

increase is due to some of the severe cutbacks, the meat axe that Premier Sterling Lyon has taken to many decent programs in the province of Manitoba. If that is indeed the Tory policy, we should know about it before the next federal election, because we all know what the result was in Saskatchewan when people were told about Tory policy. The Tories were kept out of office in an overwhelming landslide for Premier Blakeney. In the next federal election I am sure that when the people of Saskatchewan realize where the Tory party stands—they already know where the Liberals stand, so that does not matter—the federal Tory party in that province will be about as successful, if even that successful, as Dick Collver of the provincial Tory party in the election of October 18.

● (1622)

I was happy to say a few words this afternoon in this debate. I think the subject matter of this debate will be at the core of a big election issue. The issue will be the whole question of restraint, cutbacks, rollbacks, and where the Tory party stands. We know where the government stands because it is government policy we are debating. We do not like it. We are voting against this bill, but I maintain that it is very important that we know where the Conservative party stands, because Conservatives are going from one part of the country to the other and saying different things to different people, and different things in different regions.

The Tories are not saying the same things about unemployment in the province of Alberta as they are saying about unemployment in, for example, the province of Newfoundland. We should know about that. We should know where the Tories stand.

It has been a long time since the Tories formed the government. In provinces where there are Conservative provincial governments the people should know where the federal Tories stand. I think actions speak louder than words, and that is why I have taken some time to respond to some Tory questions about taxes on ordinary people, about per capita debt, about bungling, and about inefficient bureaucracies which are built by the Tory party. The biggest bureaucracies and those most prone to empire building and featherbedding are those built by the Tory party, the very party which criticizes anything which is more progressive than measures taken in the nineteenth century. These facts should be pointed out to the people of this country.

**Mr. F. A. Philbrook (Halton):** Mr. Speaker, at the close of this debate I would like to make a few brief remarks on Bill C-2, the health resources fund bill. Although the bill is not a major one, its subject matter is important. The minister and a number of others who have joined in this debate have dealt with it in detail, and I do not wish to repeat their remarks.

This essentially is a bill involving federal support for training and research in the health field. That field traditionally comes under provincial jurisdiction, but over a limited period of about 14 years the federal government has provided support in the amount of about \$500 million. At the present time the

fund is about 85.52 per cent committed. About 15 per cent of available funds are left in the fund.

I suppose we could say that this is a motherhood issue. We all agree on the worth of the program. We all support the idea of training and research in the health field, but I think the important thing here as between the two sides of the House is the matter of understanding the situation and of setting priorities. As a country we simply cannot afford all the good programs there are or of which we could think, especially in these tight economic and competitive times. I do not believe there is any serious conflict of motives between the two sides of the House. I think there is an understanding of the situation and of the priorities.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) has evoked some comment during this debate. I am thinking in terms of certain feelings the minister has about this bill which may be in conflict with the times. I think we all agree with the minister's fine human sentiments and with her support for social programs. We recognize her ability to fight for her department and for her beliefs. I think that is beyond question, but it is also beyond question that she supports this bill as a minister in a difficult and responsible position, like the other ministers in the government.

It is not easy to cut back programs. It is not easy to go into a time of restraint, particularly when we have enjoyed many good years and expansion. However, the reality is that we are in a time of restraint. Some hon. members in this House are very well qualified and have their backgrounds in health and research fields. Some of our members are physicians, chiropractors and veterinarians. Some are trained in scientific research, so there would be a natural bias in favour of research in the health field. I call on my own experience in medicine and pharmacy as well as pharmaceutical research, in making comments on a bill such as this. Naturally this bill goes against the grain. We would like to keep expanding; however, that is not our only point of discipline at the present time.

Research, particularly Canadian research in the health field, has been referred to in this debate. There is a tendency to talk about cost benefits in health research, and to some extent this is valid. However, from what I have heard it seems to me that there is a tendency to talk about successes and the cost benefits of those things which have been successful, such as the polio vaccine program. Other examples have been given. However, it seems to me that such talk is somewhat misleading, although probably not deliberate. Such talk deals with only part of the picture. It does not deal with programs which have not succeeded, and the majority of research programs in any field do not succeed in producing significant results. It does not deal with the total research picture and with how much has been invested in research. Some of our comments are very selective and very much in support of research spending.

I think back to the United States cancer program, a massive program which was announced a few years ago. The idea then was, similar to their foreign aid program after the war, that if enough money was thrown into something, good results would be the reward. There were some responsible researchers at that