

Supply

and four times as many as all of Canada, when we look at their industrial development and the progress they are making, when we look at the benefits to their young people and the healthy attitude between labour and management, the desire to work together for the betterment of the nation. And it all started with a Government which was prepared to make a commitment to invest in research and development.

It is a fact this Government is preoccupied with the redistribution of income. We are redistributing more than 50 per cent of income earned by Canadians, and half of that goes to social and cultural programs. I think these are all very worthy initiatives but I have to make the point that if we cannot put more than 1.5 per cent of our GNP into R and D, yet spend more than 50 per cent on social programs, then we are perpetrating on Canadians the greatest social injustice of all. That, Mr. Speaker, is the injustice of unemployment, of a desperate Government creating short-term programs which fit nowhere within a framework of long-term goals. The Government creates gimmicky, alphabet soup programs. As the Minister himself implied when he listed off all the jobs to be created, virtually all of them are examples of temporary jobs. This whole notion of a temporary solution is at the heart of this Government's ineptitude, and it must be changed. I am afraid that change will only come with a change to a Progressive Conservative Government.

● (1510)

We should not continue to fritter money away on short-term programs such as NEED, CCDP, SRF and SDP and all these other things, without recognizing that the jobs created are temporary. In fact, under the NEED and the CCD programs most of the people who get those jobs are people who have no particular skills. Yet if you look at the unemployment statistics, the people who are lining up in droves at UIC offices are people who have lots of skills such as carpenters, machinists, electricians, chemical and civil engineers.

I am told there are no engineering projects on the drawing boards of the major consulting companies in this country. That tells us that four years from now there will not be any new plants irrespective of all the gobbledygook of the Minister of State for Economic Development. We are frittering money away on programs designed to rake grass over the wintertime, using UIC exhaustees. I know they need work, but I am saying that our priorities are misplaced. If an engineering company is working, then there are contracts being let. There is work for carpenters, concrete men, form makers, miners, and then there is work for teachers and storekeepers. That is the multiplier effect, Mr. Speaker. But if we dump the limited resources we have—in fact, they are just deficit dollars—into temporary initiatives, then we are not investing those limited resources in the right direction. I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is high time this Government recognized that this important change of priority is essential within a framework which encourages investment and private sector participation. We must get away from this bail-out mentality and realize that private individuals in this country will move ahead at a great pace if only the Government of Canada would get off their backs.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question. I found the remarks of the previous speaker very interesting. He spoke a lot about Japanese technology and investment by their Government into research and development. I found that fascinating because I have done a lot of reading in that area myself. But one thing he mentioned early on rather puzzles me. He was complaining that our Government is putting too much emphasis on and too much money into advance technology in our country. I would like to ask him where he gets that kind of information because all the studies I have seen, like the Science Council of Canada and others, have said that in comparison with the Japanese, Americans, French, Germans, Austrians and others, we are putting less public money into advance technology, and one of the problems we are going to have today and tomorrow because of the rapid change of technology in our society is that we will not be competitive with these other societies now starting to restructure and retool. That is what I get from all the studies I have seen, and that is what we have been told by people who have studied the area. The Hon. Member is now telling us the opposite, and I wonder if he can enlighten us as to where he gets that information from.

Mr. Siddon: I am happy to respond, Mr. Speaker, because I think the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) somewhat misconstrued what I was saying. I was saying people cannot eat microchips. There are many, many nations around the world which can produce integrated circuits and electronic gadgets more cheaply than we can. I am not speaking against the Telidon concept or automatic process control in industry. I am very conscious of the important role that technological innovation and development will play in the future. It will provide opportunity to all Canadians.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that our strength must be in the application of those technologies, not in developing another whole range of some computers or another Challenger jet to sell to major corporations around the world. Our priority has been misplaced in deciding we could not think big in terms of technology or production; we had to produce excellent products in small numbers, like the Candu reactor.

I think we made a lot of bum decisions over the last 15 years because of incompetent leadership from the Government, and the scientific community to some extent, in directing us along the lines they have. I think we should harness the resources we have in greatest number and use high technology to make those available to the people of the world. I am talking about mining and forest machinery, special purpose transportation vehicles, electric commuter cars and rapid transit systems. I am talking about modular home designs which can be exported everywhere in the world. I am talking about water systems, sewage disposal systems, all highly sophisticated in terms of their technological application. We are second to none in the world. We have the unique expertise to produce those because we have a history of that kind of thing. We can marry our natural resources and our engineering expertise to high technology in order to harness a market, fuels and feedstocks from coal; LNG fueling systems, because we use natural gas in