

Oral Questions

We have said that we will fight it on the basis of the decision—and I want to be clear here—even if the provinces decide to settle this issue as they are allowed to do, to take the money and run. The problems that the decision gives Canada, Canadian industry and workers, will still be with us. We have to sit down at the table. I urge the Hon. Member to read the decision which will enable her to understand my concern. We have to sit down at the table and draw up a new set of rules to protect Canadian industry, workers and citizens from this type of trade harassment.

* * *

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

FUNDING OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

Mr. David Berger (Laurier): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of State for Science and Technology I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Yesterday, in a feeble attempt to defend his savaging of the National Research Council, the Minister of State for Science and Technology said that the Government was putting \$1 billion more into university research over the next five years. Will the Minister of Finance not admit that the Government is putting up less than \$700 million, and only if it is matched by the private sector? Will he admit that there is no commitment from the Government to put up \$1 billion?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Hon. Member has understood the clear philosophy of the Government which is to involve the private sector to a greater extent in research and development efforts. What we are trying to do with this new proposal which I announced in the last Budget is to bring a greater degree of integration into a matching grant formula so that the projects which are brought forward in research and development by the private sector, in partnership with the public sector, will be much closer to the needs of the market-place. Surely that is the direction in which we should be going in terms of research and development.

AMOUNT OF GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. David Berger (Laurier): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of State for Science and Technology misled the House yesterday. I am asking the Minister of Finance to correct—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the Hon. Member did not mean to put his concern in quite the words he used. I invite the Hon. Member to rephrase his question in such a way that there is not an implication of intentional misleading.

● (1140)

Mr. Berger: Whom does the Finance Minister think he is fooling with this phantom \$1 billion? Would he table the

document which shows that the Government is putting \$1 billion into university research? Where is it? Would he show it to the House and to Canadians?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear what we have said. We have put forward a proposal to the private sector whereby we will match grants to the initiatives taken by them, in consultation and in co-operation with the public sector, the result of which will be \$1 billion new financing for research and development projects. This will be done in a way which will produce projects that will be much more applicable to commercial reality. That is the direction in which we want to go in research and development. The Hon. Member should know that it will be very, very effective.

* * *

[Translation]

TRADEFREE TRADE—MEASURE TAKEN BY UNITED STATES—
GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. John Parry (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of International Trade.

If the Minister did not even blink when she heard of the American position, how is she going to react to the statement made by the head of the Quebec Wood Manufacturers Association who has come to realize that the tariff represents an amount greater than the profit margin of the whole industry? Is that not provocation enough to terminate these discussions on free trade?

[English]

Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade): No, Mr. Speaker, it is not sufficient provocation to end these discussions. If we walk away from the table, we simply expose other sectors of that industry to the same kind of attack. That is the point I am trying to make. So long as we have the existing system which allows the U.S. to reverse its decision on important trade items like softwood lumber, our industries are put at risk. We need to get new rules in a new treaty which is binding and will resolve our problem over the long term. Walking away or running away will not solve anything.

[Translation]

ESTABLISHMENT OF A BILATERAL COMMISSION—GOVERNMENT
POSITION

Mr. John Parry (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. If the Minister will not stop playing Russian roulette with jobs not only in the lumber industry, but also in a whole series of other industries, will she tell the Americans that the only point remaining on the agenda for these discussions is the establishment of a bilateral commission to solve such problems, deal with such programs, and stop such harassment of Canadian producers?