

*Supply—Industry*

the guide lines of the conference on pollution in our environment held earlier this year.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Shall vote 1 carry? Item agreed to.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Shall item 5 carry?  
5. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, \$7,100,000.

Item agreed to.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Shall item 10 carry?  
10. Scholarships and grants in aid of research, \$41,000,000.

**Mr. Brand:** Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words on item 10. I thought we could give the minister a sense of accomplishment if we left vote 1 and went to vote 10. I want to say a few words about the Medical Research Council, the grants proposed for the coming year and those given in the past year. I was pleased to hear the increase that the minister has recommended but I am sorry to say, as has been said by others this afternoon and this evening, that it is not good enough. It is too little. The minister obviously has not paid attention to the many organizations and reports advocating increased grants for medical research, particularly in view of the medical care legislation which we hope to have before the house at some time, though the prospects are somewhat dim at the moment. Nevertheless, I submit that the house and the government must take a longer and closer look at the reasons for the shortages of funds for medical research in Canada.

My colleague from Simcoe East points out that in the United States they spend \$5.05 per capita on medical research whereas we spend about 75 cents per capita. This is not good enough. As an example I should like to show how badly the University of Saskatchewan medical school, my home college, needs money and help in the field of medical research. Quite recently there was a long series of articles in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, beginning on October 29 and running through to November 2 on the problem of the financing of research as a major health need. I wish to quote from the excellent articles written by a staff reporter, Florence Pratt.

More and better teachers and better facilities for research, or second class medical care—which?

I hope that is a rhetorical question.

This is the critical situation which medical personnel and some laymen say Canada must face at once.

[Mr. Barnett.]

She quotes Dr. Louis Horlick of the department of clinical medicine in the university medical school.

—to provide high class service, “the kind I am convinced the people of Canada want, we must produce a new kind of doctor, one who will not be obsolete the day he graduates. He must know how to receive information and use it properly. This calls for a new kind of training—one that will teach the student how to examine, evaluate and apply evidence and treatment.”

Sound teaching and research go hand in hand. They require a medical college which both teaches and carries on a continuing research program, inter-faculty exchange of ideas and continual expansion of those ideas—

The article points out that it is not enough to find one or two qualified men. Then it continues:

A researcher coming here needs to be assured conditions, both of staff and of facilities, will stimulate and encourage the creative mind.

A favourable climate for research is a nebulous thing, formed of a well-balanced combination of people, equipment and buildings. This combination can be provided. But it takes money, a great deal of money and long-range planning. In Canada, the immediate and most urgent problem is where and how to get that money.

Though I am pleased at the proposed 33½ per cent increase, it is about 50 per cent of what is required at this time and perhaps 20 per cent of what will be needed in ten years if, as the hon. member for Simcoe East points out, we are to bring in the kind of medical teachers who have solid research backgrounds and can produce more and better doctors to service Canada's people, and if we are to stop the exodus of doctors to the United States and other countries. We must have these funds and we must have them now.

We are all familiar with the Gundy report which was presented to the Prime Minister earlier this year. Surely the minister knows what the Gundy report recommends should be spent on research. If he has not done so I suggest that he should read the report, as it makes excellent reading and is most informative. The summary of the report on page 1 says:

Medical research is essential to the provision of high standards of medical education, health services and health care. This fact must be recognized in any programs aimed at broadening health services and raising health care standards in Canada. If these are to become objectives of public policy—

We all know, if I may interject my thought, that this matter ought indeed to become one of the objectives of this house. It continues:

● (8:30 p.m.)

—provision must be made for expansion of medical education in Canada and this, in turn, necessitates a greatly expanded scale of medical research effort.