

encouraged to see that the Government has paid the attention which we would like it to pay to our proceedings. We are rather amazed that they have been reading them as thoroughly as they have and are making these changes in the meantime. It worries us a little that they are stealing some of the thunder of our report but, as long as we get things done, we do not worry too much about that. As a matter of fact, some of us are beginning to wish we were not going to write a report, because it will be somewhat anticlimactic. Our hearings have been the first occasion in Canada that Government departments themselves had an opportunity to come before parliamentarians and explain what they were doing about science *per se*. In more than one brief we read the statement that this is the first time that this department ever made an assessment of its science spending *per se*. Some of them rather boasted about this, to our surprise. I think it is true to say that nobody in Canada knew how much the federal Government was spending on science and development. We had contrary figures before us, which were quite far apart. In my mind there is no question that some of the evidence before the committee, and some of the statements made by members of the committee, caused the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and the Science Council to get together, and they have now come up with figures that I think are pretty reliable. This indicates how far back we were.

The first time we knew what was going on in Canada in the global sense in research and development was from an OECD report. It took some outsiders to come in with the breakdown between fundamental applied and development, and between funding and performance of in-house, universities and industry research. Until the OECD report there was no document available in Canada with these very important figures.

When Senator Lamontagne introduced his original motion in the Senate to have this committee set up, the great debate had not reached Canada. Of course there were scientists who were aware of it, but in the sense of any legislative or public interest in the question that you, Mr. Daddario, raised yourself—whether we needed a national science policy—there was no public discussion of that. Today there is a good deal of public discussion. I think one of the achievements of our committee has been to spark this discussion and provide a forum for a period of a

year and a half to which anybody could come. For example, we had representatives of the universities in this room who had never sat down together at any time to discuss the problems of funding science and the performance of science in the universities as such.

**The Chairman:** We had 40 in a week.

**Senator Grosart:** We introduced some of them to each other, and certainly introduced them in the context of a discussion of science policy.

**Congressman Daddario:** There are many interesting and parallel developments between your work and ours. I think it important to note that these common boundary conditions impose certain requirements upon the people with whom you and our committee are dealing. Over and over again we found it was illusory to think that many of these people had a fixed philosophy about science matters. This was a false assumption made not only by ourselves but by them. When they were brought together, introduced to each other and began talking to each other, they discovered that they were not really operating on the same wavelength. In these discussions there have been some remarkably good developments, which have been helpful in this process of elucidating science policy questions.

One other interesting parallel you drew was in reference to certain people in government who never had had a chance to appear before a parliamentary committee. When we first approached the National Academy of Sciences we found they were very delicate about this relationship, and in fact not anxious to work with Congress in this regard. We finally did work it out and established the first formal relationship Congress had ever had with the National Academy of Sciences, which had been in existence for 102 years. From that time the relationship has become a very casual and easy one, demonstrating that many times we create artificial barriers. It seems to me that what your committee has already done is to break down so many of these barriers and this is tremendous progress.

**Senator Grosart:** This is true. We had some quite adamant refusals from some quite important public bodies to appear, but after awhile it became fashionable to appear before the Science Committee and almost a status symbol.