

cerns. Because of their particular importance in the amendments and deletions now agreed to between my Party and the Government, I believe it to be important that I give the House a detailed account of the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to this very important matter.

He did not question the Prime Minister's intention to seek to improve the quality and quantity of considered research and information on peace and security issues. He felt that this comes at a time when all Canadians show a growing commitment to search for both realistic and imaginative solutions to the perilous state of international security affairs which we know all too well. The creation of a new institute should be directed toward ensuring that this search is conducted in the best possible manner, and that peace and security is not allowed to become the province of one political point of view, one Party or one perspective.

Pluralism of ideas and pluralism of research cannot but be applauded and encouraged. However, 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. It also implies that if the Government truly seeks to encourage all worthy research and information efforts, a newly-created institution must not be structured so as to thwart those efforts, inadvertently or otherwise.

The following areas were of specific concern to the Leader of the Opposition. One of his concerns was funding. The Prime Minister proposed that this new centre be able to raise funds from non-government sources. He felt it was not at all clear why this was desirable. Far more than with this proposed institute, other Canadian research and information efforts are dependent on the goodwill of Canadian individuals, foundations, corporations and the like. These moneys are not unlimited, particularly in an area where Canadian funding entities are both cautious about donating funds to such controversial issues and where there is a very limited tradition or practice of supporting such activities.

If allowing the new institute to raise outside funds were to channel funds away from these other more vulnerable Canadian operations, one of two things might well occur. Either these other institutions or groups might be starved of funds or their research activities would become directed and rationalized through the mediary of a quasi-governmental body. Surely the Government does not seek to create a peace marketing board. The Leader of the Opposition was particularly concerned about the impact private sector funding would have on institutions such as the Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, Toronto, the Centre for Conflict Studies in Fredericton, the Centre for Strategic Studies in the University of Alberta, the Strategic Studies Program in the University of Calgary, the Research Program on Strategic Studies, York University, the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament, Ottawa, the Centre for International Relations, Queens University, the Institute of International Relations, University of

### *International Peace and Security*

British Columbia, the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University, the Peace Research Institute in Dundas, Project Ploughshares in Waterloo and the United Nations Association of Canada.

• (1450)

Another of the concerns of the Leader of the Opposition about Bill C-32 had to do with its board of directors. He believed that the intent to have the governing body of this institute appointed by the government of the day would not enhance the confidence of Canadians that these very important issues were being approached in a totally apolitical way. Such confidence would be greatly enhanced if the members of the board were appointed by consensus of all political parties as represented in the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

A third of the concerns of the Leader of the Opposition was publications. He believed that one of the most important elements in ensuring the quality and independence of research activities is the right, indeed the obligation, of a research body to publish the considered findings of its researchers. It would be extremely unfortunate if this new institution did not have such rights formally recognized in its founding legislation, as does, for example, the legislation enacting the Economic Council of Canada.

The spectre of a government censoring the results of research if such research was ideologically divergent or politically troublesome is surely to be avoided at all costs. Such dangers, however, are multiplied if this institute itself is financially dependent on the government of the day and must report to its designated officials.

A fourth concern of the Leader of the Opposition was reporting. The Prime Minister proposed that the Minister be able to request advice from this new institution. This is unobjectionable in and of itself. The Leader of the Opposition, however, believed that to ensure that all Canadians have access to the expertise residing in this institute, and that open and informed debate is encouraged, it would be desirable if the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence were able to commission this body to conduct research as well. Objectivity and openness would thereby be preserved.

Another of our Leader's concerns was recruiting. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out that a central symptom of the problem the Government seeks to rectify with this legislation was the unfortunate paucity of world-class expertise in Canada on peace and security affairs. It is troublesome, however, to observe that one of the most likely effects of this legislation may well be to absorb what talent does exist, depriving universities, private groups and institutions of their existing resources. Centralization of resources will have been purchased at the price of crippling unfettered analysis. This is what the Leader of the Opposition felt that a new institute could. Were the consideration raised by the Leader of the Opposition, which I have gone through, to be reflected in modifications to the proposed legislation, some very useful