

must of necessity, in a true scientific spirit, follow through to the logical destiny of this scientific age. But the expression "scientific research" is a blanket one, leaving the implication that it includes all kinds and all branches of all science.

I am afraid, however, that in this bill the government is limiting itself to a narrow field. The bill is confined to the narrow field of physical sciences, those which may be most readily adaptable to industry and those discoveries which may most readily lead to profit making by individuals. I should like to be assured by the minister that sociological science will also be tucked in beneath this blanket phrase of scientific research. No hint has been given that this will be done. In fact, in answer to my question the minister gave a direct negative, that there is no thought of studying social science, that we are just going to carry on with the study of the physical sciences.

It has often been remarked that the physical sciences have progressed far beyond the social sciences, that they have gone far beyond our power to control them and use them properly for human needs. This fact has been deplored by those concerned with the stern facts of our social and economic life. I noticed that when the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken) was speaking on atomic energy he made reference to this fact and said that the physical sciences have far outstripped the advances made in social science. It is not hard to understand why that should be. I believe it was Pope who said that the greatest study of mankind is man. It is probably because of the greatness of the study that we have been loath to take it up. Perhaps it has been neglected because it is not quite as remunerative a subject to follow as some of the other branches of science.

As between physical science and social science, the physicist has all the advantage. If he makes a discovery that is marketable, then he not only has a chance of being kept at his job or of selling his discovery, but also has the satisfaction of seeing the job to which he has given his life applied to something of value in human experience. That gives great encouragement to those who are studying in the physical sciences. But it is a very different matter when you start out to make discoveries in the field of social science. A newly discovered energy or an invented gadget which will make \$2 grow where \$1 grew before will be snatched at avidly, but a Christ with the discovery of a human brotherhood in his heart is quickly crucified. Such a man spends his time in the study of the social questions of life. However, such

discoveries have hitherto not been wanted by the few who have dominated the economic system based on the economic conquest of the many by the few.

The failure to pursue and apply social science has brought about dangerous results which we now face in both the domestic and the international sphere. As I see it, society has been left like a child to play with the matches and fire furnished by the physical sciences. There have been no signs of indicating the objective to which the discoveries of physical science should be devoted. We have given ad lib to the physical sciences. I have no quarrel with that; my quarrel is that we have not given equal study and equal attention to the social side of the question.

Human experience through a long period has known of what are supposedly antinomies, that is, antagonisms which seem to be irreconcilable quantities ready to rend asunder all human relationships. I should like to mention just a few as an indication of what I am driving at in my implication of the study of social science. We have seen in the great historic struggles of man such conflicts as the struggle between the ideology of the natural and the supernatural, between the human and divine in man himself and the struggle between the sponsors of mind and matter as interpretations of the universe. Finally we have come down to one of the sharpest struggles of all, the struggle of individualism against society or of society against the individual.

But all these antinomies have been proved by history to be false or incomplete. These conflicts proved to be reconcilable. Conflict came about because each point of view was treated as being final and complete in itself. In fact, those historic conflicts now appear in the light of wider knowledge as two partial views of the same reality. The great struggle to-day is that between the ideology of individualism and that of socialism.

Neither of these concepts can be regarded as absolute any more than the conflict between the natural and the supernatural could be regarded as absolute, or any more than the conflict between what is human and what is divine, and between what is mind and what is matter. The philosophy of individualism is no more absolute than the philosophy of socialism. In fact they are reconcilable. Free private enterprise and the social objective of socialism are not necessarily antinomies. Free private enterprise, of course, is essential, but it must flow like individual streams into the great current of social purpose and well-being. Ten million