

program, caused great hilarity among the Progressive Conservatives. Let them laugh. When they were in power, they wanted to phase out the program. They wanted to prevent young Canadians from taking part in community projects, from learning to know their country and thus consolidating Canadian unity, because Katimavik does, in fact, help young Canadians to know more about their country, to go and work in three provinces and to become better citizens.

They did the same thing with Loto Canada and Petro-Canada. One gets the impression that to them when you are in doubt you abolish. They are also asking us not to indulge in advocacy advertising or advertising with a favourable bias. What about our ads against smoking, on the use of seatbelts, on Canada and tourism? There is certainly nothing more advocating than a travel ad which tells people: Come to Canada, spend your money in Canada, visit your own country! This is very advocating and certainly not merely factual. And this kind of advertising is looked on favourably by all Canadians, by all private businesses whose interests the hon. members opposite are supposed to represent and defend. The Canadian tourist industry is very pleased with the efforts made by the Canadian Government Office of Tourism.

We are being asked to reduce advertising expenditures by one third. In other words, the Progressive Conservative Party opposite feels that Canadian citizens are too well informed, that the amount of information they get should be limited, that, for instance, they should not be told that they can save up to 30 per cent under a program for home repairs and improvements, that they should not be told that they can get grants from the Department of the Secretary of State to help them celebrate Canada Day on July 1, or that if they are having problems with urea formaldehyde foam insulation, they should apply for government assistance, or, for instance, about physical fitness and amateur sport programs, in fact, a whole series of programs that would otherwise be available only to those who are well-off, the friends of our neighbours on the opposite side. It is all very well to say that it is the member's responsibility, but it is perfectly true that hon. members do not have a propaganda machine like the members opposite, so that they can contact every citizen on the subject of government programs. Four bulk mailings are hardly adequate to inform everyone about what is going on.

And what about people who cannot read? I see here in the House a member from the Calgary area where there are 70,000 people who have reading problems. Do we tell these people: You cannot have access to information, you cannot have access to government programs? There is a case where television should be used to give people access to the government, because they may not have had the privilege of an education, like so many others. And that is what the Progressive Conservatives are asking us to abolish. Do not talk to those people, make it a very elitist proposition for people who are going to read *Hansard* or who can afford cablevision to

Supply

watch today's proceedings. Frankly, I find it shameful that the Progressive Conservatives should be pressing for that. And once again, we know theirs is the party of the privileged, theirs is the party of the elite, and they do not want us to be accessible to one and all. I am sorry but I cannot go along with these attempts at trying to make the government accessible only to a privileged minority, a minority which in many cases they represent. Obviously, the big oil companies are not going to have any problems getting information on legislation, but I am not so sure my constituents in St. Joachim can afford a trip to Ottawa to get information on the home insulation program or get to know about the Farm Credit Corporation's programs. I really think it is tantamount to asking the government to renege on its responsibilities in a democratic participatory system.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock.

At 6 o'clock, the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When the House rose at 6 o'clock, the hon. member for Shefford had the floor.

Mr. Lapierre: Mr. Speaker, when the House took recess at six o'clock, I was saying how inconsistent, meaningless and above all harmful the Progressive Conservatives' proposals are in this debate, for the ordinary citizen who, in these difficult times, should be able to avail himself fully of government services and programs. This points to the value of and need for large-scale advertising which will give Canadians the opportunity to keep abreast of and fully benefit from government services. The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe has suggested the government should, at this time, reduce its advertising expenditures by a third or so or, according to his estimates, by some \$20 million. I then pointed out that the effect of his proposal would be that the less privileged citizen, who does not necessarily have direct access to the government, or read all the press clippings, and may not know his Member of Parliament personally, would not be in a position to know about government programs if they were not advertised.

Again, the hon. member asked that the government make opinion polls public. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, for having witnessed this a number of times, the Minister of Justice or other ministers in charge have tabled government opinion polls in this House, and hon. members have made abundant use of them. The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe is requesting that we make them public immediately. It is my view that in the policymaking process it may be important for the government to refer to a poll to establish its policies, and table it afterward, as is now the