

together in a genuine national institute which can in a non-divisive manner address the genuine concerns of Canadians.

That is why it is very important that we in this House agree unanimously to invite the members of the various organizations, some of which have been referred to by the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour). There would be some I would add to this list; for example, the United Nations Association of Canada. He perhaps did not include that, if I heard him correctly. That organization, the successor to the old League of Nations Society, consists of individuals who probably worked harder for world peace than any other organization in the history of Canada. I would include on the list membership of the Royal Canadian Legion for a perhaps somewhat dissimilar reason. They offered themselves in times of crisis to ensure world peace. By doing so, they offered more of themselves than all of us could ever do.

That is why it is essential that members of organizations such as those to which I referred and those referred to by the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona be invited by unanimous resolution of this House to present to us one name in each case. I believe we have now suggested 23. I do not suggest it should be all-inclusive. We would propose, and it is essential to the principle of the Bill, that these 23 organizations and perhaps others be invited to submit a nominee to the Government which would consult with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) and the Leader of the New Democratic Party. From that list of 23 or 25 nominees, 15 directors will be chosen. As a result, we will have—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order. I believe the Hon. Member was in his seat when the Chair made remarks with regard to addressing the principle of the Bill. Suggestions the Hon. Member is now making refer to specific clauses in the Bill. This will be in order when the Bill is before the committee. For the time being, we have to stick to the principle of the Bill.

● (1240)

Mr. Clark (Brandon-Souris): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my belief that the principle of the Bill is that we wish to create an institute which will work toward the furtherance of world peace and we wish this institute to reflect Canadian public opinion and to address the concerns of Canadians. That is why I made the remarks that I made. I firmly believe that the remarks which I made and the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) are germane to the very principle of the Bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order, please. If the Hon. Member believes this, there is something he does not understand about the Standing Orders. The Hon. Member is simply trying to justify that what he was saying before was in order when the Chair specifically mentioned that it was not. I would like this to be made clear.

Mr. Clark (Brandon-Souris): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will conclude my remarks by saying as I did in the beginning that the pursuit of peace has been and will continue to be a

International Peace and Security

non-partisan issue. I also believe that the pursuit of peace is something which is a by-product of public concern. What Parliament is attempting to do is simply respond to the expressions of concern which have already been made by Canadians to the Government on numerous occasions.

I support the principle of the Bill which is before us. I support the proposal for a Canadian Peace Institute. I would hope that this institute would take advantage of the expertise which already exists in Canada. I believe, for example, that within the university community there are a number of people who, by the nature of their disciplines, would have a substantial contribution to make in the area of research.

I hope that the Government would therefore provide support to organizations such as the Social Science Research Council, the National Research Council and the Canada Council. I hope as well that the Government would consider tapping the expertise of the Canadian medical profession, the Association of Canadian Psychiatrists and the like. However, what is of the utmost importance, Mr. Speaker, is that we respond to the concerns of Canadians in a way which will convince them of our sincerity.

Therefore, I must conclude, Mr. Speaker, simply by reiterating what I have said before. If we are to reassure Canadians that we are sincere and that we are creating a meaningful institute, then we must ensure that the institute be constructed in such a manner that it enjoys widespread public confidence. I believe we have indicated how we would ensure that that would happen.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Are there any questions related to the Hon. Member's remarks?

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I will put my remarks in the form of a question but I suppose they are probably more in the nature of a point of order. The Hon. Member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Clark) indicated that he thought I had left out the names of the Royal Canadian Legion and the United Nations Association of Canada. If I did so, it was indeed a serious oversight. Those are two of the organizations that should be high up on any such list. I suppose I must put a question to the Hon. Member. Perhaps I do not have to put a question to the Hon. Member. I would simply like to leave it at that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Are there any other questions or comments? We shall return to debate.

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put my comments regarding this Bill first within the framework of a set of principles that were laid down by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) in the House on February 9. I think it is important to recall for a moment the principles for which our Party stands and which have a direct bearing on how the institute will perform.

In asking how we can best achieve policies which reduce the recourse to nuclear weapons in Europe and elsewhere, the Leader of the Official Opposition set down three fundamental principles to guide the formulation of policy. He said first that