

people with ten million free enterprises, not one of which cares for society, would not create the kind of society that any of us would want to live in. But ten million enterprising people working for the common good of all would be a very satisfactory condition as I conceive it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I do not think his remarks are relevant to the bill which is before the house at the present time.

Mr. IRVINE: I am sorry if I have to argue that with Your Honour. The bill before the house is for the promotion of scientific research, is it not? If that is so, am I to understand that the Speaker of this house is ruling out one of the greatest branches of modern society and precluding its discussion under the bill? If so, then I have nothing more to say. Do I understand that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman will understand that it is most disagreeable for the Chair to interrupt during a speech, but it is the duty of the Speaker to keep the discussion relevant to the bill before the house. The rules are very clear that on second reading the principle of a bill should be discussed.

Mr. MacINNIS: On the point of order, may I suggest that the principle of the bill is scientific research, and it seems to me that any scientific research would come within the purview of the bill and consequently would be a matter for discussion on the second reading.

Mr. HOWE: The hon. member has suggested that additional amendments be made to the bill, and I think on a discussion of the motion for second reading he is quite in order to bring up matters which he believes should be included in amendments to the Research Council Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman has the unanimous consent of the house he may proceed.

Mr. IRVINE: I do not wish to ask for the unanimous consent of the house to discuss something which I am quite convinced is in order. If you say it is not in order I will sit down. I want to know whether or not I am in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member knows that the house is master of its own rules. If the hon. gentleman has the permission of the house to proceed, he may proceed.

Mr. IRVINE: I shall proceed until either you or someone else stops me.

Mr. MacINNIS: Or until you have finished.

[Mr. Irvine.]

Mr. IRVINE: Or until my forty minutes have elapsed. I think what I am getting at will be quite clear and I do not think, sir, you will consider it to be out of order. If social science had been directing human affairs to the same degree as physical science has figured in industry in the last half century, we would not have many of the problems that we have to-day. I am arguing that while it is well that we should maintain and support further research in the physical sciences and apply them to the great systems of production and distribution, the principle of scientific research should be extended into the social field so that we may thereby be in a position to give direction to physical science in bringing about the best possible solution of human problems. Because this has not been done, the industrial application of physical science, which should have relieved man of drudgery and brought him within the compass of economic security, has brought such things as total war and wholesale slaughter in the international field and unemployment and want in our domestic economy, where leisure and abundance might have been the reward.

I suggest, sir, that such a matter as enforced idleness without adequate income to make living possible is a very serious problem indeed. I suggest further that the advances in the physical sciences have helped to increase the numbers of those who have to put up with enforced idleness on an inadequate income, and therefore it is right within the compass of this bill to be discussed.

It is common knowledge that science may be used to achieve any end. It may be used to destroy; it may be used to construct; it may be used exclusively for the achievement of personal gain; it may be used for communal benefit. It may be used for either one or all of these, so that if we are to subsidize scientific research it is important that we should know what is to be done with what we discover. What is the end we strive to achieve? If we are to spend public money on scientific research, we should have, I repeat, some say in how that will affect mankind. It is the very business of human nature itself to decide the ends toward which all scientific knowledge should be directed.

Science has two functions: one, to give man a realistic view of the whole phenomena of existence, and, second, to provide man with the means of controlling his environment and his destiny. Says Huxley in his "What Dare I Think?":

Science as a principle and body of knowledge is essentially a means. It provides the only way of achieving distant and elaborate ends.