

*Election Expenses*

mercials except those commercials presented by the political parties. I hesitate even to sketch for you what the reaction of the voter will be when that time comes. I suspect that he will be indignant. I certainly would approve of and understand the indignation of John Q. Public. You can imagine him when the next election comes, sitting before his television set and, rather than seeing his usual beer and toothpaste commercials, seeing the utter and complete repetition of the commercials put forward by the political parties. He will have total justification for asking: Is that why I am subsidizing the political parties? Is that why my money is being given to them so they can tell me about the issues? They are not doing that at all; they are trying to brainwash me.

● (1540)

The point of my amendment is really very simple, Mr. Speaker. It would prohibit the use of spot ads on television for election purposes at election time within the confines of this bill and it would also limit the use of spot ads, not prohibit them, on radio. The object of the amendment is obvious and I think I have given the justification behind it.

What I would urge upon members of the House is serious consideration of the amendment which I am putting forward. If consideration is not to be given favourably, I at least wish to warn the public of what will happen to them in the next election. In effect they will be treated as if they were morons: the political parties will assume that the best way to treat and condition them is in the same way as Pavlov's dogs which slavered at the mouth when a bell was rung. I do not think the average Canadian citizen is anything like Pavlov's dogs and he certainly deserves to be treated much more humanely and as though he had some intelligence.

The point behind the subsidy is to bring the voter into full contact with the issues. Without my amendment the bill would allow the political parties to spend the money for which they will be reimbursed in the way their publicity agents tell them will be the most effective way. I would hate to have the view of humanity that PR men and advertising agencies have. You can tell that view easily, judging from the kind of drivel to which they subject people in the form of television and radio ads. At the very least, I am appealing to the members of the various political parties to say that they have a much higher appreciation of their fellow citizens. I hope my appeal does not fall on deaf ears and that this amendment will receive some support.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the effectiveness of publicity on radio and television. Some of us could well say: It should be understood that people are not convinced by 30 or 60 second advertisements on radio and television. But there are always some people who are. If they are not, they are still affected in some way by this publicity, because if they were not, the large companies which buy advertising time for soap, toothpaste, beer or gasoline, would not spend their money in this way.

It should also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the items which we consider as essential are rarely publicized on radio or television. There are no advertisements about houses for sale. Food products are not advertised either

[Mr. Speaker.]

because people usually know such things are valuable and necessary. Knowing people cannot be influenced by a 30-second or one minute advertisement as far as important things are concerned, producers of such things usually do not advertise on radio or television. As a rule, there is advertising of products that are not necessary, things that are, one may say, trash, things that are not very important in life. On television, we can see advertising on things usually useless, or if they are not useless, it is almost impossible to see the difference between products of one brand and those of another. That is why individuals or corporations that spend money for advertising on television advertize mainly valueless products.

Politics is what sells the idea, Mr. Speaker, because after all politics is something very important, it has to take care of the nation's welfare and future. Now we shall see politics, party leaders and parliament members reduced to the level of toothpaste and Kentucky Fried Chicken.

The object of my amendment is to prevent such a thing, Mr. Speaker. That is what we should prevent, by taking seriously the object of the bill which merely says that the public want to be informed. And to enable the public to be better informed, we are going to grant subsidies to political parties. Without this amendment, such a policy would not be implemented and that is why I am asking members to consider it seriously, failing which the object of the bill would not be reached.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question on motion No. 39?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

**Mr. Harney:** I believe there are five members who stood.

**Mr. Speaker:** I see, in effect, only four and a half, one member not being in his seat—and that is not quite enough. I declare the motion lost on division.

Motion No. 39 (Mr. Harney) negatived.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I wonder if I might take one moment before we proceed with consideration of the item before us to refer first to the amended royal recommendation which has now arrived and is in my hand. It contains the amendments referred to by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) which meet both requirements, I am sure, to the satisfaction of hon. members. Perhaps it is not necessary to read it at this time in order that it be accepted by the House.