

people such as those who are in the House of Commons right now.

From that I want to lead into a few comments about where we should be using that money. As the Minister of National Health and Welfare suggested, that money should go to those who are most in need. Four members on the government side of the House and three members on this side have spent the last six months studying the needs of the handicapped and the disabled in Canada. We have had a chance to see the plight of handicapped people and the way they have been ignored by society. It was an eye-opener for us on the committee to have before us dozens of witnesses and to have received many briefs, totalling approximately 600. They indicated the lack of concern of Canadians for many aspects of the needs of the handicapped and disabled.

We should be helping to alleviate the financial and economic crises of our handicapped people. Over the last number of years, the Minister of National Health and Welfare adopted the theory that it is not very important to look after their needs; rather it is far more important to provide some universal plan to millions of Canadians who do not need it. There are over two million Canadians who suffer from some form of disability or handicap. They are prepared to let those people linger at a level of opportunity far below that of most Canadians. They are limited in mobility and in their perceptive senses of hearing and vision. They are limited in their job opportunities. Approximately 70 per cent or 80 per cent of them are unemployed. They are limited in their accessibility to buildings, even the House of Commons and the Parliament Buildings. These are people on whom we should be spending money to bring them up to the universal level of all members of the House. Yet the minister is prepared to deny those people the economic benefit to raise them to the universal level with which all of us dealt from day one.

It is rather deplorable that the minister takes that double standard. One day she says that it must be universality; the next day she says that she will help those who need it most. She just does not mean it. We will have to deal with that as the days go on.

I started off by indicating that there was a long-term problem because of the desire of the Liberal party for power at any cost. I want to suggest now what is the long-term solution. It has been virtually ignored during this debate by speakers on all sides of the House.

I am referring to the issues of research and development and science and technology. During this session questions have been asked repeatedly, and we have received rather unsatisfactory answers from the minister. The answers we are receiving now are no different from those of his predecessors over the last four or five years. They are always going to do more for research and development and more for science and technology.

A few weeks ago Dr. Kerwin, the president of the National Research Council, appeared before one of the standing committees. His testimony was very enlightening. Questions were asked as to why we were in our present economic state as

Economic Conditions

compared to Germany, Switzerland and Japan. He made the simple observation that following the last war those countries chose to opt for and put their resources into investments which pay dividends, whereas Canada chose to put its investment into social programs with limited returns. It raises our standard of living and makes us feel more affluent, but it does not pay the dividends of dollars invested in research and development.

He gave the committee some interesting figures which he had given to NRC a few days before. I do not have the figures in front of me, but I can give approximate ones in order to illustrate what he said. NRC has a program where money is lent to small industries for research and development. Over the four-year period from 1974 to 1978 or from 1975 to 1979, NRC lent \$90 million, it found that approximately 20 per cent of its research programs came to nought, and that another 30 per cent or 40 per cent were a saw-off; they were of some benefit but not too much. Approximately 30 per cent of those programs returned real dividends to the country. If I remember Dr. Kerwin's figures correctly, \$90 million of investment returned in export trade something over \$3 billion, because of the development of new products for sale. Out of that \$3 billion in trade there was a tax revenue of something over \$1 billion. I think it was \$1.8 billion in tax revenues.

● (0840)

That is the kind of investment that the government has been refusing to make for years. If we are to have any change in our economy, or to break this crisis in the long run, we must take a new approach toward science and technology and research and development. If we are to be given a chance to catch up to Japan and Germany, what we must do is put money into research and development.

I would like to speak about energy, which was mentioned earlier. We have heard much about energy tonight and about the need to be self-sufficient. I would remind hon. members that there are good authorities which would suggest to us that energy is, indeed, a necessity, but it is not the answer to our future. No matter how much energy we develop, if we do not choose to use that energy in a productive way by producing something we can sell, we will stand pat as we are. As the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) said, he is going to stand pat on his present budget. Unless we put money into science and technology to develop products that this world wants and which we can therefore sell, we might as well forget our economy blossoming into the state into which it should develop.

I am suggesting that we have had a long-term problem, namely, the desire of the Liberal government to be in power at any cost, spending grossly over the annual budget to the tune of 25 per cent more than we could cover with our revenues, getting us into debt which entails payment of a service charge. If we are to get out of that sort of situation we have to reverse our policies and start spending money on programs such as the ones NRC has. They cannot get any more money for these programs—although that is hard to believe—even though they can make tremendous profits for the national treasury.