

Human Rights

House of Commons should think about. One is that the space devoted in the Bill to the objectives of this institute is very slight indeed. The description of its objectives and purposes amounts to a couple of paragraphs. The rest of the Bill deals with the institutional structure of the organization and the appointment process. Of course, those are important, but it is disappointing to see that so little is said in the short preamble about the specific objectives of this organization.

On the one hand, I am pleased that the objectives are not specifically set out, because that might provide room for us to move forward in the areas I have discussed. On the other hand, it seems to me that something of such great importance as this should at least set forth more fully and precisely the objectives of this institution. In any case, I bring this to the attention of Hon. Members. I would ask them to study the Bill and ask themselves if they would like to see anything more precise than that which is offered among some of the objectives included in the Bill.

I for one would like to see one of the duties of this institute being to develop criteria for human rights and criteria for monitoring human rights. Many things have already been done in this field through the Helsinki Accord. In terms of monitoring, many models have been put forward already. Still, it is at a crude level even at best, and this is an area in which Canada can give leadership in research and in recommending the way to monitor, understand and assess the criteria by which nations observe or violate human rights.

The second thing I would like to bring to the attention of the House is the matter of finance. We know that there is always a problem with money. All good things require money. This one is no exception.

The Bill proposes the assignment in the first year of \$1 million for this institution and \$2 million the next year, \$3 million the next year, \$4 million the next year and \$5 million the next. Then Parliament would assess the situation and decide what further funds should be granted to it. It is a sensible approach to increase year by year the amount of money provided to the institute, but I am concerned about one thing, and I hope that the Hon. Member for Scarborough West and others who will deal with this Bill will consider it. That is, there are many people in non-governmental organizations in the field of human rights who feel, first, that \$1 million may not be adequate to launch this institute, particularly if a large part of that amount goes for the basic infrastructure involved in setting up such an institute. They feel this is inadequate funding for the very first year, which is usually quite expensive for any organization or institution.

● (1200)

Second, and maybe even more important, non-governmental organizations are concerned that the Government expects the public and other institutions to support this institute. They are having a hard enough time maintaining their own work in a very competitive market. If the Government does not plan to

support this organization in its entirety and plans to call on revenues which are already supporting other organizations, it will put a great strain on their ability to maintain the good work they are doing. In that sense it would be self-defeating.

The solution to that problem, according to these organizations, and I share the view, is that the Government should support this institute and not look for support among those who contribute money to organizations like the Red Cross, Amnesty International and others. Those organizations are already under great financial strain and such competition is viewed by them and their leaders as a very real threat to their ability to provide very valuable services to the country and the world.

My third point deals with the proposed name of this institute. This is an Act to establish an International Centre For Human Rights and Democratic Development. I know what it means and you know, Sir, what it means, at least I hope we do, when we speak about human rights. However, with respect to the words "democratic development" there is some concern. Perhaps your view, Sir, of the meaning of "democratic development", or that of other Members of the House, might differ from mine. However, I think it should be pointed out that in the report made by rapporteurs studying the matter for the Government, Madam Gisèle Côté-Harper and John Courtney, on pages 24 and 25, there is a concern expressed that this title may cause some difficulty for Third World nations when that organization is working with them.

We know, unfortunately, that the words "democratic republic" have been used by some of the most oppressive nations on earth. We know that the eastern bloc uses the words "democratic peoples republic" and so on and the word "democratic" can be misused. We know that the United States has often used the words "democratic government" as a euphemism for countries that will go along with American foreign policy. For that reason Third World nations, who see how the superpowers use these words to camouflage nationalistic intentions and the extension of their empires, are going to be suspicious when they see the words "democratic development".

What do those words mean? This is not some sort of savant's concern or dilettante's comments. It was expressed by those asked by the Government to study this matter. The recommendation is not to use those words but to use some others less prone to be misunderstood or misinterpreted as some kind of manipulative effort by Canada to establish our own way of life or values and interfere in the values and life systems of Third World nations. Therefore, I call on the Government to consider some revision in this area.

In conclusion, I hope the Government will proceed with this institute, widen its terms of reference, and that it will be more than merely an educational institution. Rather, I hope it will become involved in the pragmatic research that deals with criteria and monitoring of human rights violations, setting