

and it is dear to us. The area I represent is confronted with enormous problems and I am convinced that all Quebecers are aware of the Saguenay National Park issue.

The Liberals ran many campaigns on this issue. They ran not one, not two, but up to five campaigns on it. Therefore, we promised during the last election campaign that we would not follow their example. Beside we were able to find grounds for agreement on everything except the Saguenay National Park issue, Mr. Speaker. For instance, there is the Alma-La Baie Highway. Highways are important in Canada, but nowhere in this country is the road network as bad as in our area. We have the shortest highway in the world: it is only five kilometers long. The problem has existed for 10 years and the federal Liberals made use of the intermunicipal disagreements to withdraw their support. In my opinion, this is not the way to promote regional progress.

Therefore we strongly believe in the theme of national reconciliation because this has cost our region a lot economically and socially, Mr. Speaker.

Another important issue related to national reconciliation is the priority that our Government will give to the Economic Summit, and I may say that economic summits are something which people in the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean region understand quite well. In a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I shall be tabling the recommendations of the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean Economic Summit at which 2,000 people worked for two years formulating recommendations and setting development priorities for our region. How could I not point out that this summit, where major areas of consensus were found, took place in the absence of the Liberal MP's from the region?

As for the second theme reflected in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, namely the importance of economic renewal, it is impossible not to believe that a major change in the economic management of this country is absolutely essential.

How can anyone possibly fail to realize that we simply must make a sharp turn in the economic management of this country? Obviously, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be done in three months. We keep talking about research and development because it is important. During 22 years, the Liberals invested about 1.2 per cent of the GNP in research, as compared with 2, 3 and 4 per cent in countries like Japan, Germany and many others which were convinced that research was the only way out, aware as they were that productivity and job creation are directly proportional to investments in research. The forestry industry is the most striking example of that. In the next four years, we as a government intend to make huge investments in research. Tens of thousands of jobs are related to that industry in my riding.

According to all the reports available, the forest industry will not survive unless it earmarks at least 20 per cent—not 10 per cent—of its profits for research. We are talking in terms of

The Address—Mr. Harvey

\$200 million, not \$100 million, if we do not want our competitors to widen the gap even more rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, we have a regional university back home which has the utmost difficulty in obtaining federal and provincial government grants. That is why we intend . . . I am convinced that the course set by this government will open the doors of many departments so that we will be able to assume our regional responsibilities with respect to research and job creation.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of things about the Foreign Investment Review Agency, FIRA for short. Not so long ago, I read a report on enquiries made of foreign companies which had to deal with FIRA. Seventy-five to 80 per cent of those 67 companies, including 50 with 250 employees or more, had serious misgivings about FIRA operations. Needless to say, that is hardly conducive to Canada's economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the universality of social benefits allocated to poor Canadians. Judging from the over-all orientation of this government concerning pension reforms, family allowances and old age security pensions, I am sure that the government, with such a strong mandate from the people to change course, will not carry out those reforms on the back of poor Canadians. The government intends to do the opposite, Mr. Speaker. We will be in a position to recoup some of the taxpayers' money, Mr. Speaker, and I have in mind the Crown corporations which grew from 38 to 400 in 12 years. The Progressive Conservative Party is not the one claiming that the previous government did not have the political will to avoid wasteful expenditures.

Last December 12, the Auditor General of Canada, Mr. Dye, said this: The government has not shown enough political will to reduce wasteful spending. That statement was made by Canada's Auditor General, not by the Progressive Conservative Party. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) himself said that there was a lot of waste, that much financial recuperation had to be done. We agree with them, Mr. Speaker. We have begun to do just that and we will continue to do just that.

• (1630)

Mr. Speaker, with regard to reopening the universality issue of our social programs, it seems that some editorialists are a lot quicker to understand the situation than some Hon. Members. I would like to quote Mr. Wagnière of *La Presse*. Universality is a problem which must not be glossed over; it must be debated until we can find a solution acceptable to everyone, Mr. Speaker. The philosophy of universality is attractive because of its simplicity and fairness. However in practical terms, it is often neither simple nor fair. There are probably better ways to help children and low-income families than to distribute indiscriminately the riches of the state, only to take a portion of them back through personal income tax.