

January 23, 1969, had this to say, in part, about the matter:

Northland Utilities came under fire Monday night when Town Council questioned power officials about low voltage complaints, customer servicing, the inability to contact company officials based here, and the high cost of power to the consumers.

As I say, this is a mining town, and its people cannot see the need for the very high power rates. I think my remarks have pretty well covered the case. I have a copy of the petition, and I could give it to the minister, together with any pertinent material I have in my possession.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, Eldorado Nuclear Limited has not considered taking over the services directly, itself. So far as the rates are concerned, these have been under consideration for some time and representations have been made by Eldorado Nuclear Limited. It is hoped that there will be a reduction of rates. Since there have been no direct representations to Eldorado Nuclear Limited about the quality of service, Eldorado Nuclear Limited has not considered using its influence with a view to having the service improved.

SCIENCE SERVICES—MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR POLICY

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, some days ago at a winter conference sponsored by the Canadian Institute on Public Affairs and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation the chairman of the Science Council, Dr. Solandt, made a speech in which he repeated statements which he had made on other occasions to the effect that improvements are needed in the federal government's science policy machinery, and advising the appointment of a minister for science policy.

On March 5, I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) if the government was considering making such an appointment and I was told by the Prime Minister that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) was in fact that minister. On another occasion when asked a similar question by my colleague, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), the Prime Minister pointed to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang), the hon. member from Saskatoon-Humboldt, as being that minister. On a third occasion when asked the same question he referred to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) as the minister responsible for science policy.

Proceedings on adjournment Motion

This is an extremely important matter, Mr. Speaker. The Secretary of the Treasury Board, Mr. Reiseman, testifying before the Senate committee which is investigating science policy said that the decisions of the government with regard to science policy were largely accidental. When one recognizes the fact that in the last several years government commitments to proceed with three very important scientific research programs have been scuttled, so far as one can see without very serious discussions with the scientific community, one realizes the importance of having a government minister responsible for making decisions in this field.

The Queen Elizabeth Observatory, which was to be built in British Columbia, has been cancelled. The HARP project being conducted by the physics department at McGill University has been scuttled and is now operating out of the United States with scientists in charge who were formerly on the staff of McGill University. The ING project which was being pushed very hard by the physicists of Canada has also been scuttled.

I am not an expert on science policy, and I suppose no member of this house is an expert on it. I hold no particular brief for these projects. I am not an expert on them any more than I am expert about the money we spend on medical research, or on agricultural research, or on defence research,—most of which seems to have been a failure—but I would like to think that with respect to the hundreds of millions of dollars that we spend the people and the government of Canada are getting some solid advice from the people who know best. Yet, Mr. Speaker, that does not seem to be the case.

An article which appeared in *Science Forum* in November 1968, written by Dr. Martin W. Johns, a physicist at McMaster University, said in part:

What science policy there may be seems to be directed by persons who neither understand the legitimate goals of science nor have direct communication with scientists—within or without the government service.

Similarly, Dr. L. E. Howlett, writing in *Science Forum* in the October 1968 issue said:

Too often the argument in favour of a costly project with heavy continuing commitments is that it is good science and excites the imagination. Too rarely is there a good case to support its direct relevance to Canada's future needs and a realistic appraisal of its probable value to the country as compared with the same money spent on other projects.

Dr. Howlett is a former National Research Council scientist. I could go on. Professor