

Canadian contribution for the benefit of all of us on planet earth.

Let me quote from a letter written to me on March 3, 1976 by Donald Sprung, Dean of the Faculty of Science at McMaster University. He wrote:

As a practising scientist, and dean of one of the most research-active science faculties in Canada, I fully share the concerns expressed by Professors Yates and Polanyi. Within our faculty the vast majority of professors are actively engaged in research. Many of them have national and international reputations for the value of their work. The high quality of my colleagues is reflected in the fact that at McMaster our research support from government and other granting agencies has not fallen as far behind as it has at other universities. Nonetheless, it has fallen in value, and by a considerable percentage over the past six years. These are just the years during which they are doing their best creative work, the years at which one would expect the level of support to be increasing. In fact, it is only in very rare cases that an individual has been able to secure an increase in funds.

Time and time again researchers across the country, professors and others, write to us to give advice and suggestions. Over the weekend I had the pleasure of being present for the Canada Jaycees Vanier Award to five outstanding Canadians. Among those honoured was Dr. John F. S. Crocker of Dalhousie University. He is noted for his research into Reye's syndrome. Dr. Crocker mentioned that we had gone through a period when it was considered fashionable to say: "Do not waste money; other countries are far ahead of us and we can either borrow or buy their research". In his own case a large amount of the funding for his research had to come from outside this country. We agreed that there is a marked change in that attitude, and there is every reason to believe that there is renewed interest in and sincere backing for Canadian research at all levels.

● (1742)

We must remember that federal funding of university research is necessary because of the importance of highly skilled scientists who are required to tackle problems facing Canada concerning the use of limited resources, population pressures, pollution and protection of the environment, health care, agricultural productivity and developing new sources of food and materials.

I have had extensive dealings with the biology department at McMaster University. I would like to quote from some of the correspondence I have received from that department. This correspondence illustrates the understanding of that department of how this minister, his department, this government and others have responded in a real way to the requests of researchers across the country. Mr. Davidson, chairman of the biology department of McMaster University, wrote the following:

Our concern at the level of support for research is not only that our individual efforts as scientists are affected. As teachers, we also know that the approach active scientists bring to teaching is more critical and more alive because they have first-hand experience of contemporary problems in our knowledge. The active scientist is generally a more interesting teacher and is certainly a better informed teacher than a scientist who depends solely upon books for information. Thus our concern over research funding is not purely selfish; we see research as an integrated part of our teaching responsibilities.

Research and Development

Professor Bayley from the same department wrote:

The human population is putting increasing demands on limited natural resources. To tackle the problems this creates, Canada like the rest of the world will require all the skilled scientific talent it can get. But maintaining and training skilled scientific talent means practising science "at the state of the art." With the sophistication of much of today's science, this cannot be done cheaply. If, to save relatively small amounts of money (by national standards), Canadian science is forced to lag behind, it will take years to recoup the lost ground. In the meantime, when up-to-date experts are required in Canada, the only reasonable step would be to import them from abroad. For a country of Canada's wealth and aspirations to continue to rely on imported scientific talent would be as unprincipled in my view as expecting other countries to provide us with trained medical staff—or hockey players.

Professor Douglas M. Davies of that same department wrote:

University research differs from government research . . . in several important ways.

- 1) Applications for university research grants are carefully appraised by specialists in each discipline ensuring that only the best is supported.
- 2) Research at universities usually involves also the training of specialized graduate students who will be Canada's scientists of the future.
- 3) A university teacher engaging in original research is able to bring to his teaching of undergraduate and graduate courses a first-hand excitement and freshness in presenting the latest in view scientific knowledge.

The head of that department, Mr. Davidson, seems to recognize not only our research problems but also our political problems. He wrote the following:

A problem for any government is to justify to the electors the allocations it makes of public funds. Thus, it would be easier for Mr. Trudeau's government to direct funds into, say, cancer and heart research, than into basic research on, say, wood production in eastern Canada, or fish breeding in northern Canada. But, as we tried to show you, the solution of problems unique to Canada will never be achieved in the U.S.A. or Europe. We have unique problems and to attack them we must, to some extent, be chauvinistic and parochial. We need a group of highly skilled highly trained scientists who recognize Canada's problems and are given the chance to work on them. To us, the solution is an adequate level of funding to support research.

All this and more has been said by researchers across the country, written to members of parliament and presented to the government and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

I would like to note the fact that Max Chernesky, a virologist at St. Joseph's Hospital in Hamilton, along with Donald Savage, head of the Canadian Association of University Teachers, presented a report which is quite lengthy. However, there were three recommendations in their report, and I would like to tell the House how the minister, his predecessor and others have tried to respond to those recommendations.

One of the recommendations is as follows:

We recommend that governments at all levels consult with the organizations which represent professors and researchers prior to proposing new policies in higher education and, in particular, in regard to any negotiations between the federal and provincial governments over the financing of higher education.

The almost immediate response to that recommendation was the formation of the Canadian Committee on Financing of University Research. It is not a federal-provincial committee; it is a Canadian committee. This committee almost immediately stepped in to bring those forces together as a direct response to the brief presented by the Canadian Association of University Teachers. The committee was announced on November 2, 1976. It was announced that the committee