

The Address—Mrs. Cossitt

ment. It comes from the knowledge of continuity and security in one's works. It comes from the feeling deep within all of us that we are doing something with our lives, that we have a purpose, and with our ability and intelligence and, yes, our faith in ourselves and our society, we can build something worthwhile. We can improve and hand on to our children something better than we ourselves inherited. This is the spirit of human progress. It is the spirit which founded and built this great country from its earliest explorers and settlers to the present day. We stand for something, we citizens from many lands and walks of life who can be proud to call ourselves Canadians in any language. To much of the world we still symbolize a rugged land of vast beauty and potential, a land of forests and mountains, plains and lakes, a land of farmers, loggers and miners who put food on the table and fuel the world's industrial base.

The Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) can tell this House how many hundreds of thousands seek from all over the world to enter Canada each year.

Mr. Murphy: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I apologize to the Hon. Member who is speaking, but obviously on the government side of the House there is much too much disorder and talking. I believe you should call them to order.

● (1730)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): The point is well taken. When a Member has the floor, all Members are requested to show some decency and respect.

Mrs. Cossitt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also express my appreciation to my colleague from Churchill.

As I was saying, the Minister of Employment and Immigration can tell the House how many want to come and enter Canada each year, even though I am sure this is only a small number of those who do want to enter Canada. Yet, of all those thousands, perhaps millions, who still clamour to come and share in the dream of working and supporting themselves and their families, how many would still do so if they knew they would be ruled by a Government which has consistently whittled away at that tradition of independence and initiative, and which has made rules and regulations more important than industry and enterprise? I am not sure which is worse, the neglect they would leave behind in their impoverished homelands or the benign neglect which awaits them here.

What has happened to that sense of optimism about our future, that ideal that there would always be a job for every Canadian who wants one, that if you have a good idea you can make it grow and prosper? What has happened to it is that the Government got into the act with both feet. Government always had a better idea, more resources available, and slowly but surely that individual drive and initiative, the hallmark of our economy, has been eroded.

The young Canadian of today enters the labour force with little if any of the sense of continuity, security and achievement that was traditionally part of his or her heritage. Yet they too have dreams and aspirations. Are we simply to say

that they shall no longer dream, that they shall no longer have those aspirations—yet another regulation to be obeyed? Is there no antidote to the fear and uncertainty which is increasing as the workplace undergoes technological transformation?

I believe we must not only overcome those very real and very human doubts about technological change, but in the process we can recapture that spirit, that ethic of work and pride and achievement. Through that, and only through that, we will recapture our productivity no matter the product or the process or the machine. But how? Not with medals or more reports and task forces on technology and microelectronics. We have had more than enough of those to know what the problem is. It is now time to work on a solution. We must begin to build a structure which really will deliver lasting employment for all Canadians wanting work. Training and retraining and re-education mechanisms must be created capable of re-directing perhaps as many as four million Canadians who, over the next several years, will see their traditional work skills become obsolete. Before 1990, over one million women alone will either become unemployed or move down into the unskilled job ghettos if we do not create a system capable of retraining and placing them in the new higher skilled jobs as they develop.

According to the Science Council of Canada, an organization chaired by a gentleman of the most impeccable Liberal credentials, Dr. Stuart Smith, we must eventually commit a full 5 per cent of our GNP annually to re-education and retraining. Only with such an expenditure can we hope to remain competitive, provide the jobs Canadians will need, and the skills needed to get the work done. Yet, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the Throne Speech which shows the Government has any awareness of the magnitude of the challenge facing us. It talks about competitive, world class industry, and yet the commitment to R and D remains the same 1.5 per cent of GNP the Government has been trying and failing to reach for years. Even if it does now finally reach it, how long is 1.5 per cent going to keep our industry world class competitive when our major adversaries have targets of 2 per cent and 2.5 per cent and even 3 per cent? Or when a country such as France, with a technological trade deficit of \$330 million in 1981, is aiming for a surplus of \$6.7 billion by 1990, while our 1980 technological deficit of \$1 billion is expected to rise to \$5 billion by 1985? We are constantly falling behind.

In the last federal Budget the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) boosted direct Government expenditure on R and D to \$635 million per annum. Again, according to the Science Council of Canada, the Swedish Government was spending \$1.2 billion per annum directly on R and D back in 1980 when this Government took office. The Netherlands spends only marginally less than we do on only slightly more than half our gross domestic product. Is this our answer to world class competition? It is no use talking about potential sales of \$20 billion from Bell Helicopters and Pratt & Whitney, not when we know what happened to all those potential sales over at Canadair.