

Date: June 8, 1967

For Release: 8:30 p.m.

For Publication:
CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

NOTES FOR THE PRIME MINISTER'S REMARKS
TO THE CANADIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION BANQUET
CARLETON UNIVERSITY, OTTAWA, JUNE 8, 1967

Your program is evidence of the wide range of your intellectual curiosity.

Curiosity, as every scientist - political or otherwise - knows, is one of the enduring and persistent characteristics of man. It is responsible for many of his troubles because it is always upsetting someone's favorite applecart. But it is also the main force behind his own and his society's progress. Indeed the curiosity of the scientist - political, social or natural - has been behind most of the vast changes that have swept - and are now sweeping - over the world with a speed and scope that is bewildering.

Of course politics has not escaped the impact of man's curiosity. It is indulgence in this urge to explore the meaning of the world around him; the world of social and political and economic behaviour; to explore it in an objective and intellectual way, that makes one a political scientist; or if you prefer a political theorist. Anyone who does this exploration in an unscientific way is merely a politician.

It is, of course, quite impossible to combine the two approaches, though contemporary experience shows that they may be practised in succession; with eager and inquisitive men and women switching from one to the other, in transitions that are even more valuable to the political scientist than they are to the politician.

Naturally, I admit to some prejudice in this matter. But I have always felt that a plunge into the untidy moat of practical politics improves the nature and contentment of life, as well as the practicality and the reality of activity, on return to the ivory tower. I apologize, at least to myself and Miss Jewett, for this unfortunate reference to "the untidy moat" as if it were something muddy and stagnant.

In fact, the profession of politics is the second oldest in history, and much more reputable than the oldest; whether you define politics as the science and art of government, or, more originally, as it was once in the words of a professor of mine long ago, as "the skillful use of blunt instruments".

The political scientist recently seems to be turning his mind, directing his restless academic curiosity and his intellectual assurance, to the new ultra-modern world of communication. Indeed, a prominent Toronto TV and radio newspaper columnist pointed a few days ago, with some anxiety, to those "university people" - political scientists of one form or another, no doubt - "who are now engaged in establishing communications as a new academic discipline." He attributes this to the "dazzling ascendancy of one of their own, Marshall McLuhan," whose adoption, as he put it, "by the media as the latest public guru, merely heightens the frustration of all his ivy-covered colleagues."

Then came Mr. Braithwaite's most caustic observation: "The more the academics study communications, the more they come to realize that the essence of the subject is the thing itself, the act of communication. And though they pay lip service to the precept that the most valid form of communication is the simplest - one man speaking to one man, or a small seminar - their ambition really is to have access to the newspapers, to radio and, most of all, to TV."

I might not go so far as that, but I must confess that my confidence in my own ability to do anything intelligent in the practice, if not the exposition, of politics, is rapidly being eroded by the radio and TV commentaries of Political scientists, or even worse of those Political non-scientists who haunt the galleries of Parliament and the corridors of government offices. Both the scientist and the non-scientist in this field of national and international political science speak and write with an easy assurance of infallibility which I have never been able to muster since I left the History Faculty at Toronto University. I find it all intensely depressing, if not demoralizing.

I read the other day that political commentaries always flourish in a time of political disarray. The fact is, of course, the political disarray is due largely to an excess of political commentaries.

Confronted with the continual frustration and worry brought about by practical considerations getting in the way of intellectual and political perfection, I get discouraged when I listen to the confident voice of academic omniscience on everything from the recognition of Red China to the base price for industrial milk.

I am comforted, however, by the thought that, God willing, I may soon be academic again, starting where I left off, somewhat to my own surprise, in 1928. Soon I will again become an authority, instead of merely a Cabinet leak. I may even qualify to become a member of the Canadian Political Science Association, where my experience may help speed up the move toward bilingualism and biculturalism and stop the drift toward separatism - I beg your pardon - specialization in learned societies.

