Government Orders

opportunity to speak so I will just make my comment. Perhaps you would like the hon. minister to do so and then perhaps our colleague could answer.

Following my exchange with the minister, I was concerned regarding the kinds of equipment we are talking about now. The minister assures me that our little trucks will not cause problems and could not be used in some kind of confrontational situation. What I really wanted to know was what would happen if it was a different weapon.

Second, my colleague, whom I certainly respect and whose speech I found fascinating and certainly educational, talked about the transparency of the Swedish model. Will that put a stop to third party sales? I mean, if the Swedes decided to sell to someone, what stops them from selling those weapons to another country that we would not have been able to sell to in the first place?

I hope the minister can ask his question.

Mr. Hockin: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add a point of information in response to some of the points the hon. member was making.

We have agreements with the following countries: the U.K., Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Italy, Sweden and the United States.

I wanted to clarify that this is in the bill, because the suggested amendment by the hon. member asked to do this. An Order in Council would be required to add these countries to the Automatic Firearms Country Control List. Also, if we wanted to add countries to this list for other purposes, there would be the same kind of transparency.

I think a lot of what the hon. member has been suggesting is accomplished in the bill.

Also, in terms of the nature of the light armoured vehicles, they are wheeled vehicles and therefore cannot be used on the desert and are just used for defensive purposes. They cannot be used in an offensive way in the Middle East. That is by way of response to a question she asked earlier.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister to look once again at the wording of the legislation. As a lawyer, I find that the wording of the legislation in section 2, proposed subsection 4.1, does not restrict the list to countries with which they have arrangements. It says:

"including those countries." It does not say "restricted to".

The French version is much more limiting. I raised this question this morning with the minister for foreign trade and he did not have an answer for me. It appears wide open at the present time.

I do not think that the bill deals properly with this. I know that there is a list. By the way, I suggested that we also have an amendment which would oblige the government, if it intended to put by Order in Council any country on the list, to put the proposal before the standing committee on external affairs for examination before the permit was issued. This would allow Parliament to have a say on who is on the list and who is not on the list.

In answer to the hon. member for Mount Royal, yes, in Swedish law when companies sell to other countries they have provisions in their contracts, it seems—I do not pretend to be an expert. I read Sweden's policy in this booklet where it points out that Sweden has now sued certain countries, taken certain countries to court, for transferring weapons to a third country. We can have sanctions if we want. For example, if a country broke a contract and transferred those arms to a third country, we would put them on a black list. We might sue them as the Swedes are doing but we might also say: "That is the end of it for you, fellow. No more sales to you".

There are different ways of dealing with this, but we can control to a much greater extent the end use of arms sales than we do now, and countries are attempting to do that.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I too wish to rise today in opposition to government Bill C-6. For those folks watching the proceedings in the House of Commons, as a word of explanation to those Canadians, what the government is attempting to do with the legislation it has introduced and wants to pass through the House of Commons is change the rules and regulations so that it would be in a position to export automatic weapons and certain personnel type carriers, basically to Saudi Arabia.

We in our party oppose this for a variety of reasons. First of all, I think as Canadians we were able to take some pride in Canada's historic role in being more of a peacekeeper than a major merchant of death. Canada has no great history in terms of conquest and imperial-