

terms of being competitive and a plan to address it. That is exactly what we are doing.

I do not think we need a series of simple resolutions, important in themselves as they are. I think those resolutions do not tackle the real and important issues in a thoughtful and deliberate way. That is what we have to do in this House, ask the right questions and seek the right answers.

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Madam Speaker, I am a little bit discouraged by the minister's comments about the motion today. He said we had trivialized the subject of research and development in the motion.

**Mr. Milliken:** Those are the Prime Minister's own words.

**Mr. Manley:** He also said the government will vote against the motion in accordance with the rules and traditions of the House.

There are two things I would like to note about that. First, the words in the motion are words taken from the Prime Minister himself. Contrary to trivializing it, the hope today is that we will be able to raise multi-partisan debate on issues on which we are all in fundamental agreement.

The importance of research and development, in the Prime Minister's words, are the lifeblood of a successful economy and country, and saying that Canada—and I am quoting from the motion now—

—must increase its level of Research and Development in order to ensure economic growth in an increasingly competitive and technologically literate global community.

The motion is not meant to solve all of the problems of the nation. But it is meant to afford an opportunity to the House to raise, not only for the benefit of our colleagues but for the benefit of the people of Canada, this very important issue.

I would like to call the minister's attention to the supply proceedings of November 24, 1989 in the House where a motion was put under supply by the then hon. member for Oshawa on which the government gave its unanimous support.

I am astonished that the minister would come today and criticize an opportunity to put forward such impor-

### *Supply*

tant matters and that his government would not avail itself of the occasion to indicate that it too agrees with how important these matters are, much as it did last November. The government did not fall nor did the words of the Leader of the Opposition in introducing his motion indicate that the government would fall.

The minister in his substantive remarks made much of the government's contribution to research and development and suggested the problem really lies with the private sector.

I think there have been a number of analyses done which show that industry-funded research and development in Canada is lower than that of our competitors. According to OECD statistics in 1987 we were right down there in industry funded R and D behind Japan, Germany, Sweden, United States, the Netherlands, United Kingdom and France.

I would like to call to the attention of the minister that from the same source 1987 government funded R and D was well below the U.S., France, the Netherlands, Sweden, Germany and the U.K. Even government funded R and D does not make Canada look terrific.

I would like to conclude my observations by asking the minister that since he has been critical of a motion containing the Prime Minister's own words, would he now indicate to the House and to the scientific community if the government has abandoned the criterion of gross expenditures on research and development as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product? Has the government abandoned that indicator of R and D performance in Canada and, in doing so, has the government abandoned the target of 2.5 per cent set by the Prime Minister in favour of other criteria? If so, what are they?

**Mr. Winegard:** Madam Speaker, I think the Gross Domestic Product ratio is only one thing at which any country must look. I think the government would make a great mistake if that was the only figure it was going to use to answer the real question of whether this country is competitive and if not, how to make it competitive.

The government is looking at a broad range of figures that it hopes will give a good picture of what needs to be done in the industrial sector particularly, in order to make Canada more competitive.