

Apartheid

entitled in almost all cases to have the wages that a white person would have for the very same job, whether man or woman.

We are told that the people will be hurt by our sanctions, and yet those who are leaders in non-violent action, non-violent protest, speaking as black people, like Archbishop Tutu, like the Reverend Mr. Boesak, those people are silenced, as far as the Government dares, by police threats. They are not allowed to speak publicly. Their demonstrations, their public actions, are banned, and these are non-violent leaders, so that the South African Government wishes to create the impression that it is a besieged civilization, opposing invasion by violent people, because it will not permit any movement, non-violent, towards change.

One of the best things that the present Government has done has been its move in the direction of sanctions against South Africa. They have not been successful in bringing down apartheid yet, it is true. For one thing, the Government has only gone partway, in spite of the Prime Minister's promise several years ago to go the whole way. The Government keeps holding off and holding off. It is true that there are trade considerations and that the Government in Canada does not want Canada to go short if other countries are making money by selling to apartheid.

It may be that because of Britain particularly, the sanction movement will not succeed in its direct economic effect on South Africa. But to the extent that the Government of Canada, backed by thousands and tens of thousands of the people of Canada, backed by the great majority of the people of Canada, has supported the idea of sanctions, at least there is a message given of hope to the black people and the coloured people of South Africa that is a message of warning to the white slave owners.

● (1750)

Mr. A. H. Harry Brightwell (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on this topic today. I believe that one of the contentions of the motion is that recent progress towards dismantlement of apartheid has rendered inapplicable some of the sanctions Canada has imposed on South Africa. In spite of the very passionate speech by the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson), I do not believe there have been major reforms in South Africa. However, contrary to what my friend from Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands (Mr. Manly) said, I do believe that the sanctions we imposed impact upon the poorest people in South Africa. I favour a continuance of our policy of moderate sanctions while leaving the door open to be involved closely with South Africa as the situation changes.

It is true that we now have the phenomenon of the Government of South Africa engaging in an international campaign to try to convince the world that it is prepared to let the black majority share in political power. However, it has not addressed the basic issues and has not demonstrated that it is prepared seriously to contemplate negotiations with the

majority towards the creation of a non-racial representative Government.

Apartheid is a system which attempts to preserve all political and economic power in South Africa for the 15 per cent of the population who are of European descent. The theory was that the different races should develop separately. By pretending that the non-white majority, 85 per cent of the population, were not really South African, the Government of South Africa attempted to rationalize the operation of a whites only parliamentary system. The Government went so far as to declare approximately six million South Africans to be citizens of totally uneconomic and geographically fragmented "homelands", which it declared to be independent. For all others, the South African Government introduced rigid restrictions based on race to determine where people could live. Similar restrictions were imposed on the use of schools, hospitals and all other public services.

I assume that the motion under consideration supposes that the minor relaxations in the application of some of these race-based restrictions constitutes significant reform. Relaxation of restrictions has, however, been a minor phenomenon, usually in the large cities which are frequented by foreigners. For almost all the population of South Africa, race continues to determine living standards, where one can live, go to school, to work, or be treated for health problems.

On the political level, the assumption may be that a proposal by the Government of South Africa to establish a national council with only a minority from the 85 per cent of the population which is not white somehow constitutes reform. However, we should note that it is only a proposal so far. It also excludes from participation most of the individuals whom most of the population regard as their leaders through a clause which disqualifies anyone convicted of what many regard as political crimes. Additionally, the majority of members would be appointed by the Government, presumably to represent the white minority or its interests. It is not surprising that the proposal has been rejected by all significant black leaders, including Chief Buthelezi who said that he would consider participating only if Nelson Mandela were released and allowed to participate, and if the bans on the ANC and other organizations were lifted.

Indeed, recent messages out of South Africa are negative and appear to be clear evidence of an unwillingness to face the prospects of real change. The Government acted to place even further restrictions on the peaceful political activities of opposition organizations and a number of individuals. It acted to detain church leaders who tried to deliver a letter to the President asking him to rescind these political bannings. It introduced legislation that could put in jeopardy international funding of organizations that oppose apartheid. I do not believe these are the actions of a Government which is serious about facing fundamental change. The majority of South Africans remain without political rights and continue to suffer gross economic and social inequities.