

*Science and Technology*

One of the few things that I do besides being a member of parliament is to be a member of the board of governors of the University of Manitoba. This afternoon I spoke to the dean of the medical college at the University of Manitoba, and I am certain that if the minister wanted to take the time and make a little effort and phoned the medical college at McGill University or the University of Montreal, he would be told exactly the same things as I was told today by the dean of the medical college at the University of Manitoba. Within the past year, the University of Manitoba negotiated a new wage agreement with its support staff. That wage agreement gave the employees, many of whom work as assistants to medical doctors and scientists at the medical college, an increase of 20 per cent in wages retroactive to about six months ago.

The increased grants this year to the Medical Research Council, and therefore back to the University of Manitoba, will not begin to cover the cost of that increase. At the same time, the staff association which represents the medical staff at the University of Manitoba is also conducting negotiations and is likely to obtain an increase in the neighbourhood of 20 per cent. The increased grants this year and the small increase last year to the Medical Research Council will not begin to meet those increases in salaries which the University of Manitoba had to give to its employees.

What will happen? Very simple, says the dean of the medical college. Real medical research at the University of Manitoba will be cut back. The dean gave me some examples. They have been doing a major research project on allergies. They were beginning to get some very promising and encouraging results which, if carried to their logical conclusions, could have brought a great deal of relief to the thousands of people across Canada who suffer very seriously as a result of allergies. They will not be able to follow up these interesting new aspects having to do with the treatment of illnesses such as this.

They have been doing some research programs into the biochemical aspects of aging. These will be drastically cut back. They were hoping that, as a result of the findings they would make in these fields, they might find methods of reversing adverse effects in the biochemical health of older people. They were hoping that as a result of these programs they would be able to begin to rehabilitate patients. They have been looking at people who are ill as a result of heart disease. Programs are being cut back in every area in which they are working. The momentum which they have been able to build up in the last few years is being lost. Teams which they have built up over the years are lost. I am not an expert, nor is the minister, but they tell me that it takes about 12 years to build up a medical research team. Those teams will be broken up.

● (2100)

The Americans are also cutting back, but they have been spending something between ten and twenty times more per capita on medical research than Canadians have been spending, so by our standards they will still be living in a fantastically favourable environment. Just when many things were beginning to pick up after the drought of the last half a dozen years, again restraint is imposed.

Let me go on to put on the record a statement made to the Government of Canada in August of 1974, a joint statement by the Canadian Society for Clinical Investigation, the Canadian Federation of Biological Societies and the Association of Canadian Medical Colleges. They made a statement which they entitled "Medical Research: The Immediate Need for Increased Funding." In this statement they talk about the medical requirements of the medical colleges, and they show that the budget for 1974-75 of the Medical Research Council was \$41.4 million. The additional funds for all approved operating grants were \$2.5 million. Additional funds for personnel support and special programs amounted to \$1 million. The appropriate budget for 1974-75 was \$44.9 million. Then there is an allowance for growth in activity at 2.5 per cent. That is certainly not a very large growth, and it amounts to \$1.1 million. There is an allowance for inflation at 10 per cent of \$4.5 million. They estimated a potential budget requirement for 1975-76 of \$50.5 million. But, as I have already indicated, the actual increase in the cost of doing medical research is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 20 per cent. In their budget of \$50.5 million they estimated the inflation factor at 10 per cent. The actual increase in cost as a result of inflation is 20 per cent, so we should add to this another \$4.5 million which would have brought their budget up to \$55 million, the budget requirements for the Medical Research Council for the fiscal year 1975-76.

If the minister will look at the estimates for 1975-76, he will see that the actual proposed expenditures are \$49.5 million, a shortfall, according to what these organizations have calculated, of \$5.5 million, a shortfall of 10 per cent on what they have calculated they need. Mr. Speaker, I am not the expert—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I must advise him that the time allotted to him in this debate has now expired.

**Mr. Charles Turner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Science and Technology and Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that hon. members opposite are making the point that the government is spending too little money on science policy. Actually when one considers the figures, the government is spending more in all departments with the exception of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Looking at the total figures for the years 1973-74, we spent \$1,141,215,000. In 1974-75 the figure was increased to \$1,266,154,000, and in 1975-76 this has been increased to \$1,443,872,000.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Turner (London East):** The figures for the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce have also been increased from \$99,261,000 for the year 1974-75 to \$104,694,000 in the year 1975-76. Where do hon. members get their arguments? For the information of the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark), I would like to advise that the Department of the Environment of Canada is spending \$243 million in the year 1975-76, an increase of \$23 million over the year 1974-75 and an increase of almost \$50 million over the year 1973-74.