

only with the intra-mural research done by the federal government and for the fiscal year 66, 67 they amounted to \$200 million.

Senator Grosart: Now, by intra-mural, does this mean inter-departmental?

Dr. Hunt: In house.

Senator Grosart: Yes, but the federal house is a big one. Does this include Crown corporations; does it include NRC?

The Chairman: Oh, yes.

Senator Grosart: Well, if it is \$200 million and NRC is \$120 million.

Dr. Schneider: No, \$45 million.

The Chairman: In 66, 67 NRC spent \$37.4 million out of \$200 million for in-house research.

Senator Grosart: Oh, I see; yes, I get the distinction.

But what I am trying to get at is what is the total demand on the public purse for R & D, the federal public purse?

The Chairman: I am quite sure, Senator, that if you don't want it in too great a hurry that our staff can provide these figures for you.

Senator Grosart: Yes; well, the reason I was looking for it now is I am still trying to fix how great is the responsibility that NRC has undertaken.

This to me is a very, very important question when we are going to assess the future policy of the government in respect to NRC.

Dr. Schneider: Well, as far as the in-house research is concerned here, I think we have to distinguish this from extra-mural research support.

In house as we heard the figures is 37 out of about 200 million; it is between a fifth and a sixth of the total federal government in house research expenditures.

Senator Grosart: Yes, this would only apply to 37 million of your expenditures, yes.

Dr. Schneider, in an article you wrote for the *Science Forum* you make this very interesting statement:

"Accordingly a review and re-appraisal of the Council's programs and policies is now opportune and necessary. A useful principle here is that those programs and

policies that have been very successful and for which there is a continuing need should not be tampered with too much; those that have been less successful or lacking need detailed study."

Have you any method, critical path or anything like that, by which you assess success, or more or less success?

Dr. Schneider: As I mentioned, I think it was this morning, this is now getting under way. We have set up a group headed by Dr. Cook, which we call a *délegué général*, with a staff, to go into this in detail.

I might mention that this group has no other operating responsibilities; they will spend full time on this and we hope to look at these programs in detail.

The reason I think it is opportune is because things have changed very rapidly, as we have seen from some of the data we have presented to you. I think there have to be rapid changes; things are moving very rapidly, and we have to look at what we have been doing and certainly there will have to be some decisions made about where we are going and how we should plan for the future.

Senator Grosart: This was one of the questions that was specifically asked in the guide lines and when I went to compare your brief with the guide lines I notice I wrote in the margin, no comments given.

There are one or two others, and because we are going to have a good many other departments before us I wonder if you would not misunderstand this question: If there was a failure of response to the specific questions asked in the guide lines, if there was, was it accidental or deliberate?

Dr. Schneider: Perhaps a bit...

Senator Grosart: I say if there was.

Dr. Schneider: Perhaps a bit of both, and I think we did discuss this with Dr. Poecock, because we understood that this questionnaire, if we can call it that, was of course prepared to apply to everybody and we felt in some of the areas it wasn't particularly applicable.

At this particular point we should have said something in it; that I think was an accidental omission. So that, as I say, there was perhaps a bit of both, but the intent was certainly to provide you with all the information; there was certainly no deliberate