

Health Resources Fund Act

made by the then minister of national health and welfare, looking at the speech I made on that occasion. At that time I pointed out that the figure of \$500 million was not based, as far as we could see, on any scientific or realistic assessment of what was required. I said that the figures seemed to have been pulled out of thin air. I must have been correct because today, despite the very sharp increases in the cost, which means that the \$500 million allocated in 1967 is worth today approximately \$300 million, this figure would have to double or quadruple to be on a par with spending by the government of the United States on medical research.

I said that we needed to spend another \$100 million a year if we were to come close to the efforts being made in the United States. We are a long way from spending that other \$100 million per year on medical research, even though \$100 million allocated in 1967 would probably be worth \$160 million today.

I pointed out that if there were sufficient funds for personnel and the necessary facilities for medical research the brain drain of scientists out of the country would disappear. However, the brain drain continues and will probably accelerate given the stop-and-go approach this government has taken toward scientific research in general and medical research in particular.

The minister seems to have rationalized what she is doing by saying that things are going at least moderately well. What we must do, in discussing this bill, is not just look at the termination of this program and the elimination of \$29½ million from this fund, but at the whole picture of what this government is doing.

Without going into great detail I would like to go over some of the cuts which have been made by this government. The government has cut \$8.5 million from supportive science in the Department of Agriculture, \$3 million from the extension to the Lethbridge Research Laboratory, \$2.8 million in contributions toward construction at veterinary colleges, \$2.7 million from the Canadian Dairy Commission for product research and promotion programs; \$8 million in grants to universities for water resources research, although much of our water is polluted; \$1.4 million from the Alberta oil sands environmental research program, \$700,000 in stratospheric research, \$2.7 million from the pollution abatement technology program, \$2.8 million from the Newfoundland Environment Centre and Maritime Forest Research Centre, and a support cutback to the Department of Fisheries of \$11.1 million.

There were also cutbacks in the technology development program in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce of \$2 million, \$13.5 million from Statistics Canada, including \$1.3 million in post-secondary education programs administered through the education, science and cultural division of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

I come now to the cutbacks made in the Department of National Health and Welfare. I remind hon. members that the cuts must be added to the \$29.5 million which the minister is already proposing to eliminate in this program. The total science cutbacks—

[Mr. Orlikow.]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro)—Forestry—Decision not to close Petawawa research station; the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith)—Labour conditions—Unemployment figures published by Statistics Canada—Status Indians; the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan)—Feasibility study on coal mine in Donkin, N.S.

● (1702)

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business, namely, notices of motions and public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Are notices of motions Nos. 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 stood by unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): We will now proceed to notice of motion No. 8 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie).

* * *

TRANSPORT

NEWFOUNDLAND RAILWAY SERVICE

Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West) moved:

That this House directs the government to reject the recommendation of the Sullivan Royal Commission on Transportation Services to and within Newfoundland that proposed the discontinuing of railway services in Newfoundland and reaffirm that Newfoundland should have a vigorous and effective railway mode of transportation and that the government accept the other recommendations of the interim report of the Sullivan commission and discuss the implementation of the same with the government of Newfoundland and this house urges the government to consider the advisability of the government agreeing to meet the financial losses of the Newfoundland railway, a railway system owned by the government but operated on behalf of the government by CN, so that CN will cease its attempts to sabotage and close the Newfoundland railway system and begin effective management to the railway mode of transportation for Newfoundland.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion is most timely because, if the House passes it today, it will forestall what can only be described as the murder of the Newfoundland railway. The