

silicon Valley, they're already thinking beyond it. They've got seminars going on The Post-Information Economy.

In any case, with automation and technology moving so quickly, the accent in the near future will be — surprising as it may sound — on flexibility, on the ability to adapt. The age of the super-specialist is over, for the time being at least. In a way, we're re-inventing the Renaissance Man.

It has been said that revolutions devour their own children. That's precisely what's happening in the hi tech revolution. Overspecialization has been overtaken by the technology it created, a technology that is changing so fast that no specialist can keep up with it. Let me give you an example. The highest tech workers in high tech are designers of computer chips. At a rough estimate, there are only 5,000 of them in the world, and they are very well paid. But not for long. In five years they're obsolete. Then they have to go back to school to catch up again, if they can. And they'll have to keep doing this every five years or so, or go into another line of work.

The explosion of demands for constant learning is having an effect on traditional universities, by the way. They, too, will have to adapt to the technology revolution and everything that it implies. For example, para-universities are now moving into the U.S. industrial structure. The Hughes aircraft company, now owned by General Motors, runs the largest graduate school in Southern California — bigger than UCLA or USC. Hughes U is used (how's that for alliteration?) entirely to keep Hughes' own engineers current. Which means they won't be going back to universities.

Why not? One answer that suggests itself is that some universities, at

least, have failed to keep up to the needs of the times. Their programs are perceived as being inflexible. They're also — and you're not going to like this — closed too much of the year.

This is too much to cope with all at once, but we can at least try to tackle it piece by piece. The key is flexibility, and what the Federal Government is trying to do is to help make Canada more flexible, to put Canada in a position to face the challenge of change. To us, this means opening up our economy, to make it more competitive at home and abroad, more attractive to productive investment at home and abroad.

This involves some basic decisions on trade. We have determined that the only real alternative is to go ahead and try to open up our trade. And we are proceeding to do so, on two main fronts — bilaterally with the United States and multilaterally under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, otherwise known as the GATT. There are, of course, two other options we could have chosen — indeed, that some Canadians would urge us to choose. We could elect to go on just as we have been going, which is basically doing nothing. Or we could slip backwards into protectionism, hiding inside Fortress Canada, and let the world pass us by.

In this regard, two distinguished Canadian economists, your own Richard Lipsey and Murray Smith, have produced a series of scenarios in their recent book, Canada's Trade Options. "If Canada continues with the status quo," they say, "there are several strong possibilities for the shape of the economy in the year 2000." None of them are particularly inviting.

Let me read you some of the scenarios, according to Lipsey and Smith.