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While science is rarely at the forefront of political controversy, the previous Canadian government acted strategically to silence government scientists and to render their findings invisible. Led by Prime Minister Stephen Harper, the government cancelled the long-form census, eliminated the office of the National Science Advisor, closed libraries, testing labs, parliamentary offices, and research programs, and interfered with researchers’ communication with the public. When research is veiled or cherry-picked by government offices, its policy implications cannot be properly addressed. Further, some advocates of policy outcomes based on scientific research were targeted as hostile to the national interest. This practice was consistent with a notable and unprecedented centralization of power in the Prime Minister’s Office.

Scholars in Science and Technology Studies and in the history and anthropology of science and social science have shown that “science” and its evidentiary rules have evolved through complex social, political, economic, technological, and institutional contexts. Science has never been pure, or purely objective; it has always been closely intertwined with social and cultural practices and priorities. The Canadian government’s direct interference with scientific and social evidence has made explicit to wider publics that political power can shape what and how (and how much) we know, whether by governments seeking to secure a preferred policy or corporations seeking to secure profits. The Harper government’s unprecedented “silencing of the labs” (The fifth estate 2014) and its larger assault on public science and evidence-based policy brought increasing condemnation from scientists around the world.

Since 2006, according to many reports, the Harper government made concerted efforts to control or prevent the free flow of scientific information across Canada, particularly when that information highlighted the undesirable consequences of resource development. Carol Linnitt notes that, “The free flow of information is controlled in two ways: through the muzzling of scientists
who might communicate scientific information, and through the elimination of research programs that might participate in the creation of scientific information or evidence” (Linnitt 2013). In 2008, the position of National Science Advisor was eliminated. In 2010, the government cancelled the long-form census and began to close libraries, destroy archives, and shutter research facilities. The 2012 omnibus budget bill, Bill C-38, cut funding to or dismantled the following environmental bodies or pieces of legislation: the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the Kyoto Protocol Implementation Act, the Fisheries Act, the Navigable Waters Protection Act, the Energy Board Act, the Species at Risk Act, the Parks Canada Agency Act, the Canadian Oil and Gas Operations Act, the Coasting Trade Act, the Nuclear Safety Control Act, and the Canada Seeds Act. The Prime Minister’s Office also prohibited government scientists from speaking to the media, shadowed and censored Environment Canada scientists in the course of their work, terminated environmental assessment stations in the North, purged scientific libraries, and closed hundreds of labs and water testing facilities across the country.

Records on socially controversial policies such as Aboriginal residential schools, gun ownership, and foreign workers either disappeared or failed to register in political solutions. When government acts to delink policy from evidence, it denies its citizens not only the right to know what scientists know but also the right to engage in informed public discussions about issues that affect us. Another result of this government’s hostility to evidence (when it did not support its policy goals) was the emergence of a counter-movement dedicated to bringing scientific controversies and their political implications into the public eye, spearheaded by organizations such as Evidence for Democracy and Scientists for the Right to Know.

Scientists and journalists opposing these trends accused Harper’s Conservative government of “libricide” for closing some of the world’s most important fishery, ocean, and environmental libraries (see TheStar.com 2014; Doctorow 2014; Climate Science Watch 2014; Linnitt 2013). When the National Science Advisor’s office was dissolved, its libraries were moved into Information Management and Technology Services (IMTS), and five out of seven of these important libraries were closed. In some cases, IMTS invited the public to enter and scavenge the shelves before shipping out what was left to remote sites. In other cases, witnesses saw collections being moved to dumpsters (Nikiforuk 2013b). Canada was a world leader in research on sustainable fisheries and oceans. We possessed world-class laboratories and libraries with some of the finest environmental science and freshwater book collections in the world (Nikiforuk 2013a). Many of these are now gone.
Scientists and advocacy groups described a growing incongruity between the government’s single-minded dedication to profitable and efficient natural resource extraction, and the known, scientifically proven risks of environmental degradation, such as polluted waters, climate change, and resource depletion arising from such extraction. This incongruity became increasingly evident with the unchecked growth of the oil sands, fracking, overfishing, factory farming, and the movement of bitumen by land and sea. The collection and public dissemination of research related to these issues gave way to the enactment of strategies dedicated to suppressing such knowledge. While cutting programs like water testing, wastewater surveys, and emissions monitoring programs (Linnitt 2013), ostensibly for budgetary reasons, the government dedicated targeted funds to the accumulation of punitive evidence, like investigating the public communication and charitable status of environmental non-profits. When government officials suggest that public scientists or environmental groups questioning pipelines or oil sands are hostile to the nation’s interests and even “terrorists” subject to potential counterinsurgency tactics, and when the Canada Revenue Agency threatens to audit bird watchers (and many other groups) in case public statements about the natural environment disqualify them from charitable status, we know the country is facing a serious problem that concerns not just science, but democracy itself.

These practices of closure and surveillance did not just affect policy discussions or outcomes. They also threatened future research and where it might point us. Whether documenting fish, drilling, water, oil leaks, or the treatment of Indigenous peoples, many of these materials are lost forever. Indeed, “evidence” is not confined to the world of natural resources, and “libricide” is not confined to the collections of the Departments of Science or Fisheries and Oceans. The long-gun registry was not just terminated; its records were destroyed. The long-form census gathered statistical evidence of changing family, economic, rural–urban, and social patterns that was essential to making social policy responsive to people’s actual needs. When it was cancelled, the director of Statistics Canada resigned from public service. We call this a “politics of evidence” in part because it harms some communities more than others. This government refused to order an inquiry into missing and murdered Indigenous women, formulate a response to the Truth and Reconciliation Report, address the rights of refugees, or tell the truth about the Temporary Foreign Workers Program and its impact on unemployment and workers’ rights, because, as the prime minister so cogently put it, “we don’t do sociology.” Notably, the United Nations Human Rights Committee released a
report highly critical of the Canadian government for its failure to address these urgent issues (CBC News 2015).

Under this regime, our ability to know what is happening in our country and to base reasonable policy on this knowledge was shattered. Scientists and researchers must be allowed to learn about the country and communicate their knowledge with the public. Where evidence is suppressed, public knowledge and awareness are also suppressed, curtailing the will for change. Missing evidence has significant implications for the safety and security of everyone, whether it involves social, scientific, medical, environmental, women’s, LGBT and Indigenous peoples’ problems and histories, or the future of the planet.
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