

revitalization of the Canadian forest products industry. That industry is now in a position to compete effectively worldwide. I did not hear the hon. member decry and condemn that particular government intervention.

What about the intervention and the incentives given by the federal government to the Canadian steel industry? By anyone's estimation, we have one of the most competitive steel industries in the entire world, including Japan. It is much more competitive than the American steel industry. Ours is highly efficient with all of the new technology which is partially a result of government intervention and incentives. I did not hear the hon. member for York-Peel decry that as a bailout. Perhaps at the time that is exactly what it would have been called, a bailout of the steel industry.

Mr. Deans: When did you do that?

Mr. Stevens: Specifically, what are you getting at?

Mr. Evans: By putting forward those incentives over the years it has allowed the industry to restructure itself and become competitive on a world scale.

Mr. Deans: That was available to all industry.

Mr. Evans: The hon. member says that was available to all industry. I think he is effectively making my point for me. The hon. member for York-Peel, if he calls bailouts more than just cash, or if he talks about tax incentives as a bailout or any kind of economic incentive—in other words, the taxpayers of Canada participating with industry—has to admit that those kinds of incentives provided by the government have led to some spectacular improvements in industrial efficiency.

With respect to high technology, the minister spoke earlier about the \$27 million grant in increased assistance which has been given to Telidon. He spoke about the incentives given to Mitel. I believe the figure for Mitel was \$40 million. Correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. Stevens: And they are going to Wales.

Mr. Evans: The hon. member says, "they are going to Wales". The company is going to Wales to break into a very large and lucrative market in Britain, but it will be a Canadian company.

Mr. Stevens: Employing the Welsh.

Mr. Evans: I would have to question the hon. member's motives. Is he saying that our companies should not compete worldwide? If they should not compete worldwide, then would he say that we should not have foreign corporations in Canada? If that is the case, is he going to support FIRA holus-bolus and unequivocally?

Mr. Stevens: Margaret Thatcher thanks you.

Mr. Evans: I think the hon. member makes his own case when he needs to make his case, and denies everything that relates or flows from that case when someone else points out

Industrial Development

the holes in his logic. In the motion which the hon. member has put forward, we see the contention that the government's action has led to the devastation of small business. I would like to see evidence of that.

Mr. Stevens: Six thousand, five hundred small businesses went under last year.

Mr. Evans: The hon. member says "Six thousand, five hundred small businesses went under last year". But 20,000 new ones were started, Mr. Speaker.

Let us get serious about this. Mr. Bulloch, the head of the Canadian Federation of Independent Businessmen, has said with regard to the extension of the Small Business Development Bond that this is a very good move for small business in Canada. Mr. Bulloch has not been putting forth comments that government policies have devastated small business. With regard to the energy program, Mr. Bulloch has indicated that energy prices should go up faster, implying perhaps that the National Energy Program is protecting his constituents—small business—too much. I do not see the evidence of the devastation of the small business community, which is mentioned in the motion put forward by the hon. member.

The hon. member made the point that there is no direction of thought for industrial innovation. I would suggest that that is not true either. I would suggest there are other kinds of problems in the area of research and development and innovation in this country which do not relate to the level of government incentives.

I just had a study completed for me relating to international research and development incentives. In other words, I wanted to find out what other countries do to promote research and development and innovation in their countries. My thoughts before the fact were that we would find other countries had large tax incentives, that there were major grants being given to research facilities and private firms. However, we found just the opposite.

Mr. Stevens: Take a look at Ireland.

Mr. Evans: The hon. member says take a look at Ireland. I would suggest that there are probably other countries which have more effective R and D than the one he has just mentioned. Let me point out a few things perhaps for the edification of my colleagues. In the concluding remarks of the study we find:

Other European and Scandinavian countries have less intense programs of R and D, but share many of the basic instruments for its promotion, chiefly, in the government sector, large agencies and institutes—

That is government intervention. The conclusion continues:—of concentrated research and programs of subcontracting R and D work to private laboratories; and, in the private sector, each country has its own high-technology export industries—

That is government supported. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce mentioned the Export Development Corporation. I think he also mentioned, quite correctly, that the hon. member for York-Peel disapproved of that when