

is what the struggle is. It was back in the eighteenth century that David Hume said all government rests finally on public opinion. This government knows that; that is why it is into such an extensive and rapidly accelerating use of advocacy advertising.

I would like to remind hon. members that central Europe, particularly the German states, in the early 1900s was ruled by highly interventionist and socialist governments. They were elitists who believed their education and brilliance could make better decisions than a body of people working in widely diverse activity under the rule of law, and subject to the discipline of supply and demand, which is the natural law of the marketplace. It was government intervention which cost the people of those countries their freedom and led to the fascist dictatorships of the 1930s.

You had to live through those dictatorship regimes. I was born in 1921, not 1948, and the third most powerful man in the Nazi regime of Germany, Mr. Speaker, was a man by the name of Goebbels, the propaganda minister. It was his job to feed out the advocacy advertising of the government to keep the people unaware of the key issues and the tragedy that whole area was. That is why I am speaking in this debate, Mr. Speaker; that is starting to happen in Canada as we allow this government, in a leadership democracy, to move to advocacy advertising at the rate and to the extent it is.

● (1710)

It is very hard to swallow that 37 years later the same development is taking place in this country. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that Robert Hutchins, an educator in the United States, said "The death of the democracy is not likely to be an assassination from ambush; it will be a slow extinction from apathy, indifference and undernourishment."

The degree of rape by government intervention in the Canadian marketplace is indeed frightening to me. We are no longer talking about a mixed economy made up of half government and half private sector. The government sector has too many privileges and powers. There is too much exclusion from Canadian law, particularly from Canadian advertising law. With agency status there are guarantees. These agencies do not have to earn their capital; they just have to rape and pillage the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. gentleman but I must advise him that his allotted time has expired. I did allow the hon. member the two minutes that were taken from him.

Mr. Jim Peterson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Minister of State for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important debate. In order that we can put in on a much more rational and sane basis than I have heard coming from the opposition side today, I would like to set forth what this advertising campaign is about. I refer specifically to the Canadian Unity Information Office.

The Canadian Unity Information Office has three major purposes. The first is to make known to Canadians the services available from the federal government. By government, we are not talking about the Liberal Party; we are talking about what

Supply

this House has dealt with—what Canadians from every province and every political party have a right to expect from their government. I am speaking of the programs on which we have spent a lot of time working.

The second purpose is to make Canadians more aware of their own country, to make them more aware of their north, their peoples, their resources and of the potential and great future that we can have.

The third purpose of the Canadian Unity Information Office is to explain to Canadians the principles of our federalism, of our political system—

Mr. Blenkarn: And to sell the Liberal Party.

Mr. Peterson:—of our political heritage and the role played by the various levels of government in our country. In listening to the debate today, I am more convinced than ever that this type of information must be made available to all Canadians, but I think we should start with the opposition.

I recall the hon. member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) saying that some people in his riding thought that the maple leaf symbol was the symbol of the Liberal Party of Canada. What a travesty it is that Canadians do not understand their country better. I think we should all hang our heads in shame. This shows there is a need to educate and a need to make every Canadian aware of the fundamental symbols of our country and what they stand for. I am more convinced after having listened to the opposition of the job we have to do.

Let me talk briefly about some of the points made by the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty), the lead-off attacker for the Tory party who has clothed himself in a mantle of righteousness. He failed to tell us that when he was in the Clark government as the minister responsible for advertising his government carried on this type of program as well.

The fact is that we have elevated certain aspects of our advertising needs in the two years since we were elected. I do not apologize for those, Mr. Speaker. During the course of that time we have had a referendum campaign in Quebec which was aimed at splitting our country apart. I do not apologize for one minute for this government, under the leadership of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and our Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien), having gone to the province of Quebec to counter separation.

The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe said that we advertise more than the biggest private sector corporation in Canada. That is true. But why did he not use the figures to show the true level? He did not talk about the percentage of expenses that go to advertising. The percentage of our government expenses that go to advertising are a mere fraction of what they are for General Foods. I am advocating that in some areas we have to do a far bigger job of educating Canadians about the future that we can have. If the hon. member is going to use figures, let him use ones that are just, rather than