis. With a clientele spanning LIFE, to THE NATIONAL ENQUIRER and camera in tow, Galilee pursued Jackie with the tenaciousness of a hound after a fox. The public was growing bored with the exercise.

In 1970 TIME compiled their list of ten greatest bores. Making the top ten was none other than Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis. TIME thought that all the publicity surrounding the former first lady was a drag. This was despite the fact that TIME had devoted as much unwarranted space to her as any publication.

Obviously, there is a need to re-define the criteria for newsworthiness. When one seeks publicity, one should be prepared to receive it. When there is legitimate public interest in a story, it must be served. But the press must avoid the role of voyeur for the masses.

## NOTE TO ALL READERS

If this newspaper was delivered to you, you have probably been placed on our permanent subscribers' list and will receive the remaining two issues of the *Yellow Journal*. If you like reading the paper call us at 363-9519, to be sure of your subscription's status. Let us know of any friends or associates who might find the *Yellow Journal* worth reading.

If you picked up the paper at one of our distribution spots, please continue to do so if you know you will be there regularly. Otherwise call us for assured delivery to your home or office.

It is our hope that all of the many libraries receiving copies are making them available to the public on reference shelves.

For back copies of the *Yellow Journal* send six cents in postage stamps for each copy of any issue required to: Circulation, *Yellow Journal*, RPI/H-10, 50 Gould St., Toronto.

## CREDITS

Editor: Allan Golombek. Associate Editor: Murray Miskin. Feature Writer: Pamela Roy. Layout and Reporting: Greg McMaster, Trish Irvin. Production and Reporting: Bernie Birman, Susan Bigelow. T.V. Producer and Reporter: Tim Johnston. Masthead by Ingrid Vellekoop.

The *Yellow Journal* announces that Allen Klarreich is no longer with our staff. Replacing Allen for this issue was Susan Bigelow. Susan may be rejoining our staff for our final paper.

The article on page two of our last paper entitled "Brazil: in businessmen get mixed reception", did not include the name of its author and thus appeared to be an editorial. The article was written by Greg McMaster.

## Crude allocation for U.S. market raised by 10.5%

The National Energy Board has allocated the export of 894,226 barrels a day of domestic crude oil to the U.S. market in August, up 10.5 per cent from July.

They're getting cruder every day!



The Yellow Kid Editorial Cartoon



AT 19 Dimmie Johnson of Houston, Tex., is the youngest ever Grand Dragon in the history of the Ku Klux Klan. Johnson, who has shoulder-length curly hair underneath that hood, was elected by the Texas Fiery Knights, a KKK splinter group hoping to revitalize the once violent, often feared and always secretive organization.

4 The Toronto Sun, Tuesday, July 16, 1974

# Press comments on election coverage

We asked three experienced newspapermen to evaluate press coverage of the federal election. Here then, are their comments.

Peter Worthington, executive editor of the *Toronto Sun*. "The press managed, as usual, to bore people to death. What pleases me is how people rejected the advice of the press by voting Liberal even though all three Toronto dailies urged them not to. There's some hope for the people. They seem intent on making up their own minds."

"The only ones that the *Sun* editorials convinced were the *Globe* and *Star*. It seems that press is out of touch with the people all of the time. But if I had to do it all over again, I wouldn't change a thing."

"By the way, the *Sun*'s man-in-the-street survey came out letter perfect- 2 to 1 for Trudeau." Roy McGregor, assistant editor of *Maclean's*. "Funny that the press, like (Charles) Lynch, predicted minority government and weren't even close. It could be that the pundits do too much thinking, or they just don't have the common touch. Maybe they just thought that the people were more interested in the election than they

really were. I think that most people make up their minds when they reach the polling booth."

Ron Haggart, CITY TV. "First of all I felt sorry for the press. The bulk of print news coverage was description of what leaders were doing, very little of what they were saying. It's easy to fault the press, but coverage is a product of necessity. If the press didn't report what the party leaders were saying, maybe it's because they weren't saying very much, or saying the same thing every night."

"Coverage was unincisive, dull. Tony Westell's piece the Saturday before the election was the exception. It was a simple, lucid comparison of what the leaders were saying, and demonstrating that neither Trudeau nor Stanfield were telling the truth consistently, but that Stanfield was more culpable because he claimed to be."

"What struck me was the fact that the *Star* endorsed the Conservatives editorially and their red-line headline on the Saturday before the election was favorable to Stanfield. The headline quoted Stanfield as claiming there was a PC tide. If the PC leader says that there is a PC tide, is that news. It is a non-event. One must be skeptical, on-guard while reading the *Star*"

# The Davey Report -

## FACT .. OR FICTION ?

This is the fourth and final article in a series discussing the report of the Special Senate Committee on Mass Media chaired by Senator Keith Davey.

By TRISH IRVIN

An awakening to the condition of Canada's mass media began in November, 1968, when the Special Senate Committee on Mass Media was formed by Senator Keith Davey.

The Committee cited a number of aspects of the media's structure and performance that were in need of improvement. The implementation of these proposals could only be done by the owners of the media and the people professionally engaged in the media.

In spite of this report to the Canadian people, the "Rip Van Winkles" of the media business still seem to reign supreme. Perhaps in this year of 1974 it is time to examine the influences and effects the Report has had on Canada's dozing media.

### FICTION

In 1972, the Ontario Press Council came into being. The council consists of 10 professionals from the newspaper sector and 10 from the public at large. The 10 members from the media are representatives of the 8 newspapers involved in the council, although all Ontario papers were invited to participate. A major function of the council is to consider complaints of the public against participating newspapers (and vice versa).

