

you must contribute, you must make available, resources for science because it is a good thing, because it is important."

**Senator Grosart:** Surely, all that would apply to energy policy, or immigration policy, or agricultural policy? We have set up separate departments to deal with all of those things, but they are all-pervasive, just as science is, and everything you have said about science applies to energy, or to immigration, or to manpower or anything else. I do not understand why MOSST appears to be putting so much reliance on what appears to me to be a pulling back from the essential role of co-ordinating and to some extent, concentrating science policy. What I find difficult to understand in the presentation you have made, or that the department has made, is that over and over again you say that you are doing exactly this. You say, "We are assessing and reviewing . . . We are getting a visible science budget." This is in your report. Somewhere else—perhaps in the speeches—you say, "We must not have a visible science budget prior to the time that it goes to Treasury Board." Yet, throughout this presentation you say, "We are doing this." I do not understand why MOSST is trying to pull away from this. Perhaps you will be able to tell us in this committee meeting today why MOSST is deprecating its own role so continuously. You have done quite a bit of it yourself.

**Hon. Mr. Drury:** Yes. One has to be rather more specific about the charge, if I can call it that, of deprecating one's own role. I suggest that anything I have said, or that the brief says, is not deprecating our role, but trying to give effect to the notion that science and technology are, as you put it, all-pervasive and the opportunities for their useful employment exist every where and in every face to four life, but in relation to the solution of non-scientific or non-technical problems. When one talks about co-ordinating and a science budget, if this conveys a notion that quite independently MOSST should be running a series of scientific or technological exercises unrelated to the specific needs of individual government departments or agencies, then we would have departments or agencies operating for the betterment of science, whatever that is.

**Senator Grosart:** But, surely, that does not follow?

**Hon. Mr. Drury:** Our view is that if one takes a particular department, let us say Agriculture, you find there they have a series of problems. Some of these problems can be resolved by the application of existing scientific knowledge, and some may be resolved by the application of future or hoped-for or anticipated scientific knowledge. Others really cannot benefit from the application of either science or technology. The Department of Agriculture puts a priority on the resolution of these particular problems, and some are urgent and some are less urgent, some are important and some are less important; but the priority is not a scientific or technological one, it is basically a national one in terms of our national goals. The role of MOSST should not be the determination of these priorities of the Department of Agriculture, but to see that to the maximum possible extent useful technological and scientific help is given in the resolution of these problems. Inevitably in any department there will be a tendency to look at one's self in perhaps a fairly circumscribed field. It is to be hoped that from the outside MOSST can, with its wider knowledge of what is happening in other fields—that is to say, fields other than agriculture—provide assistance. It can also provide administrative assistance to the

department or to the technological or scientific elements of the department, with a view to ensuring that administrative arrangements, based on experience elsewhere, are perhaps more effective and more efficient than otherwise they would be.

**Senator Grosart:** Would you agree, Mr. Minister, that they should be an essential part of a policy for science, or to use a phrase you used in the presentation, a framework for science policy? Some place in the government's decision-making process decisions have to be made to deal with the adequacy or inadequacy of the total spending on science as a percentage of the total federal budget, yet you seem to say that you do not like that, you do not like it considered as a percentage of the GNP. Would you agree that there should be somewhere in government a review and assessment, prior to the spending of money on science and technology, of the adequacy of the total, the distribution by performance, the distribution of that money by various categories of science, for example, as between basic and development (something that for some reason or other is not broken down in any way in the Green Paper) the percentage of total government spending distributed as between R&D and what are called other related activities, between departments, between the natural sciences and the humanities and so on? Would you agree that somewhere, before the money is spent, there should be a review and assessment and advice given to the government as to the total package of scientific and technological spending—that is, the public money spent in this area? Should it be looked at before, or should it be looked at only afterwards, as we are doing now?

**Hon. Mr. Drury:** We do endeavour to collect information as to the types, location and purpose of spending in the scientific field. But this analysis is made with a view to determining where the gaps are, where the successes are and where the failures are, rather than assuming that if in some way or other we can spend twice as much money on science, then we are going to be better off in some fashion, or that by spending half as much on science as a whole, we are going to be better off. If I may come back to the purpose that we would like to see science and technology serve, it is the solution of problems. If we have problems in an area where scientific and technological tools exist, or are in likely prospect, one would then expect scientific and technological expenditures to rise in seeking these solutions or in their application. If, as a country, we perceive that our problems are in areas where science and technology cannot be of much help in resolving a problem, then one would expect, as we address ourselves to those and try solutions, that scientific and technological effort and expenditures would decline as a proportion of the total.

In Canada, if one looks at the federal budget over recent years there has been a very substantial increase in expenditures by the federal government under the heading known generally as transfer payments. For the resolution of a number of our social and economic problems, the conclusion has been reached that in a society where we believe the maximum freedom of choice to the individual should be our aim and rule, a number of these social problems, inequalities and injustices, can be cured by putting economic resources in the form of dollars in the hands of individuals and letting them make their choices. This means that federal expenditures on transfer payments, particularly to individuals, have risen proportionately very largely indeed. That is where the money resources are going.