

made are often related to other phenomena. Of course, the relationship is not always obvious, but when we look at it closely, it becomes apparent.

We know for instance that, in Canada, one of the main reasons for the lack of financial support for research and development is that very little research and development is done in the private sector, especially by the big multinationals which operate in Canada. This is noteworthy since the Opposition often tends to criticize government policies aimed at screening foreign investments. They often attack the Foreign Investment Review Agency, or FIRA, whose role it is, before deciding to allow or refuse foreign investments, to ensure that any new investment from other countries will bring significant benefits to Canada and the Canadian economy, specifically in the area of research and development. However, Mr. Speaker, the big multinationals which came to Canada during the 50's, the 60's or the 70's, when we had what could be considered an open door policy, have done virtually nothing in the field of research and development.

All this goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that the government must continue to have some form of control to ensure that those investing in Canada do not do so only to skim the market, that they are not coming here to invest with the savings of Canadians, but that when they do invest in Canada they assume their responsibilities in the area of research and development. It is my view that the Government itself still must make a bigger effort, and we are going in the right direction with the initiatives announced last April by the Minister of Finance. However, I feel that more must be done by the private sector. As far as I am concerned tax incentives must be made available by the Government, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks because there are so many worthwhile proposals in the Bill that I could go on for hours upon hours explaining the reasons why the Opposition parties will have to accept their responsibilities and allow us to proceed rapidly with the Bill. The child tax credit had jumped up \$50 from \$293 to \$343 in the June 1982 budget. Clearly, this was more than what was allowed under the indexation provision because, in 1983, had we not changed the existing legislation, we would only have been permitted to increase the child tax credit from \$293 to \$326. Thus, in view of the immense needs, the most urgent needs of our underprivileged Canadian families, the ones who benefit the most, large families in some cases who very readily benefit from the child tax credit, I feel that as legislators we have a responsibility to deal as rapidly as possible with the Bill in order that the Government may increase the child tax credit as it proposes to do.

● (1650)

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there Hon. Members rising to ask questions of the Hon. Member who has just spoken?

Income Tax Act

Mr. Gamble: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the urging of the Hon. Member, he is suggesting that, despite the fact that Bill C-2 is first introduced for debate today and consists of over 205 pages, it be immediately passed by the House. If that be the case, let me ask him if he is familiar with the recommendations made to the Minister of Finance by the joint committee on taxation of the Canadian Bar Association and the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants in November of this year. If he is, let me then ask him how he believes the provisions of Bill C-2 meet the complaints legitimately made by the learned representatives of both of those bodies to the provisions of subparagraph 54 (g)(iii) as they presently stand in the Income Tax Act, having regard to the rather devastating and detrimental effect that would be suffered as a consequence of the potential obligation to include in the computation of income an item which hitherto has been regarded as non taxable, that is to say the proceeds of disposition of personal residences?

[Translation]

Mr. Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we have a translation problem or, whether the Hon. Member has listened closely enough to my brief contribution. I was only referring to a reasonable time frame. I assume I am dealing with serious people, responsible people, and as a member of the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, I am familiar with the proposals, the changes the Hon. Member has just referred to. Indeed we will have an opportunity, at second reading stage, to consider this legislation clause by clause, taking into account what the Hon. Member has just referred to. So, I am not saying no. I am not saying this legislation should pass third reading stage tomorrow morning. I am saying that on second reading, the danger is that we may hear mere repetitions, empty proposals, and political rhetoric to delude the Canadian public. If on the other hand there are serious proposals, proposals based on convincing argument, I am willing to co-operate with the Hon. Member.

[English]

Mr. Gamble: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member will recognize that the process which we are going through is one which involves a detailed examination of a very complex statute, the kind of Bill this House sees, unfortunately, too often. It involves the lifeblood of the nation which is being sucked away by a Government that does not understand what it is doing. It is that very attitude of, "everything is fine, let's pass it" that creates the problems from which the nation now suffers. It is only when this House has some regard for these provisions, and how complex they are, and how burdensome they are on the people of Canada, that we shall ever come to grips with the monster that we have created and under which the people of Canada today suffer.

It is all very well for the Hon. Member to suggest that when we begin to deal with this Bill in committee changes will be made. He knows and I know and every Member of this House knows that there will not be one change made to this Bill. What we will see in the end is this monstrous piece of