

*Government Orders*

copyright legislation at this moment and certainly having a swinging door as the different groups come through to indicate their interest in the whole area of intellectual property law and the copyright decision-making in the interests of one party or the other.

It would seem to me that the merger must be being fairly well received, and it will enlarge the intellectual property considerations with additional expertise, I would presume. In light of the fact that I have not heard very much about this whole process, I would presume it is a positive and orderly step to have taken.

There was one observation made in another matter that I was dealing with and the answer to that was why would you be concerned? Where to place your concern in any of the things going on around here is in the procedure for nomination through Order in Council appointment.

If the Order in Council appointments to the tribunal are enlightened, carefully thought out and indicate that the people who are being appointed are people who have competence in the field, then through that selection process you thereby assure that the tribunal will function well. We will leave that tribunal in the hands of good nominations and then careful thought on the part of the new members.

The second thing that we are looking at is the merger of the Canada Council with the Social Science and Humanities Research Council and the International Cultural Relations Bureau of External Affairs.

This three-way merger will have an unwieldy moniker, from what I can see. It is to be called the Canada Council of the Arts and for Research in the Social Sciences and Humanities. The new acronym will be far more suitable, as it is called CARSH and for the purposes of the rest of this discussion, I will refer to it as CARSH because I think that seems appropriate to the picture.

This is the second marriage for these two bodies. I think you were in this House, Mr. Speaker, as the first marriage took place followed by the unhappy divorce and separation proceedings, a long-term mediation, and I believe you even sat on the committee, and extensive studies and consultations took place at that time.

Parliament in its wisdom saw that this was not working and allowed on the grounds of incompatibility of objectives a separation and then a divorce of the Canada Council and the Social Science and Humanities Research Council.

They had two different missions; one in the arts and cultural matters, the second in more profound kinds of research into the social sciences and the humanities.

The Canada Council was really directing its energies to the building and ongoing growth and development of the cultural arts, while the science research council was doing some wonderful spade work in developing the interests of Canadians in these fields of action.

Over the last 14 years these two councils have matured, they have flourished, someone said to me that they have flowered—that is true—each in its own separate domain of expertise. Did you give me another word, Mr. Solicitor General? I am listening. Anything that is said in a positive vein is well accepted in the Canada of today. It gives hope and forward thought.

Each in its own separate domain has become really quite expert and each has served its own constituency with concern, with caring and active boards, with the participation of those boards and with competent and dedicated staffs.

Now the government in its wisdom has decided that the two should remarry, unlike the 1978 decision, without any studies, without any consultation, with no counselling and with no mediation.

The partnerships and the multi-disciplinary work that are the keystones of the efficient and collaborative co-existence of any groups, as members of this House will know, are absolutely fundamental to good business practice and good healthy inter-group relations. I sincerely hope that every effort will be made to make this work if this is the way the government intends to go. Perhaps in committee we might come up with an amendment that might take us in another direction. We will have to see what the witnesses have to say in this regard.

It is very important to reflect for a few minutes on why it was felt in the late 1970s that such a separation was in order and why an independent research council was needed. I am indebted to Chad Gaffield of *The Ottawa Citizen* who wrote on March 25 of this year much of the