

• (5:30 p.m.)

The non-smoker gets 200 mgms. of benzopyrene per year driving to and from work in a metropolitan area. But how about the poor guy who is smoking two packs of cigarettes a day? He is affected by both air pollution and cigarette pollution. He is getting 350 mgms. of benzopyrene a year. That is a heavy dosage, a very heavy dosage.

It is an accepted fact that cigarettes are a major cause of lung cancer. Anybody who has seen anyone with lung cancer cannot but be moved with compassion, and must be concerned with the smoking problem. I am not criticizing the government in a political way, but what has it done in this field? Surely, it is the responsibility of our medical research centres, and particularly of the people who manufacture cigarettes, to produce a tobacco that is not cancer stimulating.

The last figures I saw for 1965, showed that there were over 3,000 deaths due to cancer of the lung. As an aside, I may mention that Dr. Delarue will be speaking here shortly, and I hope all members of the house will go to hear him. He is an outstanding authority on chest surgery.

On January 1, 1966, the United States government made it mandatory on cigarette manufacturers to indicate on each package the hazard to health. What have we done in this respect? How much have we spent advertising the harmful effects of cigarette smoking? What have been the results of that advertising? I would like the minister to give us a reply on this matter, and if he cannot give it today then let him give it to us within the next two days.

What does the government intend to do in the matter of cigarette package labelling. If my memory serves me correctly, we were informed that once the United States made a move we would follow. Now, I ask when will we make it mandatory for cigarette package labels to read, "This may be hazardous to your health"?

I say in all sincerity to the minister that I am very concerned about this matter. Being a doctor and being the head of a clinic, I have seen too many fellows come in with cancer of the lung. They get the smoking habit early, and if there is anything we as members of parliament can do to stop young people acquiring the smoking habit, we should do it.

The hon. member for New Westminster has asked many questions about this matter, but we have not received the information that we

### *Supply—Industry*

want. I am sure the minister would like to give us that information because I hope he is as much concerned as I am.

I was pleased to see that the minister has increased the grant for medical research but, Mr. Chairman, he is only throwing a little more fuel on the fire. He is not really stoking it up. We are spending \$12 million a year on research in Canada, just a tenth per capita of what the United States is spending. We rank far down the list. In the medical profession, we rank 13th among the progressive countries of the world so far as the provision of doctors is concerned. When I look at that figure, I get a little ashamed of our efforts in this field.

The same is true with respect to medical research. We are far down the list, even though we have motor cars, television sets and radios, and even though we boast about having the second highest standard of living in the world. But we cannot provide enough research and money to keep our young university graduates in Canada.

Today we have a shortage of doctors. We have about one general practitioner to every 1,900 people. I repeat that we are in 13th place among the nations of the world with respect to the provision of doctors. Why is this so? It is because we lose 200 doctors every year to the United States. Why do we lose them? Because they do not have adequate research opportunities here in Canada.

The government is going to implement a medicare scheme in 1968, but I ask where is it going to get the teaching scientists to staff the universities? At present we are losing 200 bright young fellows every year because many of them are taking on research in the United States. Where are we going to find the teaching scientists to fill our own teaching posts?

I say with all sincerity that no matter how the government expands our present medical schools, if it does not get sufficient teaching scientists there will be a musical chairs program, with teachers moving from the poorer universities to the better universities. The result will be that poorer universities may lose their accredited standing entirely. This is a very serious matter.

Just last week I was talking in Toronto about this problem. We need more money for research and more branches of research. There is no use erecting buildings if we do not have the teachers and teaching scientists to man them. Where can we get these people that we need? First of all the government