

Congressman Mosher: Can you at that point override the veto?

Senator Grosart: In saying that I mean to indicate that under our system it is the exclusive prerogative of the executive, that is the cabinet, to introduce any legislation that involves the spending of public money, so much so that when such legislation is introduced it is necessary for the Prime Minister or the Minister introducing the legislation to say he has just heard from the Queen that she needs the money. This means that no member of the opposition, or indeed, any of the parties in opposition in the House of Commons or the Senate as a body is in a legal position to introduce any bill which would involve the spending of public money. That is the theory but it has been got round a bit because, of course, any legislation necessarily involves the spending of some public money. Therefore, the principle has developed that if you look at the pith and the substance of the bill and if it is not spending money in large sums other than for, say, secretarial expenses or other expenses of an incidental nature, a bill can be introduced to change public policy.

Now, in direct answer to your question, in theory our Senate is really in a much better position to introduce legislation because the official opposition in the House of Commons relies largely on what we call "supply days" which are roughly eight days a session set apart for the opposition to move a motion of non-confidence or, theoretically, to move the adoption of a bill. But it could not, of course, involve the spending of public money.

We have a private members' hour, which lasts about one hour, two or three days a week, and the practice there is to talk out all private bills. Hundreds of them are introduced. I think there are about one hundred now before the House of Commons, and none of them has much chance of getting through, unless the Executive says it is acceptable. So, under the Canadian system there is practically no power of initiative on the legislative side other than from the executive.

What, then, is the use of a committee such as ours, or the other device we use for inquiring into matters of public policy—that is, royal commissions? Such bodies will influence executive action and legislation, if their recommendations are considered to be good by the executive. I think Mr. Drury made that clear recently when he said that the

Executive would be likely to pay some attention to the report of this committee, if the recommendations were good. That is about where it sits.

However, we in this committee are very happy to be able to say to you that already a good deal of executive action has been taken as a direct result of evidence heard before the committee. For example, I would mention the separation of the Science Secretariat from the Science Council. I feel sure that this committee can take some credit for that. Originally, the Secretariat, which is the Science Secretariat of the Privy Council, was also the Secretariat of the Science Council, which is, theoretically at least, an objective, part-time body whose responsibility is to give long-term guidance in science policy. It was obviously an unworkable situation where the Secretariat of the Government was also the Secretariat of the so-called objective body. We pointed this out in this committee, and the separation was made.

In this committee there has been a great deal of discussion on the fragmentation of public policy in the matter you raised, Congressman Daddario, pollution. As was pointed out in this committee, there are in Canada at the moment about 228 political entities, all with responsibility in the area of water pollution alone. Not too long ago the Government gave the federal aspects of those responsibilities to one department, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. So there has been at least a degree of co-ordination of public effort in that field.

We have had a good deal of evidence in this committee on the effectiveness or otherwise of a number of Government incentive policies to upgrade the level of research in industry.

It has been said publicly that all of these are now under intense examination by the Government, and there is not much question, in my mind, at least, that substantial changes will be made following some of the criticism of these plans—and there are five or six of them—made in the committee.

The chairman has also referred to the learned societies, which is a direct example of some influence on public action by this committee. It so happened that we had the Canadian Association of Chemists and the Canadian Association of Physicists and...

The Chairman: The engineers.