

example we can be of some assistance to our fellow human beings throughout the entire world.

These are philosophical questions which would undoubtedly be a subject of learned discussion at the proposed institute. I do not believe that there is anything wrong with wide-ranging philosophical discussions as well as discussion about more detailed areas.

I am also somewhat familiar with some of the peace movements that have occurred in prior years. I think back to the late 1920s, when Coolidge was President of the United States, and the approaches which were used at that time. There appeared to be two approaches both in the United States and in Europe. The first approach was a kind of simple way of doing things. If you read about, some people may remember, the "Outlawry of War" campaign that was active in the late 1920s and 1930s, there the idea was that public pressure would be put on governments so that each government in turn would sign an international treaty by which each agreed not to use force first in the reconciliation or the solution of international arguments. The theory went that as more and more countries signed an international undertaking of that nature that would, by its very nature, outlaw war. Everybody would have agreed not to use, as we call it today, the first strike option.

• (1430)

That was rather a simple approach but people felt very strongly and sincerely that war could be outlawed by this rather simple mechanism. At the same time as that movement was going on, there was also, just as today, government-to-government negotiations on the major disarmament issues. They were bilateral, multinational, and they could focus on particular types of weaponry or they could focus on particular geographic areas. One series of conferences that went on dealt with the large naval vessels that were being built at that time. That was analogous to the nuclear weaponry of today.

Everybody thinks in terms of nuclear weapons and what we are going to do about them. They are very expensive and very dangerous. Things could go wrong in the use of them as deterrents. But in that day and age, the question was with large naval vessels. That was where all the money was going, money that could be spent better elsewhere for social purposes. A lot of manpower was to be tied up in these things. These vessels were looked upon in much the same light as the nuclear threat is today.

As analogies, today we have the SALT talks that are going on, we have the MBFR, we have the CDE talks, all on a certain type of weaponry or within a certain geographical area. There is, as other Members have pointed out, a good deal of similarity between the approach that is going on now and the approach that was going on in the late 1920s and 1930s. In light of developments after the 1930s, it seemed that neither of those two approaches worked very well. Most of the nations of the world eventually became embroiled in World War II. This gives me cause for concern at the present time. But because of past failures, because we have not been able to resolve these difficult problems in the past, I do not think the human race

International Peace and Security

can afford to give up its search for eventual success. It is something we have to pursue even knowing that for the last many thousands of years of human history we have to admit to not being that successful.

You have permitted me to digress in general terms on the question of disarmament and peace-making, Sir. I would like to return, if I may, to the Bill proper. This Party gives general support to the proposal put forward by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). We have, however, had some concerns. We were not entirely satisfied that the direction in which the institute was to go had been clearly enough enunciated. We were concerned with a very important matter of appointments that were to be made to the board of directors of the institute, and especially the very important position of executive director, the person who will actually lead this institute into the fray and have a good deal of say over staff appointments, over where money is to be spent and who is to be involved in the process.

We were concerned over the true function of the institute. Was it to be something that was to be entirely separate from government, or was it to be something that was, under certain circumstances, to be seen as an instrument of government? It is pretty difficult to have both at the same time. If you read through the original Bill as presented and given first reading, it is not at all clear which of those two alternatives was anticipated in the Bill. It seems to take a little bit from each proposition. If the institute is to be entirely separate, has not its function already been fulfilled by other organizations?

I have before me a publication of the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament. This publication is called the *Arms Control Chronicle*. The edition I have is number one, volume 1, I would imagine. In my opinion, it does a very good job of outlining the chronology of events in the disarmament field and where we stand now with respect to different sets of negotiations that are taking place.

I hope the new institute will not be superfluous. I hope it can be arranged in such a way that that will not be the case. If, however, it is to be an instrument of government or on certain occasions an instrument of government, what will be its exact role and how will it function? Will it, for instance, be privy to defence secrets, either defence secrets of Canada alone or defence secrets of the NATO alliance or the North American defence system? What will our treaty partners think when they tell the Department of National Defence in Canada some technical secrets relating to armaments? Will that information be passed on to somebody who is not within government proper? What will be the disposition of that information eventually?

If the institute is to have access to military secrets, will this not to some extent undermine its potential to deal with other parties? If it is trying to deal with parties from a country whose general view and outlook is not that of our own and is sometimes looked upon as an enemy, and at the same time it is known that the institute has access to military secrets, will that not make these things difficult?