

ment manifested by the last prime minister: virtually none.

If I was among those out there looking for some promise for the future, by God I would hesitate before I would look to the Liberals to fulfil a promise of greater contributions to research and development as it is necessary to increase our economic growth.

I will concede to it that this government did form the National Advisory Board on Science and Technology. It did form the national Networks of Excellence. It has provided scholarships for students in science. It has introduced the new strategic arrangements. But, when it comes down to the core of it and the Prime Minister said we must double our rate of expenditures in research and development, my God, what a failure.

In 1985, 1.4 per cent of our Gross Domestic Product was spent on research and development and in 1989, 1.32 per cent. As a matter of fact, it frightens me to note that that is exactly the kind of trend that began in 1968 with Mr. Trudeau. Will it be the same? We have been told that there is new moneys being spent here in and there on some of those new programs that I just mentioned. I have also indicated that we must understand that no strategy of increased scientific or developmental research will go anywhere in the absence of the people who are necessary to pursue that research and the people who are necessary to produce the products that will develop out of that research. What has happened?

I want to take note of this in the context of what the Prime Minister said in this oft-quoted article. You have to understand that the Established Program Financing funds not only health but post-secondary education. That program has been victimized by the Liberals and the Conservatives. In 1983 the government attacked it by cutting the revenue guarantee. Also, in 1983, 1984, and 1985, it limited funding through the 6 and 5 per cent caps that were introduced at that time. This is what the Prime Minister said. This is what the Prime Minister, the then leader of the party to become the government, had to say: "It is important that the federal restraint program of six and five not be applied to research and development. The National Research Council—". What did the government do? It made its own cut in 1985. In three consecutive budgets, up to and including this budget, it

### *Supply*

has attacked the EPF to an extent of almost \$9 billion in accumulated cuts between 1984 and 1995.

#### • (1600)

The minister has complained, as well he might he might complain, about the lack of adequate expenditures by industry for research and development in comparison to other nations. But the fact of the matter is, since 1985 industry has increased its rate of expenditures for research and development by 5 per cent, while the government has cut its share by 4 per cent.

Let's examine the record to see what substantial change has occurred in the situation. Gross research and development expenditures as a percentage of GDP among eight comparable countries in the OECD comparison—lowest; industry-funded R and D as a percentage of GDP—lowest; government-funded R and D as a percentage of GDP—second lowest; government performed R and D as a percentage of GDP—middle. In every other area, we are the lowest or the near lowest, and this government has done nothing to change that very substantially.

It has not only failed to enhance the amount of research it has done, it has failed to give adequate support to our universities.

One thing it did do with respect to research and development in the universities is the matching program, but now that is at risk. I only hope that it will finally listen to the recommendations of the Lortie report from the National Advisory Board in Science and Technology which said that over a three-year period, the amount provided to the granting councils should be doubled, and that thereafter the amount provided should be increased by 1.5 times the increase in the GDP. But you are not going to sustain this R and D, whether it is basic research or industrial research, if you do not have the troops.

Right now we have the silly situation of our high tech industry getting permission from immigration to bring in more highly trained people, while we fail to train them in Canada, while we cut the amount of expenditures available to the universities.

While we talk about training, we have 20 per cent illiteracy in this country. You cannot sustain a high R and D, high-valued national economy on the basis of a 20 per cent illiteracy rate. The government's solution is to make those people who are unemployed pay for the training of those who are working, instead of having a sustainable,