

Supply

prior to Parliament's taking a position. We see that there is a striking break with the past, even in terms of the policy stated by previous ministers.

What was so striking about the speech given by the Secretary of State, who has responsibility for federal advertising, was that in one breath he condemned private sector advertisers who engaged in advocacy advertising. He said to them and bluntly, "We want you to know that advocacy advertising cuts no ice with the Government of Canada." Then in the next breath he said that the government sees its responsibility as promoting policies even before Parliament has passed judgment and at a time when they are only the policies of the Liberal Party, and the government feels free to use tax dollars to do that.

As another example of self-serving government advertising, on Remembrance Day, the day before the federal budget, the Government of Canada spent over \$130,000 to put ads in over 100 daily newspapers across Canada which had the headline: "In the past 18 months the Government of Canada has resolved over 200 items dealing with our economic development." In the copy the ad gave a long list of programs. It was not designed to tell people how to apply for the programs; it simply listed them and said this:

We all know there is no one answer to the economic problems that confront Canada and the rest of the world, but here is a selection of projects that, taken together, are promoting sound economic development.

That was on Remembrance Day, November 11. The next day the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) stood before us in the House of Commons and introduced his "tighten your belts" budget which demanded that ordinary Canadians show restraint and give up their jobs, their homes, their businesses and their farms because, the government said, this was what was necessary in the war against inflation. What sort of restraint is there when public funds are used in this way to promote the policies of one political party and when on the next day the Minister of Finance makes a statement like the one he made?

Let me cite another example of advertising which is highly suspect. On Monday, November 16, just a few days later, in the "Report on Business" there was a full page ad showing a beautiful scenic picture of the Rockies and the prairies. The headline was "Canada—we have a lot to offer each other".

Mr. Peterson: That is true.

Mr. Beatty: It was part of a series. These full-page, full-colour ads ran at \$16,000 apiece, and there was a series of seven. Each one in the series ended with this statement:

Canadians, working together. On the land, in industry, in the mines, on the seas. Working together, and with the help of government—

Which government?

—helping Canada grow. Canada. We have a lot to be thankful for.

To whom, one might wonder.

And a lot to offer each other.

Indeed. When I questioned the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Peterson) on this a few weeks ago,

he said this was designed to defeat separatism. The government was fighting separatism on Bay Street with \$16,000 ads in the "Report on Business". Does anyone seriously believe that separatists will somehow be miraculously converted to supporting Canada because of this ad? Surely not. I suggest instead that when ordinary Canadians find that this government's policies are costing them dearly, this sort of frivolous, dangerous and self-serving advertising on the part of the federal government can only embitter Canadians and destroy support for the federal system in Canada.

As a further example, hon. members will remember the energy ads which were run a couple of years ago by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde). At the time those ads were begun there was the infamous leaked memorandum from Mr. D. C. Hanright, director-general of information services for the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, Mr. Hanright described what he saw as the purpose of this advertising campaign. He said this:

Federal "control" will be suddenly, forcefully gained with announcement of the "package". This, however, will be a lumpy, almost indigestible mass of policy.

He was referring to the National Energy Program.

Unless that initiative is retained by merchandising both the package and its individual elements, and existing programs in the fields of supply, allocation and conservation, that initiative will go by default to the inevitable detractors (including a largely hostile media, the producing provinces, the foreign-owned multinationals, and the Opposition).

"Opposition" was spelled with a capital "O". To whom was Mr. Hanright referring when he spelled "Opposition" with a capital "O"? He was referring to the opposition in Parliament. The purpose of the advertising was to take energy off the list of pressing public concerns and to convince Canadians that the Liberal government had energy matters under control. If the federal government did not spend federal funds to do that, according to Mr. Hanright, the inevitable detractors—the opposition in Parliament, a "hostile" media, the multinationals and the producing provinces—would convince Canadians that there were serious problems in relation to energy. That was the purpose of that campaign. Surely no one can look at that statement and say that the federal government was not designing to use public funds, taxpayers' dollars, to promote the policies of one political party to the disadvantage of other political parties in Canada.

I am sorry the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Blais) is not here at the present time. Last May he gave a speech, and in that speech he likened the federal government to a multi-product corporation. In his speech he said:

Government is too complex nowadays to rely on "policy by press release". Programs must be explained—and not by reporters, but rather by the people who created them.

This is what he said to the Association of Canadian Advertisers in Toronto:

Imagine in your own companies if you had a \$60 billion product and the only advertising you relied upon was word of mouth, reports in the media or comments by your competitors.

The "competitor", again, is the opposition in Parliament. According to the Minister of Supply and Services the role of