

Environmental Affairs

toxicology fund. We needed more funds in research. Last year we spent over \$500,000—

Mr. Caccia: You cut \$4 million and came back with \$1.5 million.

Mr. Gurbin: Last year we set up \$500,000, doubled because of the industry's component. This year it is over \$700,000 already, doubled again by industry. There is \$1.4 million in new money, new funds for new projects into wildlife toxicology research.

The Member across the way says something like "the world is falling apart. Funds have been cut here and there." In the two years, 1984-85 up to 1986-87 with moneys committed, if we look specifically at the research budget for Great Lakes programs, we have no diminution of scientists. There were 90 and there are still 90. The Member is inaccurate and wrong if he says otherwise. We have 253 person-years, increasing to 274 person-years. We have \$15.95 million, increasing to \$19.2 million, an increase of 20 per cent in two years, year over year.

Mr. Caccia: He does not know his facts.

Mr. Gurbin: I wish the Member could have done as well when he was the Minister.

Mr. Caccia: You lost \$7.5 million over two years.

Mr. Gurbin: On the toxic programs to which we are committed as a federal Government, not the kinds of programs the Member for Davenport is talking about, those things that were fitted in or created to make it look good for somebody at a point in time, the budget has been nearly doubled. Our effort, our expenditures and our person years on toxic programs specifically have been doubled from 45 people to 75 people and from \$2.7 million to \$4.8 million. Those are specific figures and those are the facts, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing that slips by very quickly is the understanding of what is ongoing and what is being supported by the Government, particularly when we start talking about the toxicology research and the efforts initiated, made and being carried on—

Mr. Caccia: The Guelph Toxicology Centre, for instance.

Mr. Gurbin: As an example, there are programs in British Columbia at the University of Victoria in aquatic toxicology and at the cancer research centre in human toxicology. At Simon Fraser University they are dealing with environmental and industrial toxicology. The University of Western Ontario is involved in pharmacology and toxicology. Carleton University is involved with regulatory toxicology. The Institute for the Research on Asbestos is involved with programs, the University of Montreal is involved in drug and occupational toxicology and Memorial University is dealing with environmental toxicology. We have other centres, namely the University of Saskatchewan Toxicology Research Centre and the Centre de

Recherches en Toxicologies du Québec which is dealing with human toxicology.

Mr. Caccia: What the Member—

Mr. Fretz: Why don't you listen?

Mr. Gurbin: I am going to stop, Mr. Speaker. I could go on with lists of things to which we are continuing and increasing our support. What about the Medical Research Council? It got \$150 million. That medical research council did not know where its next dollar was coming from when the Member opposite and his Government were in charge. That Council did not know what was coming next year or the year after. It was seriously hampered in its efforts to make a valuable contribution on behalf of Canadians—

Mr. Caccia: You are skating on thin ice.

Mr. Gurbin: —in the areas of toxicology and research.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order.

Mr. Gurbin: Next we come to the Americans.

Mr. Caccia: Talk to us about the Niagara River, not the Americans.

Mr. Gurbin: This is where this Member is right out to lunch, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Caccia: Talk about the Niagara River.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, order. Order, please.

Mr. Gurbin: I will change my tone if the Member opposite—

Mr. Caccia: You are being ridiculous.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please.

Mr. Caccia: Talk to us about the Niagara River and how you botched it up. That is what you should be talking about.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please. The Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) should know that Members from all sides of the House get equal time. If things keep going the way they are going now, the Parliamentary Secretary will have to speak longer because he keeps being interrupted. I do not think it would necessarily be the wish—

Mr. Caccia: If you are—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please. Please do not interrupt the Speaker. I am sure that would not necessarily be the wish of the Hon. Member for Davenport. If Members will bear with us, the period for speeches is approximately 10 minutes. After that we move on to other speakers.

Mr. Riis: Maximum 10 minutes.