

is not done, I suggest the work of this committee will be largely a farce. If the committee is merely dealing with what the government says are the statutory instruments it is entitled to look at, then the committee is not looking at the whole problem of statutory instruments.

It amazes me that this committee has powers so limited that all it is empowered to do under the act is to review. As I understand it, there is not a word in the act that says what the committee can do after its review. This committee can talk forever. It is not even required to report. If it were to report, to whom would it report? It is a joint committee. Does it report to both houses and say, "We don't like this statutory instrument"? Does it have any power in any way to bring pressure on the government to change its ways and to alter this unconscionable process of government by executive without reference to the normal process of parliamentary legislation?

I would ask the Leader of the Government to take those two questions into consideration and, if not now, at least in due course give this chamber a rather more explicit indication of the scope of activities that this important committee is expected to undertake.

Hon. G. Percival Burchill: Honourable senators, speaking as a layman, I would like to mention one thing to the Leader of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition, and all who participated in the debate when this matter was discussed in the Senate some time ago.

On many occasions, lawyers have spoken to me and complained about the multiplicity of laws and regulations. Only last week, in the City of Saint John, a distinguished member of the legal profession complained bitterly about this. He spoke about the great volume of legislation that was being passed, and how difficult it was for him to keep himself up to date. He then referred to the multitudinous regulations.

I want it to be known that this is regarded as a very urgent matter. I am sure the proposal will be endorsed by the people generally, and that it is a step in the right direction.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Goldenberg, debate adjourned.

[Translation]

SCIENCE POLICY

REPORT OF COMMITTEE EXPENSES TABLED

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne, Chairman of the Special Committee on Science Policy, pursuant to Standing Order 84(3), tabled a report of the special expenses of the committee during the Third Session of the Twenty-eighth Parliament.

[English]

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

REPORT OF COMMITTEE EXPENSES TABLED

Hon. Harper Prowse, Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, tabled a report, pursuant to Rule 84(3), of the expenses of the committee incurred in connection with the examination of the parole system, during the Third Session of the Twenty-eighth Parliament.

[Hon. Mr. Grosart.]

LOCAL INITIATIVES PROGRAM

NOVA SCOTIA APPLICATIONS—QUESTIONS

Hon. John M. Macdonald: Honourable senators, I have a few questions I should like to put to the Leader of the Government. I realize that the answers cannot be given this evening, but perhaps he will obtain them and give them in due course. The questions are:

1. What projects have been approved under the Local Initiatives Program in the Province of Nova Scotia?
2. What is the amount of the grant involved in each case?
3. Who actually received or is to receive the grant?
4. How many jobs is each of these projects supposed to create?
5. How long will these jobs last?
6. What project applications emanating from Nova Scotia were rejected?
7. Why specifically was each rejected?

Hon. Mr. Martin: I shall certainly take notice of those questions and shall try to give replies as quickly as possible.

LABOUR RELATIONS

DISPUTE BETWEEN TREASURY BOARD AND THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS—QUESTIONS ANSWERED

Hon. Paul Martin: Honourable senators, a week ago Senator Cameron asked me four questions. The first was:

Does the government not think that the so-called collective bargaining process has just about run its course so far as the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers is concerned?

The answer is:

The collective bargaining process is unlikely to run its course in any final sense. That process appears to be widely acknowledged in Canada as being the most effective means available to determine terms and conditions of employment. Its application in the Public Service of Canada has enjoyed far more success than failure, since over 250 collective agreements have been signed without disruption difficulties as a result of direct negotiation. Strikes and threats of strikes have been few.

The second question was:

How is it necessary for a sovereign government to have to ask one of its creations for permission to prosecute common lawbreakers?

• (2040)

The answer is:

The Public Service Staff Relations Board is a creation of Parliament, not the government. Having recourse to such a tribunal is a common requirement in most labour legislation across the country. Resort to the institution of prosecution should not be precipitate and it should be instituted after other methods of ensuring compliance with the legislation have failed.