

flawed in its principle. It is flawed in the espousal of its concept. That is why there has been a determination on the part of this Party to ensure that the Bill will proceed in a way that will guarantee its independence and will ensure that the credibility the institute should have in its opening days will be maintained by the perception that it is operating in an independent way from its very outset.

I believe the way in which those special Canadians who have been advising the Department of External Affairs have been treated has left a great deal to be desired. I have been a member of the advisory committee to the ambassador for disarmament. There have been two or three ambassadors. For the moment, I am leaving aside the question that the Government has left this very important post unfilled. I will not quarrel with that at the moment. However, I would like to make the point that when there were active consultations by representatives of the groups that were identified by my hon. colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona—and I was there personally to hear them—there was unhappiness and frustration by members of those groups because they felt that the Government was not taking them seriously. When the Special Session on Disarmament was held in New York in 1982, representatives of those groups attended in a formal way. At that time they felt that the Government was not responding to their collective concerns. That has built up, in the minds of some observers, an apprehension that if we are going to go ahead with a formal structure called the Canadian Peace Institute, there be put into place a system to ensure that those groups—and I do not mean to restrict my hon. colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona; I am sure he would put that list forward as a list of basic resources within Canada—will at least have guaranteed opportunities to suggest names, and guaranteed opportunities for input. That is very important in the understanding of Canadians. There is a growing number of Canadians on all sides of the perspective of the arms control question who want to ensure that these groups are not only speaking, but that the Government is listening.

The board of directors has been at issue with previous speakers. The appointment of the chairman of the board and the executive director would be within the purview of the Government and, of course, all the appointments would be the collective responsibility of the Government.

With respect to the appointment of the chairman and the executive director, I would like to make a brief comment. I think the Government has an opportunity to demonstrate that it is serious in ensuring that the board be non-partisan and will provide an opportunity to build a consensus of support; that it will be an organization whose stature will command the attention of all Canadians, indeed internationally, and will play a role beyond small domestic concerns.

Therefore I suggest that the board seriously consider as its chairman the name of the Hon. Robert L. Stanfield. I think that Mr. Stanfield is a person who is an acknowledged statesman, who is judicious and impartial. He is a member of the North-South Institute now and plays a very important role in that body. He is a man of great travel who has deep concern

and presence. I believe that if the Government were seriously to consider the name which I have put forward, that would be a signal to all Canadians that this board is going—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order. The Hon. Member knows that he is not dealing with the principle of the Bill. He has made his point. Would he come back to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. Roche: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am certainly speaking to what I consider to be the principle of the Bill, but I acknowledge that your view is greater than mine.

In the moment that is remaining, I would like to put forward the view that this peace institute needs to take into account the kind of work that it is going to do. Surely, that comes right to the question of the principle of what the peace institute is. I think that the Peace Institute must ensure that there is accurate, reliable information of an impartial nature so that Canadians can come to a judgment as to the extent of the arms race. Indeed, we are quarrelling quite a bit about the figures that are put out by various organizations. My concern is that the people who frame government policy must have the most objective, impartial information that can be obtained. That should be a primary role of the peace institute.

With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to return following the lunch hour to make a few comments concerning ways in which the peace institute could collect information, which would then lead to some final comments regarding Canada's contribution to the creation of greater conditions for world peace with security and disarmament in a mutual, balanced and verifiable way.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): It is agreed that the Hon. Member may continue his remarks when we resume this afternoon. However, may I inform him and other Hon. Members that if a discussion starts this afternoon regarding the way in which the institute is going to collect information, that is not within the principle of the Bill. It has been difficult this morning. It appears that some Hon. Members want to make sure that I earn my salary!

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, before the luncheon adjournment I was making the point of why the peace institute needs to establish its credibility at the very outset, and the kind of work we will expect the peace institute to do. In that context, Sir, I should like to quote from a very interesting article written by Dr. Don Bates who is a professor in the History of Medicine at McGill University and chairman of the McGill Study Group for Peace and Disarmament. Mr. Bates is a very well known