

the heart and focus of our own attention and indeed the most urgent and important issues that any of us in public life can address. The seeking of independence from Parliament for the institute is not an indication of a lack of interest on the part of Parliamentarians. Quite the contrary; it is a recognition that on issues of this kind, if we want in fact to rise above the kinds of partisan considerations that sometimes properly and naturally engulf this House, there must be the certainty that there is an agency in Canada able to look at these questions and offer advice and observations without the suspicion that it is the instrument of a Party, a faction or a particular perspective. That was the earnest desire of all Members of the House when the institute was established. That will be given final realization with the adoption of the amendments that are proposed today.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** Order! In order to keep the proceedings in line with parliamentary procedure, I am just going to read the motion now before the House:

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead), seconded by Mr. Andre, moves that Bill C-69, an Act to amend the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security Act and certain other Acts in relation thereto, be now read the second time and, with unanimous consent, referred to Committee of the Whole.

[English]

**Ms. Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to say a few words about the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security. I agree with the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) who has said that the amendments before us today are largely housekeeping amendments. Like him, my British Columbia French is not quite good enough to determine the total significance of changing the French word "mondiales" to "internationales" and indeed I really have been challenged on that matter. I think I have come to understand the reason for it and so I thank the drafters of it for giving me an opportunity to work out the subtle distinctions between the two words.

The second minor amendment to which the Minister has referred is perhaps not quite so minor. It gives the Board rather than the Governor in Council authority to determine matters like the amount of expense account money members of the Board receive when they travel.

The third matter is of course more significant. It was never the intention of anyone in the House when we drew up the appendix outlining the amounts of money that would go to the institute over the first five years that that would in any way be tampered with or changed. Indeed, in my experience in Parliament, it has been quite rare to have a five-year projection of the amount of money that a body would receive. As the Minister has pointed out and as we all felt very strongly a year ago June when this Bill was passed and the institute was being created, it is absolutely essential that the institute be independent of Government both in terms of the membership of the

institute board and its financial support. The final amendment which will relieve the institute from certain provisions of the Financial Administration Act was our intention all the time. To that extent, the amendment tidies up something that was always intended.

I believe all Parties in the House can take great pleasure in the fact that the way in which members of the board of the institute are appointed makes it extremely difficult to make appointments on narrow political or patronage grounds. Perhaps I will take advantage of this opportunity to say to the Minister that there are a few other institutes like the Ocean Institute to which he might give some thought in order to encourage this kind of a process for the appointment of members of the board. While the appointments may in fact be good appointments, there is not the same assurance that the Minister insisted most strongly on having for this particular institute.

In the case of the Ocean Institute and other research institutes, we are not provided quite the same assurance as we are for this one that there will not in fact be patronage appointments. Since this matter has been drawn to our attention again because this is the first time we have amended this Act and also because the first report of the institute will be tabled next week, perhaps this is a good time for the Minister to give some thought to extending this procedure for appointing board members to other institutes.

Earlier today the Minister suggested quite rightly that my colleague, the brilliant expert on matters of the North, might give him advice when looking at the question of northern sovereignty in committee. Perhaps he might now be good enough to suggest that I would be one of his advisers when revamping the way in which boards of comparable institutes are appointed.

We all look forward to seeing the first report of the institute. Most of us who were concerned with the creation of the institute have been following its activities and speaking to members of the board during the course of the past year. We have some idea of what the board has been doing. I am sure all of us thought at one time that there might be real problems for the board, not because of narrow political differences or matters of that kind but rather because of quite sharp ideological differences as the board was deliberately made fairly representative of the broad spectrum of opinion on international security and peace issues. Obviously the Members of the board have been engaged in very lively discussions among themselves, but everything that I have heard indicates that those differences, such as they are, have been muted because they have all had a very common interest in the development of a first-class research capacity within the Canadian public, the Canadian universities and the board itself to deal with many of the issues relating to international peace and security. They have also had a common concern about the public education side of the board's activities. Research and public education and the granting of research contracts have been things upon which there has been a very broad measure of agreement after very lively discussions among board members.