

tinkering with the economy. It is welcome news, because we on this side happen to believe the same thing.

Mr. Kempling: He meant making a mess of things.

Mr. Simmons: The hon. member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling) knows all about making a mess of things. He would know a lot about that. The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain recommended no more tinkering with the economy. Here, once again, the batting average of the NDP is 1,000. They have managed to get on both sides of this issue, too, because during the election campaign they were advocating a great deal of tinkering—they wanted to take over everything and run the whole show. Even since, I have heard some of them imply that the government could do it better than private industry. They want to run the goose that lays the golden eggs clean out of the country.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have any success with economic development policies the full co-operation of a lot of people is required, including industry which has not in any shape or form pulled its weight as far as research and development is concerned. We have goals which we should like to see achieved.

An hon. Member: What are they?

Mr. Simmons: I abjectly apologize to the fairly sophisticated members of the opposition who are sitting over there at the present time, but I am still pursuing my mandate of a few minutes ago when at the request of the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre I undertook to repeat everything two or three times. If it is no longer operative, would the hon. member release me from that obligation so that I could get back to some adult talk?

Mr. Wilson: What are these clearly stated objectives?

Mr. Simmons: Aha! One of them clearly is to see to it that the national expenditures on research and development are raised to 1.5 per cent of GNP by the mid-1980s. Now there is an objective for you! That is a commitment. But, to carry it out, we need—and I will explain number one to the hon. gentleman first; we have discovered that we have to revert back to the game plan—to achieve that objective we need the co-operation of industry which has not been pulling its weight on this particular commitment, Mr. Speaker. We are hoping this will change. We are hoping to get the message out. I agree that it has to be said not once, but twice and several times so industry understands.

Mr. Kempling: Say something thoughtful.

Mr. Simmons: I will give the hon. member for Burlington one single sentence, with thought. But he must give me an undertaking that he will get somebody to explain it to him.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simmons: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the notes I have here.

Economic Development

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Hooray!

Mr. Knowles: Does that mean I shall have no opportunity to ask him a question?

Mr. Otto Jelinek (Halton): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to respond to the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. But I must.

An hon. Member: There was nothing to respond to.

Mr. Jelinek: There was one thing he said in the 20 minutes allotted to him, and I wrote it down because he repeated it so often. He said that the official opposition does not have its heart in what it is doing because we cannot come up with any evidence which demonstrates a lack of an economic policy by the Liberal government. He nods his head in agreement. Well, I will tell him something. My heart is in it, and so is the heart of every member on this side.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jelinek: Our hearts are in it because we know that Canada, with all the potential it has, is the richest nation per capita in natural resources, the richest nation in human resources, the richest nation in economic possibilities. Yet what has happened? I will tell the hon. member what has happened. He says he wants facts. Well, in 1970 Canada was the third richest nation in the world, behind only Sweden and the United States. But by 1978 we had fallen to eleventh place under the Trudeau government, and we are falling even faster.

I will tell him a few more things. Federal government spending, for example, will be \$60 billion this year. The spending deficit will be \$14 billion. The total gross national debt is \$105 billion. Interest on debt now costs the taxpayers of Canada \$11 billion annually. These numbers are too large for many Canadians to relate to in a meaningful way. If they are broken down, however, their magnitude becomes more meaningful, and I will break them down for the hon. member and for the record because this is the incompetence of ten, 12 or 15 years of Liberal administration. These are facts and figures. The hon. member says our hearts are not in it. They are because we know the potential future Canada has. However, it has been demonstrated that that potential cannot be reached with a Liberal administration continuing to run the country to the ground the way it has been.

● (2140)

To break down those big figures which are so difficult for that hon. member to understand, government spending, for example, will equal \$6,800 per taxpayer in this current year, 1980-81. This compares to only \$1,600 per taxpayer just over a decade ago, the year before the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) took office. On a per capita basis government spending this year will amount to \$2,492 per man, woman and child in Canada, and it was only just over \$500 ten years ago. Government spending is now almost five times greater than it was