

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say that all the questions raised by my hon. friend are interesting and of substance in regard to this legislation. I think they are very important points. I can assure him that when this bill is before the committee, the Superintendent of Insurance or myself will deal with them thoroughly. We are looking for good legislation which will protect the Canadian public and at the same time do the job that needs to be done to ensure investors of security of investments.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION**

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

UNITED NATIONS—SOUTH AFRICA—CANADIAN ABSTENTION
ON ARMS EMBARGO REGULATIONS—DECISION
ON SPARE PARTS

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, three weeks ago I had the honour of attending the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations as a parliamentary observer. During my stay at the United Nations the special political committee was presented with a resolution sponsored by a large number of lesser developed countries calling for compliance, on the part of all nations, with the Security Council resolution requesting an end to the shipment of arms to South Africa.

The resolution was moderately worded and really represented the absolute minimum in action that one could expect from nations opposed to the policies of apartheid in South Africa. It is no secret that some of the sponsoring countries were moved to ask Canada to act as a sponsor of the resolution. We were to my knowledge the only industrially advanced, predominantly white nation to be so approached. I consider that approach to be a compliment to this country. There were probably a number of reasons for the approach being made to Canada. There was the fact, for example, that under a previous administration Canada was instrumental in making South Africa's continued membership in the Commonwealth impossible, an act which I venture to say has had much to do with the Commonwealth continuing to exist as a multi-racial organization.

There was another reason—the fact that Canada has on numerous occasions verbally expressed its abhorrence of apartheid policies. Finally, and most importantly, there was the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) angry letter to

[Mr. Speaker.]

the British government denouncing its intention to supply additional arms to South Africa. To our everlasting shame, not only did we not co-sponsor the resolution but we abstained on the vote on the resolution, on the explicit instructions of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), as he informed the House in answer to my question. Our action, or rather our lack of it, could be viewed as nothing but the sheerest hypocrisy by other nations, in view of our previous statements and actions.

The reason given by the Canadian government for its refusal to, in effect, put its money where its mouth is, was that the cabinet had not yet reached a policy decision in respect of the continuation or termination of military spare parts' shipments to South Africa. But it is not as if this resolution was a total surprise to our government. The United Nations has been dealing with the situation in South Africa virtually since the inception of that organization. The question of South Africa is an annual item on the agenda of the special political committee. The Security Council passed resolutions calling upon all nations to cease shipment of arms to South Africa, twice in 1963, once in 1964 and again in July of this year.

• (10:00 p.m.)

This government has had ample time to decide upon its policy with regard to military spare parts' shipments to South Africa and has had ample notice that it would one day be called upon to demonstrate to the world whose side Canada is on. The truth is that this is simply one more example of the woful unpreparedness of the government to deal with matters of substance in the field of external affairs.

It is not that the decision which the government is seemingly having so much trouble in reaching is so difficult. Even by the standards, if one can call them that, of the white paper on external affairs, the continued shipments of spare parts to South Africa cannot be considered to be in our national interest because they do not bring us much money and they risk permanently alienating approximately 250 million black Africans, not to mention countless millions of Asians, for the sake of the good will of a few million white South Africans. In the long term, where is the greatest potential for material gain? The answer is obvious.

I have used this argument with considerable reluctance, Mr. Speaker, because I do not consider it to be terribly relevant. However, I have used it because it might impress itself upon the minds of those minor league Machiavellians who are responsible for the White Paper. Surely the relevant consideration is that our military spare parts' shipments are of the type that significantly enhance the ability of the white South African régime to repress the black and coloured population of that country.

The government of the United Kingdom could at least argue that the equipment it planned to sell to South Africa is highly sophisticated and costly, of little or no use in the enforcement of apartheid. This argument may or may not impress one. It obviously did not impress the