

*Science Council of Canada*

those figures, Mr. Speaker, the only figures of expenditure by the federal government that I have been given on research into this field relate to moneys spent by the Department of National Health and Welfare, the Department of Fisheries and the Fisheries Research Board of Canada. These figures are, in my view, of very minor consideration indeed.

For example, the Department of National Health and Welfare has spent on water pollution control an average of between \$40,000 to \$50,000 per year over the past five years. The Department of Fisheries estimates that it has spent \$90,000 over each of the last five fiscal years. The Fisheries Research Board of Canada, in addition to that spent by the department directly, has spent of the order of \$55,000 to \$60,000 per year average over the last five years. This is all in the field of water pollution control.

The only expenditures in air pollution control have apparently been made by the Department of National Health and Welfare and I should like to put these figures on the record. In 1961-62, \$58,096; in 1962-63, \$72,858; in 1963-64, \$94,438; in 1964-65, \$119,487; and in 1965-66, \$112,036. Those figures represent, according to the return given me, the total amount currently being spent by the federal government in the field of pollution control, which the council of resource ministers estimates is presently costing Canada \$1.1 billion a year.

If the Science Council of Canada can do something to change this situation, then I for one will be glad to see it go into operation. I should point out that the answer I was given does make it clear it is provided with the explanation that the reported activities of the department and agencies include only those which have been directed specifically toward research into water and air pollution control, per se.

● (9:00 p.m.)

Not included, according to the answer I received, are the wide ranges of departmental investigations and monitoring of water and air phenomena which directly or indirectly affect the nature, distribution or dissipation of pollutants. I think this is an answer which might properly be put on record. I do not think one could put a question on the order paper which would produce an exact answer telling us what is being spent for such purposes as the monitoring, and other studies to which reference is made. But other figures indicate that it probably represents a very

[Mr. Barnett.]

small proportion of federal expenditures in relation to the necessity of dealing with this growing problem as a matter of urgency.

I hope the Science Council can also do something to keep the government and all concerned more directly in touch with what is being done in various research fields. To illustrate this point I should like to refer to a letter I received from the Minister of Forestry after I had asked some questions during his estimates about an amount of \$1,700,000 granted to the Pulp and Paper Research Institute of Canada for its capital spending program.

I asked the minister whether or not this research institute was conducting any research into pollution. He said he really did not know but he would obtain an answer for me. I am glad to say he did. As a result, I had sent to me, together with a covering letter, a letter from the President of the Pulp and Paper Research Institute which outlined some of the work which this body is doing. It indicates that in a modest way at least some research has been done in the pollution field, though, apparently, "in a corner", without the minister who is responsible in this field having any direct knowledge of it. I take it that this is the kind of situation which the proposed Science Council is designed to remedy. I hope the council will be successful in its endeavours.

I am sorry there is not time to put on record the full statement made to the minister and, indirectly, to myself by the President of the Pulp and Paper Research Institute because it does contain some interesting information. However, I invite any members of the house who may be interested to have a look at the letter.

I have mentioned this in the present context because I think it illustrates how uncoordinated and, in many respects, how fragmentary our efforts have been in various fields of research, particularly in this field of research into pollution control in which I am interested, because it affects many people in the part of the country I represent. In addition, all hon. members will agree that this is a question of growing national importance.

I hope that when we get into committee of the whole the minister will be able to amplify and clarify some of his ideas as to the way in which this council may be able to assist in dealing with problems of the kind to which I have drawn attention.