

Paul McRae, the Liberal member for Thunder Bay expressed the hope that the proposed Institute would interest itself in conflict resolution.

“Let us go back to this statement that I have been using — you know, the cartoon with two men knee-deep in gasoline, one with seven matches and one with nine matches, and arguing back and forth about whether the matches are bigger, and so on. Some people are beginning to think that maybe the match argument is going no further, that the arms control thing is not getting anywhere, so maybe we should be worrying about getting the gasoline out of the tank. There is that sort of idea that conflict resolution may very well be a better approach than the arms control argument.”

Similarly, Kay MacPherson of the Voice of Women said that her organization could support the Institute “if it seems to be doing something in the area of conflict resolution and moving towards peace.” She stressed the need for the Institute to do “something that is going to be different . . . going to be imaginative about what the world might be like, not about what the world is like right now.”

This need of an innovative approach was echoed by Norman Alcock of the World Federalists of Canada who saw “a golden opportunity” to establish something quite new: “a middle-power institute with sufficient freedom to explore new innovative ideas and in the software area.”

Another element in the testimony was a general feeling that questions of disarmament and arms control could not be satisfactorily addressed without reference to the deeper underlying issues of social and economic justice.

Murray Thomson of Project Ploughshares reminded the committee of the recommendation of the Brandt Commission that the world needed a more comprehensive understanding of security which would go well beyond its military aspects. Representatives of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops and other Canadian Church leaders agreed on the impossibility of “building a peaceful world or a world of security unless we are prepared to deal with questions of injustice.”

Professor Humphrey of the Canadian Human Rights Foundation was concerned that the mandate given the Institute should not be directed solely to the problem of disarmament and arms control, important as that was, but to the “deep-seated social and political malaise” of which the arms race was a symptom.

Various people thought that the Institute could

play a useful role in studying what a spokesman for the Canada-Arab Federation described as “the social and historical underpinnings of conflict.” Ernie Regehr of the Mennonite Central Committee described peace as “something that emerges out of conditions of justice in the world” and spoke of the need to “enlarge on our understanding of the notion of what security is and what the conditions and requirements of security are.” Alan Rose of the Jewish Congress warned, however, against thinking one could “discuss peace without dealing with security” or that the issue of human rights could be addressed without reference to the Helsinki Final Act. He thought one useful task for the Institute would be to study “a whole litany of concerns that relate to covenants signed and violated by the Soviet Union.”

Many witnesses examined ways in which the Institute could provide valid and lasting solutions to international problems. It was agreed that the Institute should conduct a programme of research either by itself or “in collaboration with other Canadian or international institutions.” Professor Henry Wiseman, of Guelph University, emphasized that the Institute would not “develop a Canadian identity and perspective unless it does research and develops responses to issues that are distinctly Canadian and in response to Canadian needs.” It should do some of this research in house, otherwise it would not “gain the credibility that it must have” but it should also encourage scholars across the country to undertake research. A long list of topics was suggested for such research.

The Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops quoted Pope John Paul II on the “need for world society to develop effective means of negotiation and provide itself with those instruments of coordination and dialogue which it needs to ensure its survival.”

Douglas Roche, then a Member of Parliament and later to be Canada’s Ambassador for Disarmament, spoke of the need to promote “international policies that would allow the present system of deterrence to be replaced by a programme of collective security”, and Norman Alcock of the World Federalists of Canada urged the Institute to study the relationship between disarmament and security. In the event of disarmament there would be a need to establish stronger international institutions and permanent peace-keeping forces. “We cannot have nuclear or conventional disarmament unless we set in place at the same time alternative security systems.”

A spokesman for the United Nations Association suggested a study of the role and activities of the United Nations as “one area of focus for the Institute.”

Among other topics suggested for research were human rights, links between disarmament and