

*Supply*

lowest. Government-funded R and D is the second lowest. Higher education R and D is the second lowest. Advance degrees awarded by population are in the middle. Domestic patents granted per 100,000 individuals are the second lowest. International patents are the lowest. Our total R and D personnel in the labour force is the lowest. We cannot be competitive and maintain facts like those. Our rating in the world has got to improve.

My colleague for LaSalle-Émard spoke quite eloquently earlier today on the issue of Canada's role in sustainable development. It was not that many months ago in this House when the government brought in its bill to create the Department of Industry, Science and Technology, a major department bringing about industrial development in Canada. When it had the option of including in the mandate of that department sustainable development quite in keeping with the recommendations of the Brundtland commission, it refused to do so. It defeated that amendment. It refused the recommendations of the Brundtland commission on the floor of the House of Commons. So much for sustainable development.

Then we have the whole question of what the government's policy is with respect to the economy, the GST, the budget. We have a Minister of Finance who has repeatedly said that his mandate for the goods and services tax, for example, comes from the 1988 election. If you go back and look at what he was saying in that election about the goods and services tax, Mr. Speaker, you will see that he was talking about a national sales tax, integrated with the provinces, visible, fair and revenue neutral.

What has he delivered in the goods and services tax? He has delivered a tax which is at the federal level only. Canada will be the only country in the world with two levels of retail tax, federal and provincial. He has delivered a tax which will not be visible, which is not going to be integrated with most of the provinces, and which is anything but revenue neutral. By his own admission he claims that the GST is central to the strategy of lowering the deficit. If that is revenue neutral, I would like to see how he works his numbers out.

Mr. Speaker, my time is up and I defer to my colleague from Ottawa West.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, given the nature of the motion, some of the statements in the House on the government side today have been truly remarkable, because they have dealt with unemployment rather than with employment as this opposition motion does.

I want to touch very briefly on some of the social implications of a high unemployment rate, a failure of the government to address the need of its people to work to provide for those basic needs. Such a policy falls disproportionately on the most disadvantaged in society. It falls disproportionately on women leading to the poverty of women. It falls disproportionately on children, many of whom grow up without adequate nourishment, adequate clothing and adequate security to do well in school, to be able to contribute in the long run to the betterment of society and to provide for their own needs as adults. It falls disproportionately on those who always have a problem in employment, those who are of visible minorities, persons with disabilities, problems which we have not yet been able to solve in our society or even in our public service of giving every one of our citizens, everyone who is working in Canada the opportunity to develop fully their talents and abilities to make the best contribution they are able to make to the well-being of society, to the well-being of the country and to the well-being of the world.

It is only when we accept that full employment is possible, that a job for everyone who wants a job is possible and stop saying that having well over one million people consistently unemployed in this country is essential to fight inflation. Only when we believe that there is another way will we develop policies and programs that make that happen.

Common sense tells anyone that it is better to have someone working, paying taxes, contributing to the health of the economy through the purchase of goods and services and creating jobs for other Canadians than to have them idle, their talents under-utilized in society and to have them in fact drawing on public funds. That is a less desirable option clearly than a full employment or near full employment policy.

I want to address the environmental implications in this motion and our international competitiveness. I have written to the Minister for International Trade drawing to his attention the fact that whatever extreme