

The Address—Mr. Nystrom

happen. However, how do we get around the following problem? We would like to sell sliced bread to Japan and European countries rather than just wheat in order to keep the extra jobs in Canada. However, they do not want to buy sliced bread and they do not want to buy flour. They want to buy wheat, and if they do not buy it from Canada they will buy it from Argentina, Australia or the United States. How do we proceed to implement the ideas of the Hon. Member?

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, if we had a more aggressive sales policy and perhaps more aggressive trade commissioners around the world, we could sell more processed and refined goods. Other countries are doing it right around the world. The Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) knows that as well as I do. Perhaps Canagrex would have been able to promote the sale of more processed farm commodities and do more trading and bartering. However, the Government across the way has decided to kill off Canagrex, thereby chopping another \$6.6 million or \$6.2 million from the budget.

The farmers from my constituency supported that particular piece of legislation. I voted for that in the House. I wish that that legislation would have stayed, but it is being chopped off by the Government across the way. The purpose of Canagrex was to sell, sell, sell for the farmers of Canada. I do not know what the Conservative Party is afraid of. Is it afraid of Canagrex because it is a Crown corporation? Is it afraid of Canagrex because it might get out there and sell for some of the small producers who do not have the ability to sell through the big private marketing agencies? I am not sure. Perhaps the Hon. Member can explain it himself.

Mr. Winegard: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment on the last exchange between the Hon. Members. All of us in this country must recognize sooner or later that, if we are indeed to export manufactured goods, we have been remiss for 15 years or more in upgrading technology of all kinds in the country. We have not been able to produce manufactured goods at a cost which anyone could sell abroad. One of the reasons I believe this Government will increase the sale of manufactured goods is that for the first time in a long time we have a Government that recognizes the significance of technology transfer. That is the key which has been missing for many years.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily disagree with the Hon. Member's comment that one area in which we as a country have fallen back is technology. I made some reference to that myself. We are into the so-called post-industrial era now in the information society, and we are rapidly falling behind. In fact, our standard of living in the last 30 years has fallen from second in the world to tenth or twelfth. One reason for that is that we have not restructured our economy. We have not restructured a lot of the industries in the country. One of the reasons for that is that so much of our economy is foreign owned. We have depended so much on the head offices in the United States, Europe and Japan and we have the branch plants in this country. The branch plants are always the last ones to be modernized. They are the last ones

to have jobs preserved in them. They are the first to go by the wayside. They do not do research and development. There is no innovation in them. That is one of the problems and consequences of foreign ownership. Fully 26 per cent of our economy is foreign owned compared to 3 per cent in the States, France or Britain, or 1 per cent in Japan. I am afraid the Government across the way will be going in the opposite direction by getting rid of FIRA and opening up the doors once again to foreign equity, ownership and control.

The other point I would like to make is that if you look at the budget papers from last night you will find that the Government has reduced research funding in the country by either \$60 million or \$80 million, I forget the exact figure. This is in a country where research and development already had too low a priority. Until yesterday we had spent about the same percentage of our GNP on research and development as did Ireland and Egypt. Despite that, the Government has cut that back by an extra \$60 million to \$80 million.

The same thing is happening in agriculture. About \$2 million or \$3 million was cut back on research and development in agriculture. Mr. Speaker, coming from a farm riding I know that instead of spending less money for R and D in agriculture we should be spending more money in terms of helping the farmers improve the products which they are trying to produce to feed the hungry people in the world. Instead of going forward into the future we have a Government which is moving backward into the past.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to comment briefly on what the mover has just said about Canagrex. I think that this was a program . . . I am very happy to see that the New Democratic Party is now joining the Liberal Party in recognizing that the former Government had some good programs. I also know that the Member from Guelph who has just spoken will have many other opportunities when he chairs the Committee on External Affairs to establish new relationships between Canada and other countries, and in my opinion, everyone is co-operating.

Mr. Nystrom: I only want to add a few words, Mr. Speaker. I have already said that I was in favour of Canagrex, and I still am, and the 31 members of our caucus voted for Canagrex last year. That legislation had been introduced by the former Minister, Mr. Eugene Whelan. It was nothing new for me. I have always been for Canagrex as we need such an agency to promote our exports throughout the world. This is very important. I agree with you that it was a backward measure which the Government announced last night.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure and a great honour for me to take part in this debate. But first, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you and your assistants on your appointment to the Chair of this illustrious assembly. I also wish to congratulate the Government opposite and, I should