

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."

Pauline Jewett, the New Democratic Party critic for external relations, replied to Mr. Clark as follows:

"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.

Jean Chrétien, the Liberal Party critic on international relations, also reminded the House that:

"We established that Institute, and when it was set up we tried to find a formula that would have its operations as far removed from partisanship as possible. There were amendments suggested from various quarters, and this is a completely non-partisan Institute that is playing a positive role."

## THE ROLE OF THE INSTITUTE

Although there was unanimity on the absolute necessity of independence, opinions were divided on whether the Institute should, or even could, advocate specific policies. Some wanted an Institute that would be activist, even deliberately interventionist; that is, not only willing to criticize the doctrines and the practices of the government of the day, but also empowered to propose explicit alternatives and strategies, that would include clearly formulated plans of action. Others were opposed to this concept, insisting that the Institute should not try to compete with the advice given by officials unless it were explicitly asked to give such advice. Rather, the Institute should seek to compel recognition through the quality of its research, and the forcefulness, relevance, impartiality and objectivity of its conclusions and recommendations.

Among those who argued for an activist role was Jim Stark of Operation Dismantle. He doubted the point of the exercise "if it cannot serve as a policy advocate", and thought that "without this degree of independence the Canadian Institute could well be seen as an extension of Government policy and enjoy little respectability in Canada or abroad." Representatives of Project Ploughshares and of the Canadian Conference of Bishops agreed that the Institute should be able to "criticize existing Government policies" and to "propose very clear action strategies to the Government."

Several others, however, argued that the Institute was not there to advise the Government but to express views and ideas from which the Government might benefit. Arthur Menzies believed it was essential that "policy on peace and security remain the responsibility of the elected Government of Canada." Admiral Falls put forward a similar view but expressed the hope that officials would profit from this research. Michael Shenstone, Assistant Deputy Minister in the Department of External Affairs, asked whether the Institute "will try to issue views . . . or whether they will see their main function in that sort of realm as commissioning one or several scholars to go out and do a paper" which would then be published under the author's name. He pointed out that it would be difficult for the Institute to issue *ex cathedra* pronouncements on policy" if its Board, as had been suggested, covered a wide range of viewpoints. It would, however, serve a useful function by providing the "raw materials" from which people "can form their own conclusions."

Professor David Cox agreed that the Institute "should not be activist" but should "provide information and a forum for people regardless of their views."

Finally, Mr. William H. Barton, formerly Canada's Ambassador to the United Nations and Representative to the Conference on Disarmament, and presently Chairman of the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, expressed the following opinion:

"I venture to predict that from the outset there will be pressures to turn it (the Institute) into an advocacy organization. In my view this would be contrary to the stated aims of the legislation and detrimental to its success. The research it sponsors must be intellectually and academically sound. The discussion it encourages must speak for itself. The Institute should not take positions except on matters of fact."

The Standing Committee seems to have adopted