

*Supply*

My hon. colleague talked about the OECD figures in terms of government expenditures. If defence is included, then one should not be surprised if Canada does not rate very high on that list because we do not have a major defence industry in terms of R and D. If defence expenditures are taken out, then Canada's spending on its government supported R and D is in the middle of the pack of all the OECD countries. That is the figure that I gave earlier in my address. With respect to trivializing the motion and trivializing R and D, the difficulty is with the motion itself. It does not place this in a context in which the people of Canada will understand what we are trying to do. Second, the opposition moved a votable motion on a day that my hon. colleague knows that in the traditions of the House it means the government will vote against that motion even if it was a motion within the complete context about which we are speaking.

The hon. member spoke about November 24, 1989. I think I should remind him that that was a non-votable motion. Also that there was agreement between all three parties beforehand as to what exactly was going to happen with that particular motion. We have had no such agreement. It is a votable motion that my hon. colleagues have placed before the House and tradition demands that we vote against that and we will. Let me reiterate once again that what bothers me as much as anything is that the opposition will not place this motion, as significant as it may be, in a total context so that Canadians can really understand where we have to go.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Benoît Tremblay (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion):** Madam Speaker, I believe the general idea behind the motion is valid, but consideration must also be given to the size of this country and the importance, as recognized by the Prime Minister, to link our research and development commitment to industry. If we are to do that, it is my understanding that we have to make some choices. We must enter into alliances with industry and reach agreements on strategic choices for Canada.

Can Canada be competitive in every area of research and development? Is it not self-evident that a country the size of Canada must choose areas and technologies,

in co-operation with industry to ensure that based on our size we can make a significant contribution to that area? Now if I remember correctly, the programs this Government made a fiscal decision to do without were programs that allowed all-round, across-the-board activities that were more or less R & D-oriented, including a lot of management consultation, to put it more specifically. Now, if we are to be competitive some years down the road, I think that choices have to be made as a country, in partnership with industry of course, and this in my view is what this Government is trying to do through strategic alliances and the choice of strategic technologies. I suggest that nobody has all the answers, and I do not think this Government claims to have all the answers in every area of research and development. Indeed, as I understand the programs, they are open to government and industry in partnership identifying areas for research, choices that this country must make in order to allot available resources to areas where we believe Canadians have the best chance of success. For this reason I think it is important to make people aware of our strategy. Of course we should do more, but how should we go about doing that based on our size as a country, based on our existing strengths, based on our industries' willingness to co-operate with universities and government? This is a very important aspect in my view.

It seems to me that this motion could be acceptable if it is specifically recognized that attempt to make strategic choices we have been making for some years in co-operation with industry.

**Hon. William C. Winegard (Minister for Science):** Madam Speaker, allocating funds for strategic technologies calls for planning, but it is impossible to plan to allocate funds for all strategic technologies. We have opted for three technologies.

[*English*]

—advanced industrial materials, biotechnology and information technology. As my colleague has said, the government has spread funds from one end of the spectrum to the other without regard to the most critical things. It has made the choices. I hope they are the right choices. The government has made them and that is where the funding will be going.