


external community and then sharply focus the internal activities of the Institute.

PEARSON: Whatever we choose to do, should we try to give the Canadian audience and any international audience that is looking on, a balanced view of every question, or should we encourage our scholars and others, to give a particular view based on advocacy of particular solutions? That is a question that will continue to face us as well, and I guess that we will probably not come to final conclusions on policy because we are not a pressure group; we are not a lobby; we don't have a mandate to persuade the government to do certain things. I expect we will continue to emphasize the balanced view, whether it is because we publish various points of view, and you have that balance, or whether we publish impartial studies. It doesn't matter, as long as the views are well expressed and well based. We should publish what we think are valid contributions to the debate. But we won't normally express a point of view as an institute. But that will always be a subject of some controversy because the media, in particular, looks for, as you know Lise, a "yes" or "no" answer.

 **BISSONNETTE:** People rely on the Institute to get reference material. But as far as Canadian problems are concerned, people would certainly like someone to tell them, for example, whether or not the idea of getting nuclear submarines is crazy or if it's a great idea. That's what is hard to find in the Institute's documentation, something that will enlighten us. That brings us to the whole question of the relationship, the connection the Institute has, with the Canadian government. Is it supposed to evaluate the performance of government? Is it supposed to follow the government's agenda? Should we be quite close to it or should we deal with it at arm's length? That question is not yet resolved as far as I'm concerned ... as a member of the Board, who sees things somewhat from the outside. It's not clear.

PEARSON: I started last year the writing of an annual report on the international situation and the Canadian government's response to it, and we will continue that this year, and I hope that it continues as a regular Institute publication. It is an end of the year review of what the government has been saying and doing. It may be critical, or it can be supportive; it depends on what the author thinks the government has been doing. But that is in the name of the Executive Director, and I think we all agree that it doesn't necessarily represent the views of the Board of Directors. It could become an important annual document – who knows – a key document in foreign policy debates over the next few years. That is one way of establishing our bona fides if you like. I think the government will come to look forward to this, perhaps be slightly apprehensive about it, because it will be critical of some of the things that are done.

COX: I must say, that I find that some things which are relatively small are enormously gratifying. One that comes immediately to mind is that the study undertaken for External Affairs on the arms control register, and the conference that was held, are having an effect. I believe, in fact, that the entire process has helped the people, who were interested in the idea to begin with, to present their views to External.

PEARSON: As another example, Mr. Clark asked the Institute to organize a meeting between Canadians of Arab and Jewish origin. We did that at Montebello. It stirred up all kinds of controversy, but nevertheless, it was the first time that there had been an organized meeting of this kind in which public funds had been used. So it was an important breakthrough and has definitely led to a greater sensitivity on both sides to the need to understand each other better. The Institute can be a kind of catalyst for such things, if we look for these opportunities and are re-

sponsive to the government's concerns. However, we must never be regarded as speaking for the government. But we can act as a catalyst, an intermediary, an objective source of knowledge, and so on. I think that is as important a role as any.




COX: What did you think the Institute would be like? Has what's happened been what you expected to happen? Is it what you wanted to happen?

PEARSON: I think when it was first proposed, nobody quite knew what it was supposed to be. It was a vague idea in the Speech From the Throne. There was really no more to it than that the Canadian public needed to know more about these issues. It was thought that the information we were getting from the States through the media was not always accurate or didn't always reflect Canadian concerns and interests. Therefore, we needed something of our own, which is a very Canadian idea; we are always creating corporations which are designed to do that – to clarify or reinforce our own identity. So, I accepted that. I was also very conscious of the fact, having just come back from Moscow, that much of the information being published on East-West relations was not only inaccurate, but deliberately distorted by certain sources. This was during the height of the Reagan administration, so that was understandable....

What I did not expect was that we would get into this whole grants business. The word "grant" is not mentioned in the Act. This was a Board decision, that we needed to help voluntary organizations that didn't have funds to pursue their interests, because the government or the private sector wouldn't help them for one reason or another. I accept that now. I think that was the right thing to do, but I don't think that it has to be permanent. I don't think that we have to go on forever writing cheques for NGOs.

BISSONNETTE: I speak as a Quebecker, but I'm sure that if I were from Halifax or Vancouver, I would react in the same way. It

has a very distinctive "Ottawa institute" flavour. It might be very convenient as far as research goes, but if we consider public programmes, the education of Canadians and so on, I think it definitely creates a problem. From Quebec's point of view there's a gap, even though we're not very far away. Over the years the relationship between the Institute and Quebec has improved dramatically. But this sort of incestuous relationship between the federal government and the Institute is a pity. It was inevitable, mind you, given the circumstances, but ... I'm not sure how we would go about dissociating ourselves a bit from the government.



PEARSON: There is a language barrier, that's certain. I don't know if the fact that the Institute is in Ottawa has anything to do with it. Even in Montreal, I don't think that we would have found a lot of francophone researchers who could have or would have worked at the Institute.

BISSONNETTE: I beg to differ. It's really too bad that the great tradition of Canadian foreign policy has evolved without the participation of francophones. This tradition must be developed among francophones. The international Francophonie is a reality.

PEARSON: We are supposed to be global in our interests. And the advantage of being in Ottawa is that you have access to information – not classified information, which we do not have access to and have not asked for and do not want – but information which is available through official documents and other sources which you couldn't find easily outside Ottawa. You have to balance that advantage against what Lise has been saying. And I don't know what the answer is. It would be very useful for someone to look at the record of Ottawa-based institutions. Ottawa tends to be dominated by a kind of anglophone view of the world despite bilingualism. I hope we continue to be sensitive to that question. □