

international development, techniques of conflict resolution and reduction of tension, and practical approaches for negotiating with the Russians. The spokesman for Science for Peace suggested the need to study the psychological aspects of such negotiations. Dr. H. Newcombe of the Peace Research Institute — Dundas emphasized the need for peace education and another witness suggested that the chief products of peace research should be materials for peace education. In conducting its research the Institute should be responsive to good ideas from private people.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE INSTITUTE

The need for the Institute to have freedom of thought and action was recognized even before the Bill was introduced in the House of Commons on 16 April 1984. During the spring of 1984, letters were exchanged between Prime Minister Trudeau, on the one hand, and the leaders of the Progressive Conservative Party, Brian Mulroney, and the New Democratic Party, Edward Broadbent, on the other, on the range of problems that the planned organization might encounter. In a letter dated 9 April 1984, Mr. Mulroney wrote:

“The creation of a new institute should be directed towards ensuring that this search (on peace and security issues) is conducted in the best possible manner, and that peace and security is not allowed to become the province of one political view point, one party or one perspective. Pluralism of ideas and pluralism of research cannot but be applauded and encouraged. But that pluralism must be both real and enduring. This implies that what a Canadian Government seeks to create in this area must ensure that its research and public information are protected from its prevailing political winds, and that Canadian research done elsewhere in the country is not distorted to conform to these prevailing winds”.

On 12 April 1984, Mr. Trudeau replied in the following terms:

“I agree that Canadians should see the Institute as apolitical and should have confidence in its objectivity. Indeed, I envisage the Board as being composed of men and women who are knowledgeable in the field, and who can be relied upon to carry out their functions in a completely

non-partisan manner. Mr. MacEachen and I have agreed, therefore, that the Government would seek nominations from the Opposition parties, as you suggested, before any recommendation were made to the Governor in Council with regard to the appointment of members of the Board.”

This procedure for nominating members of the Board of the Institute through consultations with the Opposition parties and with non-governmental organizations, as well as the method of financing through Parliamentary grants, were perceived by witnesses as an effective means of ensuring the financial independence of the new Crown Corporation and of consolidating its freedom of action. As the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Allan MacEachen, said on the occasion of the third reading of Bill C-32 in the Commons on 28 June 1984:

“There was a great deal of concern that the Institute be non-partisan and independent. It certainly was never my view that it should be anything but non-partisan, and independent, and objective. It has been given that role. Indeed, we have it guaranteed in law that the Leaders of all recognized Parties in the House of Commons will continue to have a voice in deciding the board's membership. By legislating an annual endowment we have given the Institute a means by which it can preserve independence of a certain quality.”

This question of the Institute's autonomy arose again on 11 September 1985, during the House debate on an amendment aimed at strengthening the Institute's independence. The Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Joe Clark, stated:

“[The Institute] is dealing with issues which are at 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