

political pressure was off. In 1977 their advertising budget went to \$240,000.

● (1542)

In 1978 this Crown corporation, this servant of the people, spent \$177,000 in the first five months of the year, up to the end of May, on advertising. Therefore I would guess that this year they are going to spend well in excess of \$300,000.

Why is that money spent? Everyone in business in this country knows that we have an Export Development Corporation and that, if they want to export, they can get financial help from the EDC. If they do not know that, the EDC has easy methods of letting them know, going through the classified business directories and sending out information and notices. They do not need to have ads in the daily newspapers to make their activities familiar to businessmen.

What do we have? We have a press campaign across this country. I have here an ad from the *Ottawa Journal*, Thursday, June 8. Every paper in this country has this kind of propaganda exercise by the Export Development Corporation, exporting its jobs for people like you and me. That is the name of the campaign. It is on a par with the Liberal party propaganda. I quote:

That's right, Dan Siminiuh, millions of Canadian jobs depend on exports. And it's Export Development Corporation's job to finance and ensure export sales that help generate employment at home.

It goes on to say some of the things they do. This is to give the impression that millions of Canadian jobs depend on the EDC and therefore depend on the government which controls the EDC. That is what that ad is supposed to create in the minds of the Canadian people.

I have other examples here. There is a hole supplement in the *Financial Post* of April 29, 1978. I just happened to coincide with a second reading debate in this House when the minister had us under pressure to pass the legislation before we even had a good chance to look at it. There is a whole supplement in the *Financial Post*. "EDC predicts 1978 banner export year." Do you know what that supplement cost, Mr. Speaker? That supplement in the *Financial Post* cost—

**An hon. Member:** How much?

**Mr. Crosbie:** That is what I am looking up now. The hon. member wants to know how much. He is going to find out how much. He will get the information here today. He will not get it from the minister because he won't ask the minister. We are going to tell it as it is. He wants the *Financial Post* so we will look it up for him. Page 31(4).

The cost of the *EDC News*, by the way, was \$5,500 for the last six issues. That is the average. The cost of the *Financial Post* advertisement was \$20,872.54. That is what the cost of that was. Therefore, we have this kind of malarkey, this kind of political puffery, advertising across the country to coincide with the hoped-for election this year. At least we all thought there was going to be an election until the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) got his feet so cold that his toes curled up and disappeared.

### *Export Development Act*

Here is another ad which they had in the paper:

Julia Noël works for Canada Wire and Cable Ltd. in Toronto. Julia and 2,600 other people across Canada turn out products sold to about 65 countries and supported by EDC insurance and other financial services.

That's their calculated design. That is there to give the impression that all 2,600 people who work for Canada Wire and Cable Limited are dependent on EDC for the work they do. In other words everything that Canada Wire and Cable sells around the world is financed through EDC. If EDC was not there, those 2,600 people would be out of their jobs.

That is the kind of secular advertising that this Crown corporation is doing. It is exporting its jobs for people like you and me. That's right, Julia Noël. Don't tell Julia because you won't fool her.

That's right, Julia Noël, millions of Canadian jobs depend on exports. And it's Export Development Corporation's job to finance and ensure export sales that help generate employment at home.

That is to give the idea that all of our exports are financed through EDC.

You may not work for a company that exports directly. But chances are some of your company's products or services are used by others who do.

I do not have the time today to delve into all the iniquitous phrasing and wording in this iniquitous ad, which has been paid for by the taxpayers' money, while trying to put pressure on us when we are considering this legislation.

Here we have a Crown corporation suffering from a rush of arrogance and pride to the head, which spent \$12,000 on advertising in 1974, spent \$240,000 last year, and \$177,000 in the first five months of this year. Is it any wonder we want them to come under our scrutiny and control? Is it any wonder we consider them the agency of the Liberal Party of Canada? We will change that after the next election. They will find out what party they are agents for.

That is ample support in these hearings and ads which I produced to the House today for the fact that this corporation is not acting as a Crown corporation should. It is too partisan, has been too partisan, is misusing advertising funds, and is spending too much on advertising. It is trying to cod and fool the public into believing that it finances all Canada's exports and you have to thank EDC if you work for a company or in a job that is connected with advertising. That is one point made by our leader amply borne out.

The second point he made was with regard to financing of EDC. The government has been boasting that it does not have to finance EDC, that it does not have any money in the estimates for EDC. This wonderful EDC finances itself. It can go to the bond markets and borrow money. They say it is not on the taxpayers' back at all.

I say it is like a monkey on the taxpayers' back. Every taxpayer in this country has a little EDC monkey on his back. That is where they are. Never mind that it can borrow from sources other than the government. It can borrow from sources other than the government, but why?

Our leader pointed out that the government says that loans to the EDC are not direct obligations to the taxpayers of