I must stop this light-hearted banter, however, or I will run the risk of being charged with mocking the solemnity of this impressive academic occasion. True, it is designated in the program as merely a "banquet", but it must have been considered to be a very important occasion because there is an asterisk after banquet and a

to note:

"accompanying order form must be returned immediately to the Secretary-Treasurer to reserve a place."

I am deeply flattered by this tribute to Ceasar by God.

There can be little dispute today over the need for a more scientific, a more rational and a more systematic approach to the practice of politics and to the work of government. But there is still a great deal of room for dispute as to how this need should best be carried out, if indeed it can ever be carried out in popular democracy.

Much of the advance in human well-being through economic progress that has been made during the last few decades, for example, has resulted from organization and specialization. The experience of your own association during the last couple of years illustrates this point.

From one body embracing all the major social sciences, your membership will soon be divided into three separate groups: The Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, established last year; the Canadian Economics Association to be established here this week, so I understand; and your present Association, with its membership hereafter being devoted only to political scientists per se.

I assume that these moves are intended to make each of your "disciplines" more pure and to encourage a greater distinction of your separate efforts to discern and explain the laws of human behaviour and human progress. I hope these purposes will be realized because the work of the social and political scientist has never been so important as it is now.

In this era of ceaseless and often turbulent change, people in your professions face unprecedented challenges in helping to chart our new social directions and in assessing their values.

But if it is important to pursue your studies of human problems and needs and values within your separate professions, I believe it is equally important that the interrelation of your

specialized studies should not be lost sight of. This trend toward organization and specialization has increased efficiency and maximized results, but it has also created a new and difficult political problem: how to ensure that the individual retains some ascendancy at least over the organization, the institution.

There are those who are tempted to take refuge in their own academic delving, preferring intellectual adventuring to organized action and rejecting as a shade indecent participation in established forms of political authority and power.

I have an idea which will make this more difficult - at least so far as partial participation is concerned. In the House of Commons at the present time, a committee is studying reforms in our rules and procedures and we are trying out a number of changes in actual practice. Among other results, I would like to see some ideas produced that would make it possible for our various committees to make much greater practical use of the knowledge and special skills of our political and other social scientists.

I think it would be beneficial both to Parliament and to the academic community if it were easier than it now is for committees to employ experts, even on a temporary or short-term basis, from the social sciences to give greater depth to committee studies of one kind and another. It would be useful for a committee studying certain bills or resolutions to be able to bring a few specialists to Ottawa to work as advisers to the committee for the duration of such a study. I believe that widened opportunities for the social scientist to gain personal acquaintance and experience with the day-to-day operations of our parliamentary system would be almost as beneficial to the halls of higher learning as their presence and advice would be uplifting to our parliamentary activities.

One other area of Canadian policy where there is need for co-operation between politicians and political scientists is that of external aid. The need to develop more effective and useful relations between the developed and the developing areas of the world has become as much of a challenge to our domestic policy as it is to our

external policy. If free civilization is to survive and grow, we must very soon find vastly improved methods for extending the benefits of modern existence to the whole world community of man. The rapidly advancing technology and the complex interrelationships of today's global society demand that the fundamental problems of man be dealt with on an international and an interprofessional basis.

The challenge for international development is to find new instruments for concentrating more attention and resources on applying the latest technology to the solution of man's economic and social problems on a global basis. One idea for a new Canadian initiative in meeting this challenge that should be considered is for the establishment of a Centre of International Development: it might even be on the site of Expo 67. After nearly twenty years of trial and error in the field of international development, we have learned a great deal about what can and cannot be done. But at the present time, there is no single institution in the world that could act as an internationally recognized focal point for concentrating attention and interest on this vital challenge to all of humanity.

A lot of the excitement in using new techniques for the purposes of peace and universal human progress, instead of for war and universal human destruction, is simply not getting across, either to world statesmen or to the people of the developed countries. So the Government is looking into the possibility of building on the inspiring theme of "Man and His World" created by Expo, a Centre for International Development that might perpetuate on a more permanent basis this heightened Canadian awareness of the problems and the challenges confronting all mankind at the present time.

