

*International Peace and Security*

functions could be achieved. These functions, such as I will outline in a moment, are somewhat similar to some of those listed in the legislation, but their worth is increased significantly if the new institute is constitutionally freed from the pitfalls and problems the Leader of the Opposition described as I have outlined them today.

The first function is to centralize, increase and rationalize the distribution of government funds for research and public information; second, to create a national library and data base on peace and security questions; third, to provide facilities for conferences, seminars, et cetera, and funding of the same for other bodies; fourth, to provide facilities and resources to bring foreign scholars to Canada, either in-house or for the use of other bodies; fifth, to issue an annual, independent report on government activities in the arms control and security fields; and sixth, the provision of a review by Parliament of an annual report on the activities of the institute, including its financial operations.

Unfortunately, the Prime Minister in his response to the Leader of the Opposition some days later failed to respond in any significant manner to these suggestions by the Leader of the Opposition, although he did agree to amend the proposed Bill to include the relevant wording from the legislation enacting the Economic Council of Canada respecting the right and obligation of the institute to publish the considered findings of its researchers. As the House now knows, the Government subsequently introduced Bill C-32 in the knowledge that the Bill, as proposed, would not enjoy bipartisan support. Nonetheless, second reading debate commenced on April 17.

I do not need to review today the excellent contributions in that debate made by the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) and others, except to observe that those concerns which were based on our Leader's views as expressed to the Prime Minister on April 9 did give the Government second thoughts respecting the appropriateness of the Bill as proposed.

Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition was most encouraged by a letter dated May 1 that he received from the Prime Minister. This letter responded in more detail to the concerns expressed by our Party almost a month earlier. Specifically, my Party agreed to the following amendments and deletions: First, my Leader welcomed the Prime Minister's acceptance that Section 5(g) be deleted. This will undoubtedly reduce the anxiety of the existing centres of disarmament, security and arms control study over the negative impact Section 5(g) would have on private resourcing of their institution.

Second, with respect to its financial independence, my Leader welcomed the Prime Minister's acceptance of the suggestion of the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead that Section 29 be amended to include statutory appropriation on a yearly basis.

Third, with respect to my Leader's concern over the independence of the institute from government, the Leader of the Opposition welcomed the Prime Minister's commitment to delete Clauses 25, 26 and 27 and that Clause 28 be amended to remove the word "shall" and replace it with the word

"may". However, we were most disappointed that the Prime Minister continued to refuse to enable the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence similarly to request the institute to undertake research for or provide advice on matters involving international peace and security. Without such an amendment, agreement could not be reached.

Fourth, in addition to this, the major outstanding issue between the Government and my Party concerned the independence of the board of directors and the nomination process for selection of the board. The Leader of the Opposition found the Prime Minister's proposal for simple consultation on appointments to the board to be less than adequate in ensuring the board's independence. In contrast, the Leader of the Opposition proposed by letter of April 9 that these appointments be made with the consensus of all political Parties as represented on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. He subsequently alternatively suggested that, to become a meaningful consultative process while at the same time leaving the Government the authority to nominate the board of directors, a section be added stating:

● (1500)

Prior to the appointment of individuals as provided in Sections 6, 7 and 8 the Minister shall consult with and obtain the support of the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition.

Such a meaningful consultation process would ensure that this centre would be politically independent.

The Leader of the Opposition further recommended that the Government formally consult with and obtain nominations from various national organizations. A preliminary list of such organizations was suggested to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). Such a list of nominees would form the pool from which the Government would select its candidates for the board of directors after which the consultation process as I have already outlined it would take place.

Regrettably, the Government felt unable to respond to either proposal respecting the board of directors, although it did indicate a willingness to accept the Leader of the Opposition's recommendation that consultation on the board begin immediately. We were, however, encouraged by the Prime Minister's willingness to accept the Leader of the Opposition's suggestion that Clause 28 be amended to enable the standing committee to initiate requests for study on the same basis as the Minister.

This left as the only outstanding issue that of agreeing to an appointment process which would leave no room for doubt that the board of directors would be non-partisan and would enjoy the confidence and support of all Parties. I am happy to report to the House that there is now agreement between the Government and Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition with respect to this process.

First, the Government has accepted the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that consultations on the composition of the board of directors start immediately, especially with respect to the appointment of the chairman and the executive director, as they will be key appointments for establishing the