

scientist, has voiced serious personal skepticism as to whether or not Canada should have anything to do with fusion energy development.

In spite of eminent scientists from the National Research Council declaring the great need for Canada to join other nations of the world in the costly but potentially highly rewarding field of cleaner, less polluting, renewable energy to be provided by fusion, the minister declares his doubts and Canada, instead of being inspired to another national goal, goes back to cutting wood.

The declared intention of the Ministry of State for Science and Technology is:

To encourage the development and use of science and technology in support of national goals.

The hon. member for Louis-Hebert (Mr. Dawson) has just alluded to the critical importance of technology to economic development and the creation of jobs.

But what are these national goals, other than the 1.5 per cent of gross national product which is only a spending benchmark and not a mission oriented or goal oriented one? Are these goals to be specific science goals such as putting a man on Mars, or developing the world's best information processing system, or solving the world's most pressing social problem, that of universal birth control?

Or are the goals financial ones, increased productivity in Canada and more efficient processing? Or will the long awaited industrial strategy define the goals as being the substantially increased processing of our natural resources and the Canadianizing of our industry by being the technological masters of it?

What are these lofty goals, the building blocks of a Canadian industrial and social purpose? To date the government has failed even to bring in a budget to tell Canadians what this year will hold for them, never mind this decade.

Mr. Speaker, you may well be asking if this criticism is not just talk. We are constantly reminded by the other side that we were the government for only seven months, under seven months, in fact. They told us that the \$10.5 billion deficit we planned to bring in this year was a cruel joke on Canadians and would contribute to massive unemployment. They told us that our economic forecast of 1 per cent growth in the economy was terrible, and they criticized our energy pricing arrangements which would have started the greatest economic boom and job-creation opportunity which Canadians have ever seen. They did not notice the five-year science program to revitalize the training of Canadian scientists and the creation of home-grown innovation and technological upgrading which would have included 15,000 additional research opportunities and helped with our energy development.

You see, Mr. Speaker, unlike Liberal ad hoc, off the cuff, short range, expedient political action which varies with the changing political breeze, scientific planning and research requires long lead times and guaranteed funding. Such long-range planning will be of excellent benefit to the country in the vast technological development of new products and new pro-

### *Economic Development*

duction techniques which could make Canada an economic world leader with less than 5 per cent unemployment. What, may I ask, does 10 per cent unemployment relate to in this country of ours? Surely not to American unemployment, British, German or anyone else's unemployment. This is a country which has all the natural resources it could need, it has the energy to process those resources and the intelligence to do the whole job. Why should we be experiencing 10 per cent unemployment, even in these times?

But such long-range benefits do not pay off in votes at the polls, and this government's long-range plans seldom carry past the next election. Contrast the decade of decline in research spending under this government with the instant revitalizing done by the seven-month Conservative government which brought in a five-year plan for research funding and development and which has breathed new life into the Canadian science community.

Another accomplishment of the previous Conservative government which has gone unnoticed by the present government was the fact that unemployment had dropped almost a full percentage point, not seasonally adjusted, and that new housing starts, thanks to the mortgage tax credit scheme, coupled with the Small Businesses Loans Act, which has yet to be brought forward and may never be, which would have revitalized that extremely important job-sustaining element of our society, would have lowered unemployment levels even more.

They said they knew better how to run the country—and what has the government's first five months in office, after 18 years of tenure, produced? A \$4 billion bigger deficit for 1980, higher and increasing unemployment, a first quarter growth—I should not call it growth, I should call it shrinkage—of 0.5 of 1 per cent, no energy-pricing agreement so that we may proceed with development and job creation, no industrial strategy, no comprehensive scientific policy to upgrade the skills of young Canadians and give them jobs, and no prospect of any of these in the foreseeable future.

Now they want the summer off. They want only to talk about constitutional change and hope that somehow the public of Canada will forget about Liberal failure during the next two summer months. Perhaps no one will notice the 2 per cent increase in home heating oil just sneaked through Parliament because they will not be buying it in the next two hot months. Perhaps they hope people will be so used to hearing about the increasing job lay-offs that they will not be furious with their government in the fall. Well, in two months' time when the House reconvenes, this government will have had seven months to achieve the miracles they have been unable to achieve throughout all the Trudeau years.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.