

Science and Technology

drawing something like \$3 billion in unemployment insurance, which it is predicted they will draw this year.

Think of the incentives which can be made available to industry; think of what that \$3 billion can do in inducing industry to do those things which are necessary, and thereby put people to work. Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada want to work. Only a very small number want to be idle. Most of the unemployed want to do a job. It is our responsibility to make it possible for them to have jobs, instead of dwelling in idleness, as so many are being forced to do today.

I suggest that the kind of program I alluded to will pay for itself many times over by providing work. The people in the work force will pay income tax instead of drawing unemployment insurance. The impact on the work force of Canada would be tremendous, as the program would enable people to work instead of remaining idle. With an incentive program of this kind, we can make our products lower in price, more attractive in design, better in quality, sell in greater volume, and produce more jobs for the Canadian people. For members of this House to aim at anything less should simply not be tolerated by the people of Canada.

● (1650)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather)—National Parks—Fundy National Park—Request from Albert County Tourist Association to discuss entrance fee; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Post Office—Study recommending mail delivery be left with private contractors—Government position; the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker)—Consumers Affairs—Shortage of Mason jar lids in British Columbia—Government action.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—POLICY ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre:

That this House deplores the continuing decline in Canada's scientific and technological effort and urges the government to adopt a meaningful science policy that will lead to increased industrial

[Mr. Hees.]

research and development, increased scientific research and increased utilization of Canada's scientists and engineers, thereby contributing to the long-term benefit of both Canadians and the Canadian economy.

Mr. F. A. Philbrook (Halton): Mr. Speaker, as a medical and pharmaceutical scientist with background in the university, professional and industrial settings, I am pleased to join the discussion today on science policy.

I have followed government involvement in this subject for many years with great interest. I believe that it is important, whether or not it forms a separate department, and that it must be well and acceptably co-ordinated with the community at large, especially the universities and industry.

As part of my general interest in this field I would like to address myself to three specific areas of personal interest and background, the first two briefly, the third in more detail—first, a national science policy for Canada; second, rationalization of Canadian research, and third, the Medical Research Council. I approach this last subject with due modesty because of the presence in the gallery of one of our most distinguished Canadian scientists, the head of the Medical Research Council, Dr. Malcolm Brown.

First, dealing with a national science policy for Canada, this grand design has been seriously considered for many years by all interested parties, especially since science and technology began to dominate our lives after World War II, as the spearhead for all society and our whole way of life.

There has also been criticism in Canada over such a policy, mainly in that we have not been able to formulate one and that therefore we have tended to fall behind other nations in scientific-political-economic clout. While some of this criticism has been justified, in fairness it must be stated that Canada has not performed too badly on balance considering our limitations and the results achieved as a middle-size power.

This same criticism has been leveled at other fields in Canada, such as a long-term energy policy. However, on the positive side, with all due respect to long-term objectives, and recognizing the information explosion and the fast-changing world-wide scene, there may be real advantages in maintaining an open-ended, flexible science policy and avoiding a dinosaur. Canadian moderation has served us well.

Second, dealing with rationalization of Canadian research, whatever science policy or non-policy we may have, the shortest distance to desired results is a straight line. It is often the least expensive. In every way it serves our citizens best, and our scientists as well if they can accept such a truism.

In the simple halcyon days of yesteryear, not just in Canada but elsewhere too, the grass-roots type of approach seemed generally satisfactory and actually produced some remarkable advances, such as the discovery of insulin by Banting and Best right in Canada. The private commercial enterprises still often prefer to go it alone, raising their own finances and making their own decisions.

However, for the universities, and the governments and taxpayers they look to for funding, research has almost become overwhelming in its vastness, complexity, need for