

The fact is that this country's energy future isn't being managed, its being mismanaged.

Thus, the government found the necessity to spend \$4 million on an advertising program to try to convince the Canadian people to the contrary. Again, from the *Halifax Chronicle-Herald*, dated August 1, 1980, it is stated:

According to the federal government there is no energy crisis in Canada, and Ottawa is undertaking to spend \$4 million between now and next April to convince Canadians of the fact.

"Its part of a long-term reorientation of people's thinking", exclaims Peter Craske, director of communications for the energy department.

Please, Mr. Speaker, let me read that to you again to substantiate a statement which really does not need substantiation, on behalf of the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington). The article stated:

"It's part of a long-term reorientation of people's thinking," explains Peter Craske, director of communications for the energy department.

That was a pretty potent statement by a pretty authoritative individual as to the objective of this kind of advertising. Further on in the article it states:

The federal government has a great deal of explaining to do. Perhaps we are about to see the institution of a new propaganda department to be known, no doubt, as Propaganda Canada or, for short, as PropCan. With \$4 million, it ought to be possible to prop something up. Dare one hope that it will be done in a proper fashion?

I submit to Your Honour that the accusations, the charges which have been made by hon. members on this side of the House are rather mild as compared with the interpretation which the press put on this propaganda structure as early as 1980.

Mr. Lapierre: It's their life.

Mr. McCain: Call the press liars. You cannot call me one, because it would not be parliamentary. But you can call the press liars. They will appreciate it.

Mr. Lapierre: I did not say that. I said that is what makes them alive.

● (1740)

Mr. McCain: That is the mentality that some people would apply to a structure such as this. I will return to the *Kitchener-Waterloo Record* of April 23, 1982. It goes on to read:

Apparently assuming that if you repeat something often enough folks may actually believe it, the Trudeau government has launched a \$5 million ad campaign proclaiming it is "Helping Canada Work"—

Somehow, Canada's 1.2 million unemployed, its struggling businessmen and farmers and its consumers trying to make ends meet, have trouble seeing a humming economy. What they see, instead, is a tired old government devoid of ideas, pouring out tax dollars as a screen for inaction and incompetence.

It is funny how quickly members opposite are so anxious to take issue with statements by members on this side of the House but are silent when one reads from the press of this nation. I now quote from the April 15, 1982, edition of *The Globe and Mail*:

The federal government is spending \$5 million on an advertising campaign—the message being proclaimed is Helping Canada Work—at a time when unemployment is at the highest level since 1940 and more than 1.2 million people are unable to find jobs.

Supply

Business, labour and consumer representatives have reacted angrily to the ads, condemning the campaign as a complete waste of taxpayer's money and an insult to those who are unemployed.

Shirley Northrup, policy director for the Consumers Association of Canada, said in an interview yesterday that "we are appalled and outraged that the federal government is spending more money on yet another advertising campaign . . . The funds could have been put to better use."

Going to 1981, I will quote from the *Ottawa Citizen* of Wednesday, March 11:

Federal officials are sketching in the details of a proposed \$3.25 million advertising campaign aimed at promoting the National Energy Program, despite the controversy sparked by a similar proposal last year.

Obviously the writer, Jim Travers of Southam News, does not approve of this. He writes:

Energy advertising became controversial last year when a leaked memo revealed the government was planning a very aggressive campaign to sell the NEP.

The memo indicated that the government intended to use the campaign for politics as well as policy.

It pointed out that Canadians were more concerned about energy problems than the Constitution and that the government would have to deal with the oil problem quickly if it hoped to win public support for patriation.

I now quote from an article by Lindsay Scotton of the *Toronto Star*. This clipping does not bear a date. It is headlined "Drop in the bucket". It reads:

And this lavish display of a government congratulating itself at taxpayers' expense is just a drop in the bucket in terms of the Liberals' ongoing romance with "concept" advertising. . . . the government has plans to spend more than \$70 million on advertising within fiscal 1982-83. The minister responsible for government advertising, Gerald Regan, says this will allow the government "to see to it that the public knows of government programs, of government proposals and of government policies."

His boss, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, put it more succinctly when he said that governments use advertising to promote the "policies, advantages and glories" of their jurisdictions.

The traditional role of government advertising is to provide information on services or to advise of changes in regulations. But the current thinking of the ruling Liberals on advertising and its uses is somewhat more sophisticated. Its publicity campaigns have taken on the noxious odour of propaganda—

"I don't think that the government should have to wait until a bill is passed in the House," says Gerald Regan, chairman of the cabinet communications committee that assesses the need for advertising in a particular area.

Does that mean the government is indulging in advocacy advertising, by pushing a single, and often controversial, point of view on the public? "I don't think I could define it with any degree of exactitude," says Regan, "What's unacceptable is advertising that is obviously politically partisan."

That is the end of Mr. Regan's quotes. The article continues:

That must mean that subtle political partisanship is okay, because that is exactly what is going on. The Liberal government has decided that advertising is the best way to keep and expand its market share of voter support, and is as determined as any soft-drink manufacturer to keep 'em coming back for more.

It sounds like a Ringling Brothers-Barnum & Bailey production about all those suckers. You get a new one every day. Let us hope the public of this nation will not be sucked in.

I wish I had the time to go through the committee reports and report on some of the questions which have been asked of the minister responsible for the program. It seems to come under the budget of the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr.