

and bad effects of science and technology on society are becoming so far-reaching. In other words, in such conditions scientists, as suppliers of research services, cannot be the sole determinants of the level and the distribution of science activities.

Thus scientists and politicians can no longer ignore each other. There are, of course, areas of possible conflict between the two. The scientist, who is used to living isolated from the rest of society, wants to keep his freedom. The politician, as the guardian of the public interest, seeks to save money and to increase his control over research in order to maximize its social benefits. Don K. Price has summarized this attitude:

Politicians want to cut down on the appropriations for research, to have more of the money spent on practical technology and less on academic theory and to break down the degree of autonomy which the leaders of the scientific community gained a generation ago in the procedure by which research grants are distributed.⁹

But politicians and scientists cannot continue to work at cross purposes as they have done for too long in Canada. The politician and the public administrator will have to respect the scientist and his freedom, to seek his advice and welcome his criticism. The scientist will have to accept the fact that most research activities have become political in the best sense of that word and must be guided by national goals and subjected to systematic review in the light of those objectives. Not only should the scientist accept this new situation, he should also be prepared to take an active part in the formulation and the endless re-definition of the goals and content of science activities.

In other words, the politician and the scientist must learn to become partners. They must not only live together but work together and help each other to serve society better. It can be a most rewarding challenge for the scientist with his new responsibilities to integrate himself into society. The researcher will of course have to remain a true scientist but he will also become a servant of the public with important social functions to fulfil. This politician will have to remain the guardian of the public interest but he will also become more aware that scientific progress needs a climate of freedom. This is the kind of mutual respect and comprehension that must develop between the politician and the scientist, if the goals of society and science are to be met.

William D. Carey expresses the same basic idea in different terms when he writes:

If [public policy toward science] is to be strong, it must first be relevant and it must be shown to have relevance. If research and development are necessary