

Board. Many other decentralization programs which were cancelled were reinstated by this Government, but I repeat this one was not cancelled. The problem was that it had been suspended with the introduction of Bill 101, because the people moving to Sherbrooke might have no right to English education. We have said that until these rights are confirmed we will not make the move. However, there were two decisions of the court in Quebec unanimously saying that the new Constitution would prevail. There is now a last decision to come from the Supreme Court.

According to the decision made in 1976, as soon as these rights are confirmed the move will be made because decentralization has been part of the policies of the Government. Of all the decentralization programs which were cancelled in 1979, there was one which was not cancelled by the Tory administration, and it was the Sherbrooke one.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It was put on hold.

Miss Carney: Mr. Speaker, correctly or incorrectly, you yourself have been quoted in the press as describing this as "blowing \$100 million on straight patronage".

Some Hon. Members: Order.

REQUEST FOR GUARANTEE OF EDUCATION IN LANGUAGE OF EMPLOYEES' CHOICE

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, can the Minister guarantee at this time that any person involved in the Energy, Mines and Resources move will be guaranteed the right to education in the language of his or her choice?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member should know that the House of Commons voted in the new Constitution that Canadians of both official languages shall have the right to education in their mother tongue anywhere in Canada. It is this wish of Parliament which has been challenged in the courts. The challenge was unanimously rejected by the bench of the Appeal Court of Quebec some months ago. I think Quebec is involved at this time in a futile appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada because, of course, the Constitution of Canada guarantees to all Canadians the right to minority education, and I am very proud of it.

* * *

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TAX CREDITS

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for Science and Technology. The Throne Speech of two days ago made reference to a number of measures in the Minister's area which in fact have been in progress for some months, that is to say, they are not new measures. In particular I would like to ask the Minister about the impact of the proposed R and D tax

credits which will be introduced in the form of legislation in the House next week.

Will the Minister confirm that these R and D tax credits will lead to a revenue expenditure of only some \$100 million, by estimates of officials of the Department of Finance, which in fact will increase support to R and D in the private sector by only 4 per cent, when what is needed is a 100 per cent increased commitment to R and D expenditures by private sector interests? Does the Minister agree that these increases are a pittance in relation to the doubling of R and D expenditures required in the private sector?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic and Regional Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I would hardly call the magnitude of dollars which will be attracted into the industry by virtue of these provisions a pittance. Perhaps it is a pittance in the mind of the Hon. Member, but these funds will be very well focused in the R and D sector.

I would like to underline the fact that the provisions which have been adopted by Finance and tabled in the House are in response to representations from interested parties in the private sector. They were invited, following the April budget, to bring forward representations with respect to the proposals for a flow-through of tax credits and for a modification of the incremental provision, which Hon. Members will recall used to be 50 per cent but now has been converted to a tax credit.

Clearly the answer lies in the fact that this is a response to the very sector which is seeking help, and I gather the response has been very positive. In fact I have been the recipient of many letters—undoubtedly the Hon. Member has as well—congratulating the Government on this initiative. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. We will have to wait and see if it is as effective as we hope it will be. However, there is no doubt that the measure has been very well received at this point.

• (1130)

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH DUTY-FREE MANUFACTURING ZONES

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows that the industry will seek whatever small crumbs are passed its way. In fact, the other major OECD countries are spending twice as much as a percentage of GNP as Canada in support for private sector research and development.

Will the Minister comment on the proposed duty-free manufacturing zones that are referred to in the Speech from the Throne? Will he concede that these are nothing more than a cover for foreign countries to import into Canada high technology sub-components so that we will merely assemble them in Canada? How does that fit with his regional economic development priorities and the desire to increase the genuine research and genuine products that would evolve from that research in Canada? Which Liberal ridings are going to be the beneficiaries of the duty-free manufacturing zones? Do we start with Mirabel?