

clear practical objectives, well-coordinated productive functioning, responsible budgeting, and in short, rationalization.

Yes, there is and always will be a need for basic research, in proportion with applied research, but it also can lend itself to the above criteria.

Third, dealing with medical science and the Medical Research Council, or MRC, one of the reasons this special area has interested many people like myself is the great tradition of medicine we have in this country as part of a liberal tradition of putting people before things.

The Medical Research Council of the federal government has played an important role and led the way in Canadian medical research. If I have held one personal concern about its functioning, it has been that it has not always worked in as close partnership with industry research as it has with the universities. I believe that to compete effectively Canada must coordinate all its resources more effectively than other countries. Industry, largely foreign-owned, may not always have been keen to chance it, but neither has government. I think especially of my own pharmaceutical industry as an example.

But MRC's programs have steadily expanded, and with them medical research across the country. The original MRC budget for 1975-76 exceeded \$48 million, an increase of 13 per cent over the previous year, exceeding severe inflation. In response to the community, an additional \$2.5 million was added by means of a supplementary vote. The number of MRC scholars has also been increased to 25 this year from 20 the year before. All good applications for development grants will be funded this year to help alleviate regional disparity.

The minister continues to meet and work with the representatives of major national scientific societies and any interested people in the community. The response has been largely gratifying. My own contacts with the medical and scientific sectors are very encouraging. Similarly, Dr. Charles Scriver, president of the Canadian Society for Clinical Investigation, has assured the Minister of Health and Welfare with such statements as, "you have again done wonders to improve Canadian medical science".

The major part of the additional \$2.5 million funds were used to initiate about 130 research projects which would not otherwise have been possible. About 25 additional grants have also been made to provide urgently required items of major equipment to investigators.

These funds had to be found with speed, co-operation and efficiency in other areas of the Health and Welfare budget—health care operating expenses, health care grants, medical services and health protection programs—indicating the great spirit of support for medical research in the department itself.

The invaluable contribution of MRC continues to grow while maintaining a sense of proportion in the distribution of its research programs; for example, in 1974-75, 54 per cent for research in basic science departments, 38 per cent for research in clinical departments, and 8 per cent for research outside schools of medicine such as dentistry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, optometry and so on.

While recognizing that the private sectors play a vital role in medical and other types of research, and that the

Science and Technology

needs for funding are as limitless as research itself, Canadians can rest assured that they are being well served by their government science programs.

• (1700)

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few comments to those of my colleagues on the motion before the House.

I suppose if one were asked to describe the condition of the Ministry of Science and Technology one would have to say that the word paralysis best describes it. Paralysis is defined as a lessening of the power of motion or feeling, or a state of being powerless or helplessly inactive. This description well describes the ministry as it presently operates.

There has probably been more written about the subjects of science and technology in the last few years than almost any other topic except finance and the question of inflation. I think it would be fair to say the department is suffering from paralysis by analysis. It is suffering from a lack of direction and purpose, a lack of co-ordination. To understand this, it is necessary to look behind the present minister.

Is it any wonder the department has done so badly? The previous minister, now the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie), left it in a state of chaos, and he is now proceeding to make a mess of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. He is doing such a thorough job that we can expect an announcement, any day now, that the government has declared it to be a disaster area. Thus I might say I have certain sympathy for the present minister since he inherited a department which was in a state of disarray. On the other hand, I understand the hon. gentleman only devotes three hours a week to this particular portfolio. He is not convinced there is any possibility of reorganizing the department in such a way as to make it an effective tool of scientific and industrial policy. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the minister is not convinced of this, what chance does the department have of getting any priority when cabinet decisions are made?

As far as we can see, there has been little action by the minister or by the government on the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Science and Technology. None of the recommendations of the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers have been implemented, and it is apparent that all the rhetoric contained in the 1974 Speech from the Throne on research and development, and on science and technology, served only to fill the pages of that document with meaningless words.

Where does this leave us, Mr. Speaker? I think the paralysis of the department leaves us at or near the bottom of the industrial heap. Others have quoted the OECD figures, and their remarks were both timely and to the point. Take as an example the Defence Research Board. After 28 years of operation, the board has been disbanded. In its wake we are left with an obsolete long-range patrol aircraft that is only held together by the dedication of an inspired group of people in our armed forces. We have wornout tanks which can only operate in daylight hours, and then only because other tanks are cannibalized to keep them going. We have strike aircraft playing a support role in NATO which are kept flying only