

Today the Secretary of State referred to the Canadian Media Corporation. I would remind him that the Liberal government created this by putting together four Liberal advertising agencies. The information that he put on the record in his speech today certainly needs to be corrected. If he wants a further reference he should read the testimony in issue No. 66 of the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates. His colleague the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Blais) appeared before that committee and put that information on the record. The minister should not shake his head at me but should go and talk to his colleague about this.

When the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty) was in office and was responsible for advertising, he did everything he could to bring the \$60 million budget down to \$45 million. There was a retrenchment of advertising, particularly in the advocacy area. Every time a request was received from Treasury Board, two questions were asked. The first was whether the project was necessary, and if that could not be answered satisfactorily the project was disallowed. The other question was whether the PC Party should be carrying out the project. That is one of the great differences between what happened in the short period of time this party was in government and what is happening today with the quarter billion dollar information service. Advocacy advertising is running up to \$70 million and this year, with the supplementary estimates, it may hit \$100 million.

Some government advertising campaigns are designed to take control of energy debates, to take control away from what we do in the House in terms of getting information out to the public and retain that control through action, leadership and advertising. That is what the government is trying to do with the National Energy Program. The advertising says that it wants to remove energy from the list of high-ranking national concerns. It gets value for its money, Mr. Speaker. That is why we get all these full-page advertisements about energy, how marvellous the government is and the great things it is doing. I do not know why it cannot use the TV cameras, *Hansard* and the press gallery that is full every day. But that is not good enough for the government. People hear and see and read what these geniuses do with their tax dollars and it is creating anger. The government thinks it can put that anger down with advocacy advertising that is about as dishonest as the rhetoric it gives us in this House.

The former president of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce—he has now resigned that post—is a very great Canadian and a very great Liberal. He used to be an old-fashioned kind of Liberal but now I believe he fits into the neo-Conservative slot. Mr. Stanley Roberts has been in the riding of Capilano making speeches, trying to see if Capilano might be available to him as a Liberal candidate. I hear that he has now gone to Lachine and that the hon. member for Lachine (Mr. Blaker) is rather concerned that he has a nomination battle on his hands now because Mr. Stanley Roberts wants to

Supply

be the new leader of the Liberal Party of Canada. Referring to the advocacy advertising of the Department of Employment and Immigration, he said that the money should have been used for manpower training and added that the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) claims that he does not have enough money for job training but then spends this kind of money on advertising. One has to wonder about his priorities, he said. That is the opinion of Mr. Stanley Roberts, the potential new leader of the Liberal Party of Canada.

Mr. Regan: He has as much chance as you have of being the leader of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Huntington: My colleague the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe told the House that Crown corporations are spending over and above the \$70 million on advocacy advertising and that we have no control over it. The advertisements tell us what a wonderful country this is, what a great job Petro-Canada is doing with all the new oil it has brought into being, and how the national energy reserve has been expanded. It is all hogwash, Mr. Speaker. Yet these Crown corporations that now have agency status are outside the purview of the law. They are untouchable. A whole subgovernment has been created and it is beyond our touch, purview and control. There is no control over it by Parliament.

The government will not bring in a Crown corporations act or an information act. It wants secrecy. It wants to impose its propaganda on an apathetic Canadian public. That is what advocacy advertising is—it is propaganda.

Last Thursday I had the unpleasant task of completing my income tax reform—I mean my return. After completing my return I want income tax reform, Mr. Speaker. It made me so angry that I could no longer stay on the Hill and had to go for a long walk to get free of this environment. I am paying for these full-colour advertisements which cost \$16,000 every time they are printed. And what do they tell me? They do not tell me anything. That is your advocacy advertising, Mr. Speaker.

• (1700)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tousignant): Order, please. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre) on a point of order.

Mr. Lapierre: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that our hon. colleague, with his experience and during his long walks outside the Parliament buildings, reflect on the rules of the House which are preventing him from taking undue advantage of this instrument we call a camera and from trying to exhibit all kinds of documents.

[*English*]

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I understand what the hon. member is saying, I think, but is it not interesting that they spend \$16,000 each time this is printed to show it to the people of the country, and you cannot show it in the House?