

Supply

slipped into minority government. Then there was a major increase in that year in federal advertising. The second major increase occurred following the 1980 election.

If you look at the figures produced by the government itself in the estimates, Mr. Speaker, the government indicates that in the year in which the Clark government was in office, federal spending on advertising was less than \$40 million. The federal government projects for this year that it will be over \$70 million. What that indicates, Mr. Speaker, is that in three years a massive explosion has occurred in federal advertising with the return of this government to office.

The federal government is the largest advertiser in Canada today. If you look at the private sector, perhaps the best example to make a comparison with would be General Foods. Yet General Foods' total budget to promote all of the goods and services they produce in Canada is less than half of what the federal government will be spending this year.

The government will say that it is unfair to make a comparison with a private sector corporation, but what about the situation in the United States, in contrast to the situation in Canada? The *Wall Street Journal* of March 4 of this year reported that the American federal government ranked twenty-fourth among advertisers in fiscal year 1981. Their expenditures were \$173 million. That means that on a per capita basis the federal government in Canada is outspending the federal government of the United States for each citizen by four times; that is, spending four times as much per citizen in Canada for federal government advertising than is spent in the United States by the American government.

When these figures are pointed out to members on the government side, Mr. Speaker, they say that the provinces are doing it. This is a new standard of political situation ethics, Mr. Speaker. It is said that other people are doing it so it is all right for Ottawa to do it. There is no question of morality there; there is no question whether the government can be justified in spending that sum of money. Yet the most valid reason that can be made, in comparison with the United States, shows that our federal government on a per capita basis outspends the federal government by a ratio of some four to one.

I think it is worth making the point, Mr. Speaker, that government is different from the private sector. If you were running a corporation in the private sector—for example, General Motor or General Foods—you would have a responsibility to sell your product, to get out and hustle in the marketplace, to develop a good corporate image to convince Canadians that your product was better than the competition. Your job would be to sell and to promote a particular product. By contrast, the prime responsibility of the federal government should not be to sell a product but rather to inform Canadians about the law, about changes in the law, about their rights, about health programs and about how programs work so that services can be provided.

Yet we find, Mr. Speaker, that since the 1980 election there has been a dramatic change in the philosophy behind federal advertising. We find that today the federal government sees its

job as selling federal policies and promoting the policies of one political party, the party in power, the Liberal Party. This is a dramatic change from the policies that have been followed by all governments of any stripe in the past. Yet now we find this government feels that it can take public funds and convert them to the private use of the Liberal Party.

Members opposite probably would like to have examples of how this is done. The best example, of course, is the bill board notice which appeared two blocks from Parliament Hill, the Employment and Immigration advertisement. It was not designed to inform Canadians about a program or about their rights but to promote the corporate image of the Liberal Party and the corporate image of the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

There are other examples, Mr. Speaker. You will remember when the federal government called out the Canada geese in support of the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau's) constitutional policy.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): "Goose Canada".

Mr. Beatty: They proposed a second advertising campaign, a hard-sell campaign, to follow which even Mr. Michael Kirby, in the infamous leaked Kirby memorandum, said would raise serious doubts about the morality of the federal government in promoting such spending.

The minister then responsible for federal advertising, the Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Fleming), when he was questioned about it, said this was all right because Parliament had approved in principle the concept of changing the Constitution. He said that as long as he was the minister responsible for federal advertising the federal government would not be involved in the promotion of ideas and policy until after Parliament has at least expressed itself in principle.

Mr. Fleming: Read the whole thing.

Mr. Beatty: That is a policy which he maintained on behalf of the government. Now apparently the minister does not believe he made that statement.

Mr. Fleming: I did not say that. Read the whole thing.

• (1520)

Mr. Beatty: If the minister does not want to be associated with that statement, he should think again because that statement was infinitely preferable to a statement made last fall by the Secretary of State (Mr. Regan). After the Minister of State for Multiculturalism made that statement about not advertising until Parliament had made a statement in principle on a policy, he was stripped of his responsibility for government advertising, and that responsibility was transferred to the Secretary of State.

At a conference on advocacy advertising sponsored by the Conference Board of Canada, the Secretary of State spoke, on November 25, about advocacy advertising and said that there now was a policy of the federal government that the federal government would use public funds to promote federal policies