

We endorse the recommendation if suitably enlarged to require that a prerequisite for such post-doctoral fellowships should be appropriate industrial experience, or alternatively that such post-doctoral fellowships should be tenable in an appropriate industrial establishment.<sup>37</sup>

The Committee cannot accept this suggestion as a general rule because the industrial environment is not usually regarded as appropriate for young scientists preparing to pursue a career in basic research. However, it may be desirable as an alternative for cases in which it is appropriate. In this connection, the Canadian Chemical Producers' Association suggests that the "NRC embryo scheme for post-doctoral fellowships in industry be retained and improved with a view to making them more attractive to industry."<sup>38</sup> We have already proposed that this assistance be integrated into a program under the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and recommend the department to give careful consideration to the CCPA's suggestion. It has already been demonstrated that even basic scientists can, when they choose, operate effectively in large industrial laboratories. At least two Nobel prizewinners have conducted their work in such establishments in the United States.

Two other recommendations on priorities for basic research have been misinterpreted, largely because the wording used by the Committee was not clear enough.

We proposed that the foundations, applying the criterion of social merit, "assist only those [projects] that are relevant to the Canadian scene [and] reject Big Science projects to be carried out with Canadian support alone."<sup>39</sup> While most professional and industrial associations accepted that only basic research relevant to the Canadian scene should be supported by public funds, this criterion caused some concern in scientific circles. In the Committee's eyes, relevance to the Canadian scene was not so much a matter of exclusion as of priority. We were trying to apply the principle of the international division of labour even in the sector of basic research. For instance we believe it is more appropriate for Canada to support basic scientists studying Arctic ecology than the ecology of desert regions. In our view this is a valid consideration when funds are limited. But we agree that this criterion should be used only in extreme cases and that scientific merit should generally prevail.

There was some confusion about the expression "Big Science projects." Here we used the word "science" in its restricted sense, as opposed to technology, and we meant basic science programs requiring expensive, specialized equipment. The most commonly cited cases are in astronomy, where large optical equipment and telescopes are needed, or particle physics, where expensive accelerators are required.<sup>40</sup> It is obvious that Canada cannot afford to equip its scientists for such big basic science projects. We also feel, however, that Canadian basic scientists should not be prevented from participating in such huge programs and