

**Senator Grosart:** Yes. They were before us one night. We had been at it with them all day, but it was late at night and we were getting a little annoyed. We finally said: "Will you stop complaining about a lack of government interest, and tell us with whom in the science community the Government should co-operate?" They called some of us down to the Chateau Laurier at 11 o'clock that night, poured us some double whiskeys, and asked: "If we organize a meeting will the members of your committee come and repeat that challenge?" This was done, and the result is that we have the nucleus for the first time of a national science body from the side of the learned societies. They have had two meetings now, and they are well on their way.

We may before very long not be the only Western country that does not have anything approximating a national academy of science. We have been in that position. This highlights the point made by Congressman Fulton. It is very true that we are on about the second year of a course which you have been following with great success for ten or eleven years. We sometimes say that we missed Phase 1 of the great debate on national science policy; that we came in on Phase 2, or perhaps Phase 3.

We see some disadvantages, and one is the proliferation of fragmentation and confusion in any science policy that develops on an *ad hoc* basis, as ours has done. On the other hand, we see some advantages. We even think that we might have benefited from some of your mistakes. Certainly we should benefit from some of the mistakes that have been made by other countries at whose very serious attempts to develop a mechanism for the determination of national science policy we have looked.

Our legislative-executive system is, of course, quite different from yours in many respects. As I understand it, your committees have authority in the matter of appropriations, whereas ours do not, although there has been recently a very interesting development. In the last session of Parliament a major change was made in the relationship of the committees of the House of Commons to the work of the House itself. Previously a Government bill might or might not be referred to a Commons committee. Under the new standing rules every Government bill is introduced on second reading more or less in these words: It is moved that this bill be now given second reading, and referred to such and such a committee. The effect of that is that the

committees of the House of Commons are now taking a much more active part in the scrutiny of legislation, and are recommending at times fairly substantial changes.

The House of Commons has not quite worked out the mechanism of the interface between those recommendations and Government policy. The other day a committee brought in a report which lay around for a while. Finally, an Opposition member of the committee moved its adoption. There was a bit of a procedural hassle, but the Speaker ruled that it was a proper motion, and this has really broken ground in our constitutional development. All our committees have a majority of the party in office, but some of us who are interested in constitutional development see in this a new status and authority for the Commons committee. It is an amelioration of this rather hard line of separation between the power of the executive to initiate or make major changes in legislation and the power of the legislature.

**Congressman Mosher:** Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate this very illuminating response to my question. It is obvious that your committee has reason already to have a sense of accomplishment. You can look forward very definitely to further impact even though, as I understand it, at the moment your committee is dissolved at the time you make your report.

**The Chairman:** This is the present situation, but we have received an almost unanimous recommendation from all those who have been before us, both from the private and the government sectors, that this committee should continue to operate. I think that our committee will make a recommendation to that effect.

**Congressman Daddario:** Senator Grosart, is that not the real answer to Mr. Mosher's inquiry, that from a practical point of view your committee, Mr. Chairman, has developed support for its activities. People who originally resisted your activities began to see the need to support what you are doing. Even though your committee was set up for a limited time, you have developed support which indicates, at least from what I have been able to learn in this regard, that it should continue. Is this not the practical result of what you have been doing?

**Senator Grosart:** Yes, that is very true. We in the committee are naturally very