A possible parallel to the Ontario Press Council is the idea of a Press Ownership Review Board. The one basic guideline governing this board would be that "all transactions that increase concentration of ownership in the mass media are undesirable and contrary to public interest--unless shown to be otherwise".

In the 1st Annual Report of the Ontario Press Council, it was said that, "labour pains (for the birth of the Council) began after the report of the special Senate Committee on the mass media urged a national press council for Canada".

Self-evident in this report is the fact that there is no government intention to even initiate concern over media monopolies, much less do something about them, provincially or nationally. Keith Davey, in September '73, attacked the federal

government for not setting up the Press Ownership Review Board, claiming that in terms of media ownership, the situation was getting worse.

In the area of media ownership, Canada's press appears still fast asleep.

The *Time* and *Reader's Digest* issue is yet another bone of contention. The special privileges granted only to these two American magazines, allows them tax exemptions under Section 12(a) of the Income Tax Act.

Keith Davey, in 1970, the year the report came out, expresses hope that the government would repeal the exemptions granted to *Time* and *Reader's Digest*.

In 1972, in an article titled, "The Davey Report: In Retrospect," Senator Davey again expressed an optimistic attitude towards government action needed to implement the Committee's recommendation.

To date, *Time* and *Reader's Digest* are still given special exemption under Section 12 (a) of the Income Tax Act.

### FACT

The Senate Report held great aspirations for upgrading professionalism in the Field of journalism. This is an area where some dreams came true.

The *Toronto Star*, in an article of May 4, 1973, gave publicity to the new editorial division of the Canadian Daily Newspaper Publishers Association (CDNPA). The division's role would include "developing seminars and workshops for editors and reporters, to upgrade professional abilities". As William Galf, Managing Editor of the *Vancouver Sun*, put it: "It's time for us to have a hard look at our own editorial standards or wait for some government agency to do it by popular demand." It was also stated in the *Star* that the acceptance of this editorial division in a previously business-oriented association was an outgrowth of Senator Keith Davey's Report.

### A BEGINNING, FINALLY

The 260 page report voiced concern for Canadian media survival on every page. Yet, that concern has not been seen with the severity with which it was presented. Perhaps the mere existence of the Report itself is indicative of an unfolding awareness of the Canadian identity. But being enlightened is one thing, putting into practice is another.

## MAKING

## AMENDS

By MURRAY MISKIN  
Associate Editor

This time my column is as I promised it would be: "readers criticisms of The Yellow Journal's content." We have received a fair, although not overwhelming amount of response from people who like the paper and want to subscribe. Most comments were given by telephone or through personal contacts with reporters.

After the first issue was released an interesting letter came from Don Van Mierlo of The Thorncliffe Park Community Organization.

In addition to his request to remain on our mailing list Mr. Van Mierlo commented: "I believe that what you are trying to accomplish is close to impossible to attain. It would take a tremendous amount of money to really check on the media."

Therefore I suggest that you concentrate on a few items at a time. You could function like an auditor--Go into one area in great detail."

I agree and this is what we are trying to do.

In the second paper I asked for opinions on when, if ever, a newspaper should use foul language. One reader told me that it is an interesting question but offered no opinions. Mr. Hillary Gordon, a retired former reporter for the *Toronto World* and *Canadian Press* was surprised that it was such a major issue to us. There were no other comments and my conclusion is that this is not an important issue among our readers.

Mr. Gordon believed the features to be too long and therefore unreadable. Remembering how bad yellow journalism was, he does not like the name of our paper which is certainly not a "Yellow Journal."

### Assorted Comments:

- story on headlines in first issue was "petty and immature"
- no sources given in feature on yellow journalism
- stories show biases of reporters
- good editorials
- important points raised in this column
- not enough in-depth reporting in some news stories
- all-round improvement with each succeeding issue

In the last issue a request for subscribers entitled: "What kind of person reads The Yellow Journal?" was heavily criticized by our staff as being unnecessary and badly written crass commercialism. It was written at the last minute by the editor as a filler and did not go through our editing process. It should never happen again.

Send your comments to: Just Another Yellow Journal, R.P.I./H-10, 50 Gould St., Toronto, or call 363-9519.

## ISLAND JAM-UP

By TIM JOHNSTON

In the third issue of the *Yellow Journal*, the paper's feature writer, Pam Roy, researched the Toronto Island issue and how it has been covered by the press. This well documented article raised many valid questions and gave readers another perspective on the issue.

There is another issue concerning that same piece of real estate, that for the most part was given the brush by the Metro papers even after it seemed to reach a climax on Dominion Day and the weekend of the CHIN international picnic.

The line up for the Ferries on most weekends is just too long to make the trip worthwhile for most people. Aside from being uncomfortable, hassling with crowds to get on board a Ferry to the islands can be dangerous. The closer you come to boarding the more packed it gets.

The *Globe and Mail* was the only major paper to convey a clear picture of the trying time people had. It illustrated the anxiety one mother suffered caring for her three month old baby before she gave-up and took the child home. The story also gave good coverage to the degradation that develops in tightly packed masses of human flesh: "Lady, if you touch me again, push me again, I'll punch you out."

It may be that the *Sun* and the *Star* thought that the election was the only story, at that time. As the *Globe* stated, Margaret Trudeau wasn't really in tune with what was happening that day. If ever there was a good argument put forward about the blindness of the political elite due to their position in society, well, Margaret Trudeau said it all and the *Globe and Mail* was the only paper that didn't make you read it between the lines.

When one *Yellow Journal* staff member was being squished onto a Hanlan's Point Ferry and fell against an older woman, he quickly apologized. A Ferry man was standing above the crowd and overheard. Looking over what might dubiously be called a sea of humanity he said prophetically, "It can't be helped."