

a result of doing R and D then take that product to another country and market it from that country. Has the Hon. Member given any thought to how that might be prevented, or would he prevent it? It seems to me that we pay the cost but we may not share the benefits that both he and I, I am sure, would like to see devolve to Canadians.

Mr. Siddon: Mr. Speaker, this question brings me back to my earlier comment. If we had a climate in Canada which gave greater inducement to the exportation of products than to consumption of products in Canada and if productivity were under control through the aggressive application of technology instead of our running away from technology, then I am sure those companies would keep the jobs in Canada because we could be internationally competitive in those products.

If the Japanese can export products tax free that they could sell at home at a higher price, then why are we not doing the same? If we do not address those fundamental questions we will remain in the stagnant position we are in now, with well trained young people who have no expectation of doing anything meaningful with their lives.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen)—External Affairs—East Germany—Diplomatic recognition—Government position. (b) Protection of Canadian citizens; the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) External Affairs—Czechoslovakia—Dual nationality issue; the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie)—Established Programs Financing—Announcement in Throne Speech—Amount of federal funding. (b) Government policy on funding medical care.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

INCOME TAX ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde: That Bill C-2, An Act to amend the statute law relating to income tax and to make related amendments to the

Income Tax Act

Canada Pension Plan and the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, be read the second time and referred to Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency-Orléans): Mr. Speaker, last week, at the beginning of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) promised to support all Government measures that would have a beneficial effect on the Canadian economy and would benefit Canadians as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have before us a Bill that is exactly the kind of legislation the Leader of the Official Opposition was referring to. I think the Members of the Official Opposition and our colleagues in the New Democratic Party will now have a chance to let the House work in an efficient and responsible manner. I would therefore appeal to their sense of responsibility and their intelligence, to let us proceed as quickly as possible with consideration of this Bill, to avoid a repeat of last year's experience when the following spring, the Government was in a position where it could not process right away the tax refunds to which several million taxpayers were entitled.

However, Mr. Speaker, since the past often reflects what the future holds in store, I am still a little worried, especially since this morning, I heard the Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), the Official Opposition critic for finance, when he blamed the Government for the fact that in the past, the passage of amendments to the Income Tax Act had been delayed. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Hon. Member for St. John's West and his colleagues have very short memories. I think anyone with the least bit of goodwill and who has closely followed events in the House in recent years will recall, and I challenge anyone on the opposite side to deny this, that it was not the Government Members who systematically helped to delay very substantially the business of the House. We all remember the bells crisis during the energy debate. Remember the bad faith demonstrated by Opposition Members during the debate on the Crow! It is that kind of behaviour that has wasted, not hours and days, but weeks and months of the time of this House, and the responsibility for delaying the passage of major amendments to the Income Tax Act lies with the Members of the Opposition, who are answerable to the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, that being said, I believe we cannot discuss amendments to the Income Tax Act, especially where it concerns corporate taxes, without looking at the overall picture we were given by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) last April, when the Minister brought down his Budget. At the time, the Government undertook to spend a grand total of \$4.8 billion in an attempt to stimulate Canada's economic recovery, of which \$2.4 billion would be spent on recovery projects. In fact, this was a series of measures, which included projects that were already in the portfolios of various Departments. Seventy