

is prepared to accept that kind of nonsense. It is really the back door to socialism. In fact, it may even be the front door.

The Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre spoke about what his Party would do and how they would spend. I would like to quote from a report of Mr. James Laxer, who is the the key intellect of the NDP. He argues that their policies are not appropriate today. He said:

Just where would the NDP notion of economic recovery lead if it was actually implemented? . . . to a skyrocketing deficit in manufactured products, trade, to a disastrous balance of payments situations, to a falling dollar—

That is what is happening right now.

—to higher interest rates. Leaving the structure of the Canadian economy the way it is and stimulating consumption would result in a huge leakage of dollars out of Canada . . . Such a policy would quickly return Canada to a disastrous balance of payment crisis—

That is exactly what the Hon. Member proposed in his speech—increased spending and more debts.

**Mr. Gustafson:** Payment for overexpenditure on Crown corporations.

**Mr. Dantzer:** That is what the Liberals have been doing, Mr. Speaker, for the last 16 years. It is time they relieved the Canadian public and left office.

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member care to reply to a couple of questions? He had a lot to say about mismanagement. He gave a number of examples of mismanagement. I suggest there is nothing inherently Liberal or Conservative about mismanagement. Certainly Members on this side would like to see every effort made, and they do make considerable efforts in standing committees of the House, as do Cabinet Ministers, to try to manage better.

I would like to move to a couple of fundamental questions which I do not believe he addressed when he spoke of the deficit. The Hon. Member's Party and Leader advocate increased spending on health care. The Progressive Conservative Party advocates increased defence spending. They also say one of the problems with our economy is that we do not spend enough on research and development. Furthermore, they argue we should have increased investment incentives. At the same time they say the deficit should be reduced.

Has the Hon. Member added up how much his Party proposes to spend in each of the areas I have listed? Could he give us some indication of the areas where his Party would cut spending if they formed a government?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. Before recognizing the Hon. Member for Okanagan North (Mr. Dantzer), I would like to remind Hon. Members that questions and comments must relate to the specific remarks of the previous speaker. No new issues should be raised. However, I give the benefit of the doubt to the Hon. Member and he may respond if he wishes.

**Mr. Dantzer:** Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to hear the Hon. Member outline the policy of the Conservative Party. So often in the past we have been accused of having no policy. In five,

six or seven areas he specifically spoke about our policy. I am glad he told the people of Canada that we have a good policy.

The other day an Hon. Member on this side of the House said the Government is spending \$1 billion on advertising. We will cut that out and save \$1 billion right there. That is a good start. The Government is spending millions to advertise the fishing industry and at the same time cutting back on the fishing industry. The Government says it sells no fish. There is something wrong with that kind of approach.

There are many ways and as time goes by we will tell you how. After all, we are not the Government. You are the Government and responsible for the mistakes you make. I know back-benchers bleed profusely and are helpless when the front bench makes mistakes.

**Mr. McKenzie:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to my colleague for Okanagan North (Mr. Dantzer). We read the Auditor General's report every year. The situation does not get better. It gets worse. The Auditor General has pointed out that the Liberal Government does not have the will to implement controls. It does not believe in cost benefit analysis. Its theory is blank cheque government. The Auditor General points out that cost overruns on major capital projects total \$1.1 billion. It is obvious there is no management when there are that amount of cost overruns. No business could survive with cost overruns like that. Is there any reason we could not get proper management to do cost benefit analyses on these major capital projects to bring a stop to these cost overruns? Some years the overruns are well over \$1.1 billion.

There are other areas where we could cut back on expenditures. As an example, in a short period of time 35 Cabinet Ministers were flying all over the country in Jetstars.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member. However, I appeal to Hon. Members to relate their questions and comments to the specific remarks of the previous speaker. This is not a time to raise new issues. Remarks must relate to those made by the previous speaker. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie) seems to be stretching the matter beyond the Hon. Member's speech.

**Mr. McKenzie:** Mr. Speaker, I will just point out that the use of JetStar aircraft cost Canadians almost \$1 million in a 100-day period of use in August of 1983. We have had situations where Liberals have taken three JetStars to fly campaign workers to Winnipeg.

Will the Hon. Member make comments on the Auditor General's report regarding the will to bring expenditures under control and to do something about these cost overruns?

**Mr. Dantzer:** Mr. Speaker, it is true that every time the Auditor General's report comes out there is a lot of wringing of hands and people saying they will try to do better. I am not saying the Government has not the will to do better. However, since they have not done any better they either have not the will or the ability. In other words, they have lost control of government. That may well be the answer. Perhaps the