

● (2230)

I think the basic tenet of having more research and development in Canadian industry is one with which both sides of the House can agree. We have found from industry that the decisions have to be made by them, both in their timing and their framework, so that the most effective use can be made of their resources. This means that the tax method is a more effective incentive than the grant method, where government bureaucrats may become involved in a time-consuming and costly delay in decision-making.

In the last three budgets, attempts have been made to improve the performance by industry in the research and development that is needed in this country.

The hon. member said that he would like to see an increase in the target level from 1.5 per cent of the gross national product in 1983, to 2.5 per cent. In realistic economic terms,

Adjournment Debate

Mr. Speaker, we will do very well indeed if we reach the 1.5 per cent target, in so far as the amount of money that must be spent represents a 20 per cent increase in research and development each year for the next several years. The amount of money required to reach a target of 2.5 per cent over the short term would be enormous.

Whereas I agree with the general purpose of the hon. member's comments, I can in no way agree with several of the details he has outlined. I will encourage him, however, to continue bringing these points of view forward so that they can be discussed in detail and so that there can be further dialogue in this most important area.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

END OF VOLUME III