

*Petitions*

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I think if the Hon. Member looked closely at the Budget he would see that it represents a very major commitment on the part of the Government of Canada to reinvigorate research and development activities from coast to coast.

If I may address specifically the question the Hon. Member has posed, yes, we have made some adjustments to the R & D program at AECL, but there will be discussions with other provinces to see whether there can be a co-operative approach taken to nuclear research and development. I do want to underline that the safety and health elements of the research and development programs will be maintained.

● (1500)

## EFFECT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Finance, since the Prime Minister refuses to say why he did not keep his promise. The Minister of Finance stated in his Budget that he was going to reward success. How can he justify this statement after cutting \$100 million out of R and D and lifting another \$70 million out of the earned savings of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited? That is money that that Crown corporation earned largely through the world renowned laboratories at Chalk River. Does he not realize that he is creating another brain drain situation, or is he prepared to be the author of another Avro-Arrow story?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, the Member obviously wrote that question before he heard the answer to the first question.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** We have said that we will be working with other utilities in Canada to see whether we can approach the research and development program for the Candu reactor on a co-operative basis.

In response to the broad thrust of the Hon. Member's question, I can say that broadening the definition of R and D, and having a refundable tax credit which will be of great benefit to a wide range of research and development companies across Canada, represent by far the largest commitment to research and development that any Government has made in recent years in Canada.

\* \* \*

## CLERK OF PETITIONS' REPORT

**Mr. Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the House that the petition presented by the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) on Monday, May 27, 1985, meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Mr. Speaker:** I am now in a position to give two rulings that were requested. The first was requested by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) with regard to television coverage of the Budget. The second is with regard to the complaint by the Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) concerning words used yesterday by the Hon. Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Beatty).

\* \* \*

## PRIVILEGE

ANSWER GIVEN BY MR. BEATTY DURING QUESTION PERIOD—  
RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

**Mr. Speaker:** I have, as requested, examined the record. The Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) believed that the Minister had accused him of lying. The record does not show that any such accusation was made, and I am bound to say that I can find nothing unparliamentary in the words complained of.

However, I should like to use this occasion to repeat a plea which I have made several times in the House, namely, that Hon. Members should at all times observe the normal courtesies of debate in the exchanges which take place in the House, particularly during Question Period. Today we had examples of deviation from what I think we all believe to be the appropriate practice for Members of the House. Expressions and comments can be offensive without necessarily being unparliamentary. Proceedings would certainly be improved if all Members would avoid the use of offensive language whether parliamentary or unparliamentary.

\* \* \*

## POINT OF ORDER

TELEVISION COVERAGE OF BUDGET DEBATE—RULING BY MR.  
SPEAKER

**Mr. Speaker:** With regard to the complaint of the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) about television coverage, I have now viewed several hours of budget speeches on camera. That is a part of the job that I was not aware of when I accepted this role. However, I am bound to say that the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is in fact correct in his complaint.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** The television coverage of the latest budget speech is significantly and substantially different from the coverage of previous budget speeches over the years. As Hon. Members would expect, I therefore have two things to say. The first is that I have in fact brought the discrepancies to the attention of the broadcasting bureau. The second is that, in my view, it would be appropriate, at least for the moment, to return to the guidelines that have been established.