We cannot and do not wish to become a great power from a defence point of view; but we have already proven in our peace-keeping efforts that we can make a good contribution to world order. Perhaps it will now prove possible for us to add a new dimension to our modest role in the world community by providing for a sharpened focus on the challenge of international development facing every country.

This idea, this plan is one of longer range importance,

though this doesn't mean that it can be ranged for too long. As it happens, however, most of today's political problems more than ever before have to be dealt with by a government on a day-to-day, almost an hour-to-hour, basis. This is what I meant when I said once that government is the administration of the unintended - or the unexpected.

It is all too true that in the vastly more complicated and more numerous and more pressing problems that now face those of us in government the important often has to give way to the merely urgent.

Changes are rushing in on us from every direction and they will not be put off while we retire to an ivory tower somewhere - or a trout stream - to brood over their significance or what we should do to adjust to them.

This is only one reason why I ask your indulgence for the harried non-specialist and pragmatist: the politician; the sweaty man who works in the centre ring of the dusty circus of everyday life, who must daily juggle the dream against the reality, and walk the tightrope between what is and what ought to be. Indeed, it is one of the dangerous ironies of the present condition of politics that at a time when the need for reflection and thought has never been greater, the practising politician has less and less time to think before he must act.

The political scientist, whose chief purpose is to be a thinker-in-depth about the problems and trends in our politics, is often removed from the compulsions and the pressures and the limitations that influence and at times determine political action. That, of course, is why it is so much wiser. I know you will agree with me, however, that political thought cannot have even better results if it acquires first-hand experience with political action or with the processes leading up to such action.

It is exciting and exhilarating to dream great schemes for political and social advancement. Indeed, dreams, translated into practical action are the stuff of progress. But dreams that merely result in the reasonings and research that specialists in any field are sometimes tempted to divert themselves with, can produce

very little but euphoria.

As one who has known both the ivy shelter of academic halls and the anonymous security of the Civil Service, I have at times had my own doubts about the wisdom of venturing forth, with wary shield and uncertain sword, among the lions in the open forum of party politics. But that's where the action is today.

Whatever his party affiliation and whatever his personal talents, every member of the House of Commons has at least proven himself a successful warrior on the hustings, exposing himself and his ambitions and his pride openly to the verdict of his peers. If the standards of our political battles are not so high as some of our spectator columnists and ringside warriors would like, then I suggest they should try to move openly into the lists themselves.

The arena of Canadian politics remains today one of the last strongholds of truly free and competitive enterprise; it is a big and open ring where anyone - and particularly anyone who is certain he could do better than the present combatants - is free to throw his hat and have it kicked around. In my own experience in this arena, I have not escaped without some bruised political muscles and even a drop or two of spilled political blood. But out of my own experience, and notwithstanding our sins of omission and commission, I have come to be proud of the good things that those of us in the midst of the action manage incredibly to achieve from time to time. This is a sufficient solace for the less rewarding aspects of the life we lead.

As a matter of fact, I wear my bronze badge of politician with a pride that grows with the passing years. My satisfaction was increased in this regard when I read a few weeks ago a lecture by a very distinguished political scientist, poet, university administrator, gunner and ex-civil servant, Douglas LePan, which included these perceptive and generous words:

"To the extent that those called on to rule are trying to do that, however fallibly, however imperfectly, I can see no reason to deny to those in positions of

responsibility the tribute that is their due because of the necessity and difficulty of their task. They have nowadays little support from tradition or from authority in the family or the church. They must deal with forces that are largely out of control, and which they must yet try to curb. They work with the possibility of annihilation, of world-wide annihilation, always at their back. The causes of revolt, particularly of revolt among the young, are deeper than they have ever been before. There are no widely-recognized religious or philosophic systems to redeem the world from meaninglessness. And yet, in the midst of these difficulties, they must go on."

Well, whether I go on or not, this speech must not go on. Thank you.