

This initiative was a model of the type of specific steps that industry must take in easing the pain of technological displacement and economic calamity that results when industries must close. I commend these points to the House because they again show that, rather than offering hollow, sort of general or platitudinous statements as the NDP have in this motion, this Party and its Leader have demonstrated by action that we are sensitive to these serious problems and have specific types of initiatives in mind to minimize this type of unhappy consequence for workers in Canadian industry.

With respect to item four which deals with retraining programs, I again quote from the book *Where I stand*:

Third, we need a major national program to train and retrain the richest resources of all—our people—so that all Canadians may share in our development by working and by paying our own way.

It is obvious that this Party has a commitment to reorienting those people presently facing the pain and hardship of idleness or the anxiety of not knowing how much longer their job will last.

The elements of the NDP proposals are commendable. They certainly belie the Government's lack of recognition of an inescapable fact, that technology is here to stay and that if Canadians sit back and casually watch the rest of the world rapidly develop in terms of new transportation concepts, new communications devices, new innovations with regard to medical technology, micro-electronics, energy and biotechnology, if we sit back and watch the Japanese, West Germans, Americans and others commit almost 2.5 per cent of their Gross National Product to encourage research and development, then we are lost as a nation. I refer again to the statement by the Hon. Member for Central Nova. It relates to what I claim to be the most important recommendation of the NDP motion, recommendation No. 5. I quote:

The starting line for me is the technological dimension. We must make a firm commitment to double the public and private funds allocated to research and development before 1985. Research and development, and the resulting innovations, are the lifeblood of a successful economy and country.

It is important to recognize that between 1970, when the Government began to pretend to give new recognition to the importance of research and development, and 1982, in those intervening 12 years under one Prime Minister, Canada's commitment to research and development dropped from about 1.3 per cent of our Gross National Product to only .9 per cent. It is obvious when we look at the estimates and the record of this Liberal Government's disregard for the importance of technology that it has made massive cuts. When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) return from a meeting with his friend Willy Brandt in the summer of 1978 after having discovered restraint, he immediately cut the budgets of the forest products research laboratories, fisheries research laboratories and a number of other important federal laboratories that had been part of our traditional strength in the area of research and development.

We have to recognize that we are very much dependent on what is happening in the rest of the world. In fact, in the past five years Canada's share of export world trade has dropped from 5 per cent to 3.5 per cent. The principal reason is that we

Supply

are isolating ourselves from the realities of the world and, therefore, contributing to technological deterioration. That decline in our share of world markets from 5 per cent to 3.5 per cent cost Canadians 800,000 jobs in that area alone. When we realize that 30 per cent of our Gross National Product is extracted from exports and most of those are sold in the form of a few bulk commodities, such as grain, coal, timber or minerals, and these are displaced by massive amounts of higher value-added imports coming from more progressive industrialized nations, we see the depth of our dilemma.

The questions I put to the NDP and to the House, particularly the Government, are in the following categories. Are we going to face up to realizing that Canada cannot just be talking about 1.5 per cent of GNP or 2 per cent, as the NDP have proposed? We must double our commitment to research and development. Are they not aware that a doubling of our commitment from the present \$5 billion to about \$10 billion would create, on the basis of irrefutable evidence, if properly managed, over one million new jobs within a five-year period?

Why is this Government not aware of these facts which have been presented so forcefully and clearly by Dr. Larkin Kerwin, President of the National Research Council? He is not alone. Mr. Walter Light of Northern Telecom and many other Canadian industrial leaders have made the case for a much expanded national commitment to research and development as our only hope of being able to pay for the kinds of initiatives that the NDP are advocating in their points Nos. 1 to 4. We cannot have our cake and eat it too. We cannot have work sharing and more child care facilities in industry until we become more productive as a nation. Since our productivity record has been as miserable as it has been since 1970, we must begin to generate wealth before we continue to spend it on various types of interventionist programs.

● (1250)

The first question, Mr. Speaker, and I will summarize this quickly, is: Does the Government and the New Democratic Party favour more intervention or less? Perhaps there will be some response to these questions in the subsequent debate. Do they encourage or want to suppress the evolving technologies? Are we prepared to follow and try to excel, even more than the Pacific Rim nations of the Far East, in the area of supporting and encouraging research and development? Do we favour more or less federal Government spending to achieve these goals? Do we favour more protectionism or less? Are we going to hide from the realities of the international world market? Or are we going to get out there and develop and market new products which we can sell around the world? Do we favour more private sector investment? Does the New Democratic Party want to see the private sector play a bigger role in the development of technology and research and development to enhance the value of our natural resources, so we are not just selling our raw coal but are selling our chemicals and derivatives to other nations?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Order, please. I am sorry to advise the Hon. Member that his time has expired.