

Government Orders

• (1610)

We all remember when the Prime Minister used to fly with two jets. Do you remember that? The Prime Minister would fly in one jet with a back-up jet that could be seen in the mirror. Just so he would have something to look at in the rearview mirror. That is a backup. You can understand how useful that is. If the plane runs out of gas in mid-air at 35,000 feet he could presumably jump from one jet to the other.

An hon. member: That's tricky.

Mr. Boudria: I know it is tricky, but when you are the great one there are many things you can do. Presumably, the great one figured a way to do that.

I have a few more little goodies here. This is from *The Toronto Star* of December 6, 1989.

An hon. member: It's a great newspaper.

Mr. Boudria: I know it is a great newspaper, as my colleagues say, and I agree.

The Minister for External Relations used more than \$222,000 worth of flying time for trips to Barbados and Africa. The Secretary of State for External Affairs spent \$165,000. This is for the period between August 8 and November 7. The Minister of National Defence—remember him, I talked about him in the previous article. He went to Cyprus in a government jet, stopped in Portugal on the way. That cost \$179,000.

An hon. member: That is a bad one.

Mr. Boudria: I know it is not much when you are the government and you want the House of Commons to give you \$25.5 billion. What is a billion to the government across the way?

I have quite a few examples of this kind of expenditure. The worst offender has to be the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance thinks that he can advertise the GST to such an extent that people will actually like it. That sounds naive, but have you noticed the more he advertises the GST, the lower the popularity becomes of the present government? So, in a way I like the ads because right now the government's popularity is at 13 per cent in Ontario. If it advertises more the government will soon reach a minus factor in terms of popularity. Unfortunately, the taxpayers of Canada just

cannot put up with more government advertising and other such useless expenditures.

I have a story from *The Globe and Mail* of August 22, 1989. It states in this particular ad that the Canadian government will spend a lot of money on ads but this time the ads have been given to a U.S. firm.

It was bad enough that the government was spending money on its Tory friends in Canada. Now it is giving these ads to their friends in the United States. There has been a union of various companies, a marriage of convenience between Foster and McCann-Erickson. This new conglomerate is now going to partake in some of the government largesse in the way of advertising.

I have a list of expenditures for government advertising. Do you know who the top 10 ad spenders are in Canada? Do you think it is General Motors? No. Do you think it is Proctor & Gamble? No. Do you think it is the Tories across the way using taxpayers' dollars?

An hon. member: Yes, probably.

Mr. Boudria: Yes, you guessed right. That is exactly what it is. In 1989, the government across the way spent \$76 million of the taxpayers' money to advertise such lovely measures as the goods and services tax.

Quite apart from everything else, I think it is about time the government changed its advertising company if that is the kind of result it receives from all of this. The yield has not exactly been great. If you had invested \$76 million of your money, Madam Speaker, and the end result of it was that only 13 per cent of the people thought you had any credibility at all, you would start thinking that you have been doing something wrong.

An hon. member: That's why the Tories went to the U.S.

Mr. Boudria: My colleague across the way wonders if that is why they went to the U.S.

It is interesting to note that the government spent \$76 million. Proctor and Gamble, which shows us all its soap and all those other fine things that they do, spends \$61 million in a year. That is their business, selling us and trying to convince us that their products are good. At least in their case, people have not stopped buying their products. But people have stopped buying the line of the Government of Canada. General Motors spent \$56 million in advertising; Molson, \$55 million; Unilever, \$46 million; and McDonald's Restaurants spent less than