

*Statements by Ministers*

We hope that the Nassau message has been received not only in Pretoria but also in the entire community of nations, for the world will not wait indefinitely for Pretoria authorities to come to their senses.

[English]

Canadians take special pride in the significant contributions that they have made over the years to the United Nations and its many associated bodies and agencies. Distinguished Canadians such as the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson are intimately associated in the public mind with important successes of the United Nations. It was a pleasure for me to reassert our commitment to the U.N. All Canadian Governments and all Canadian political Parties, irrespective of political allegiance, I think have held this view of the U.N. as a vital world body.

We are aware of the deficiencies and limitations of the U.N., but we continue to believe that what nations can accomplish by working together will always be greater than what any one nation can accomplish by going it alone. In this regard I take particular satisfaction from the strength, unity and vitality of the western alliance. When the leaders of the United Kingdom, Japan, Italy, West Germany and Canada met with President Reagan to discuss the forthcoming summit, the strength of cohesion of our common purpose was strongly evident. We are all deeply committed to the alliance and the principles it represents. We were also agreed that every reasonable avenue must be explored and every thoughtful attempt made to reduce tensions and promote co-operation between the two superpowers.

I encountered no disagreement, Mr. Speaker, when, on behalf of all Canadians, I urged President Reagan to go that extra mile to seek a just agreement, to presume that Mr. Gorbachev is no less interested in a secure peace. These are the ingredients that Canadians view as indispensable to the conclusion of a fair and verifiable accord. The quest for peace is everyone's business, Mr. Speaker. While Canada will not be present at the table in Geneva, our interests will. We shall remain vigilant to ensure that they continue to be defended effectively and well.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Saint-Maurice):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all Members of Parliament, I would like to welcome the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) back to Canada. Especially those of us on the opposition benches are very happy to see him back. I am not sure that he is that happy to be with us, but he is smiling and I think it is all right. I would like to raise a question of procedure, Mr. Speaker. This statement was delivered to my office ten minutes before Question Period. There may have been an error somewhere, and I know that was not the desire of the Prime Minister, but I am just reporting that fact. If it is an accident, it is an accident.

We welcome the Prime Minister back and we realize that over the years the survival of the Commonwealth was always related to one or more crises. The apartheid crisis was a great danger for the Commonwealth due to the great division of

views among the participants. I am glad that this problem has been somewhat resolved by the participants. Of course, we wish that Prime Minister Thatcher had moved more than a little bit, but under the circumstances I think it was better to take what was offered than to have this great association broken on this problem.

I am happy with the report that there is an agreement and there will be some sanctions put forward. I do think that the new ones are marginal. I think the most significant point is that there was an agreement, and the second most significant point is that there will be another meeting in six months. I hope that there will be progress made during that period of time. I hope that the group which has been selected to work on these problems because of their past experience in international affairs will be successful.

● (1530)

[Translation]

And I hope that under these circumstances, the Right Hon. Pierre Trudeau, our former Prime Minister, will accept to play the part the Right Hon. Prime Minister has asked him to play, and I am sure that he could make himself useful in this process and that his experience in the area of international relations would be much appreciated by the other members of the committee, and we all wish for the committee the best possible success.

I have also noted, perhaps with even more pleasure, the speech which the Prime Minister has made before the United Nations, more specifically his reference to the situation in South Africa. I feel that if both statements could be combined, we could make considerable progress, for I think we should set a time limit for the South African Government to abolish apartheid which all Canadians find abominable. Such a time limit should be clear and final.

And when the Prime Minister stated in New York that Canada would go as far as breaking off relations with South Africa unless enough progress were made within a certain time, he would have been well advised to do as the House had suggested, that is, to set a time limit, clearly indicating to that Government that if not enough progress had been made by, say, July 1, 1986, Canada would not only impose global economic sanctions against that country, but demonstrate unequivocally our disagreement by severing our diplomatic ties with it. As a matter of fact, Canada is one of the last countries of the world still with diplomatic ties with that country.

I can understand the Prime Minister's willingness to allow President Botha a certain time to operate politically within his country, considering the difficult situation which now exists in South Africa, the election which is to be held there, and Parliament which is scheduled to reconvene in early 1986. However, if in the spring or early summer of 1986, no progress has been made, I think the Prime Minister should act within six months, during the meeting which is to take place as a