

Proceedings on adjournment Motion

N. H. Lithwick, writing in the *Journal of Canadian Studies* in August of 1968, in an article entitled "Science policy in Canada" says the following about our so-called science policy:

• (10:10 p.m.)

After an examination of the conduct and financing of such activity by government in Canada, it is safe to conclude that there is no science policy, except perhaps the conviction that science is a good thing. This in turn stems from an absence of social policy as a whole, so that scientists have been free to develop their art as it pleases them.

Later, he says:

Indeed, the government has clearly chosen to leave future decisions on science policy in the hands of the scientists.

He concludes his article by saying:

How these priorities will be allocated by a body made up largely of scientists in the absence of a set of articulated public objectives raises our most fundamental fears—fears not at all alleviated by reassurances of the chairman that the Council will co-operate with social and behavioural scientists.

The point I am trying to make simply is that in my opinion it is the duty and responsibility of the government of Canada to establish a system of priorities so that the money which the government decides Canada can afford to spend in the field of scientific research shall be spent to the best advantage of the people of Canada as a whole. That, in my opinion, requires a minister responsible for science policy who can make reasonably sound decisions in respect of what this country needs after consultation with the scientific community in the government, in the science council, in the universities and in industry, on the one hand and the members of the cabinet on the other hand who know the total needs and commitments of the Canadian people. I submit that despite our science secretariat or council the government does not have such a policy.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) I should like to say that I answered part of a question on this subject on February 20 this year as recorded at page 6790 of *Hansard* when I replied to a similar question asked by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent). The only other thing that might be added at this time is that if there is any statement to be made by the Prime Minister on this subject it would be made on motions, which is the time when government policies are announced.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—EFFECT OF
RATE CHANGES IN NON-PROFIT
PUBLICATIONS

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, like a number of other members of the house I have tried at one time or another on orders of the day and at other times to raise a question concerning the inordinate increase in postal rates on what I term non-profit publications in Canada. I do so again tonight, particularly following what I thought was a rather curious reply made to me by the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) last week when I asked a question of that nature. If I understood him correctly he said at that time that instead of the non-profit publications seeking to have redress through a lower rate of postage, their associations might consider applying to a department of government for some type of subsidy. Therefore, I take this opportunity to raise the question again tonight.

If I understood the minister correctly, his suggestion was that there might be a subsidy for non-profit publications such as scientific reviews, church papers, trade union papers and so on which in some cases have been put out of business or curtailed in respect of their publication because of the new heavy increases in rates. I think what I should like to do, in backing up my question, is to quote from the position my party expressed last October, as recorded at page 1614 of *Hansard*:

—we wish a committee study to be made to ensure that the proposed rate increases are sufficient and are borne by those by whom they should be and do not fall upon publications which are not published for commercial profit but rather for the service of some particular educational, health or co-operative association or union.

Had something like that been done at the time, we would not be in the situation many of us feel we are in today in respect of the curtailment of these publications which are not able, from other financial resources, to meet their costs of publication. I refer to those publications I have mentioned before relating to unions, churches, scientific associations and other such small publications. In my view what the government is doing is actually curtailing communications in these fields.

I am one of those who favour proper and heavy increases in the rates on business publications, and business mail generally. They have been subsidized for many years by the ordinary consumers in Canada who have paid the first class rate. However, this is a very different situation to that which we find described in the *Ottawa Citizen* which made a