

Supply

edict of the Minister of Finance travelling here and there.

Mr. Peterson: First class travel.

Mr. Boudria: Last year it came to my attention this government had built a dog house in Rigaud. This particular dog house in Rigaud is at the Customs and Excise training college. Canadians were howling mad when they heard the price of this particular dog house. It cost \$325,000 to house 10 of our salivating friends in Rigaud.

Do you know why it built the kennel in question? Because the old one was on the tennis court and the good people there, the head honchos at the place, wanted their tennis court back. What did they do? They ordered a new one built so they could practise their backhand courtesy of the taxpayers of Canada. This cost \$325,000.

The amazing thing about it is the original cost was \$226,800, but there was almost \$100,000 in cost overruns on a dog house, if you can believe it.

An hon. member: That is like going to the dogs.

Mr. Boudria: No wonder we are going to the dogs in this country.

I have been asking this government a number of questions. Again, I am trying to hold it accountable in an effort to make up my mind as to whether or not we should give it another \$48 billion. I asked how many computer contracts were given to install the various computer systems for the GST. That sounds like a reasonable proposition. After all, the GST was much dreaded by most Canadians and much heralded by the Tories across the way. They even appointed eight extra GST-loving Senators to get it through the other place. Anyway it cost \$9,343,771 in computer contracts over six months between January 1, 1991 and June 30, 1991.

An hon. member: And it did not have to pay the GST either.

Mr. Boudria: You are right. My colleague is quite correct. They did not even pay GST on those particular computer contracts.

I also want to talk a little bit about advertising. This government is quite good at advertising. I remember

when the present Minister of Communications was a mortal opposition member and used to criticize the government. He said about government advertising at the time, which was minuscule compared to today, and I quote from May 3, 1982, *Hansard*:

“If the present situation is allowed to continue unchecked, we will find that the essential equilibrium between government and opposition, which has existed over centuries of parliamentary democracy, will be destroyed”.

Those were the words of that member. Do you know who the top spenders in advertising in Canada were in 1989? The Government of Canada was first with \$76 million in advertising; Proctor and Gamble was second with \$61 million; GM spent \$56 million and the others, of course, are much smaller. Those are the kinds of expenditures we have seen.

I will give a few other instances here. I could go on for quite some time, but unfortunately time will not permit. I want to bring to your attention the leasing of real property by this government. In its budget two years ago this government cancelled the construction of new headquarters for Transport Canada. It renewed the lease on Place de Ville here in Ottawa and spent \$170 million to rent the building, which the government is renovating. The employees will be working in a construction site for no less than eight years while the building is being renovated for the ultimate benefit of the Campeau Corporation, not the tenant or the employees in the building.

Questions were asked at that time about how this happened, who lobbied for this contract and so on.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, having consulted my colleagues, I must tell you that we have concluded that we will refuse to give the government the \$48 billion it is asking us for today.

• (1820)

[*English*]

Let us give the message to Canadians that this government does not need an extra \$48 billion. It deserves a kick in the pants, which is what we will do at the next election.