

more courage, that Government of Canada chose to dodge the issue.

We have to face up to the issue. I am not suggesting for a moment that this is an easy problem. In fact I know there would be some retaliation on the part of some Arab states.

When we talk about real legislation, I should point out that the bill on the order paper in my name is almost identical to a bill enacted by the legislative assembly of Ontario, brought forward by a Conservative government, which I have been told is modelled after similar legislation in the United States. The United States has had legislation on its books for a number of years now which prohibits American companies from co-operating in the boycott against the state of Israel.

What I am suggesting to the government whip is that if similar legislation has been enacted by the United States and by the province of Ontario, this Parliament should do at least as much. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this bill going to the committee if that would permit some real discussion. I hope that after the government gets the report it has asked Mr. Stanfield to make, it will not forget the arguments it put forward when in the opposition. I hope that the government will not renounce those principles of equity and justice which the present Prime Minister expressed so eloquently when he was leader of the opposition, and that we do not get another waffling or sweeping under the rug like we got from the former government.

● (1750)

**Mr. Ken Binks (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the hon. member who has introduced the bill, and to tell this House how much I sympathize with the reasons which give rise to it. If this matter is as important as I believe the proposer in all sincerity says that it is, then it is my view that it would be most advantageous to wait until the government brings in a similar bill, to which the hon. member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling) has already referred.

There are good reasons for waiting. If this bill is as important as the proposer says that it is, I find it difficult to understand why he would call it a very mild piece of legislation. If this matter, which has been before the press and the House for a number of years, is important, then it is not a very mild piece of legislation. Certainly if it is as the hon. member says, that it is primarily a matter of the civil rights of the citizens of Canada, then there is no way that it is a mild piece of legislation. I am sure that there is not a member in this House or a citizen of Canada who is not sympathetic to the subject matter of this bill, and who would not like to see the matter corrected.

This government is committed to dealing with this matter through legislation in 1980. When it does so, it will not introduce a mild piece of legislation simply because this matter does affect the civil rights of all Canadians. It will not be, as the hon. member has said, a recording bill. What use is a bill which affects the civil rights of all Canadians if it is a recording bill? I would have thought that someone proposing a private member's bill would speak on the matter with some

### *Foreign Economic Boycotts*

feeling, if the bill is so important, on the simple basis that he who asserts must prove. However, the hon. member rose in the House and denied that he wanted the bill given more consideration, and I believe he even told this House that he wanted the bill sent to committee so that it could be amended.

It would seem to me that any member who introduces a bill for serious consideration in this House would not want that bill amended and that he or she would have given serious consideration to what they wanted in the bill.

**Mr. Kaplan:** Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the hon. member is imputing improper motives in my introduction of this bill. I introduced it in the form that it was on the Order Paper in the last Parliament for very particular reasons which I have stated, and none of which had to do with any feeling on my part that the bill was satisfactory in the form that it was introduced, but all of which had to do with the fact that this bill had received the unanimous agreement of the parties in this House. So, to suggest that I did it for any other reasons is unreasonable, and inaccurate.

**Mr. Binks:** Mr. Speaker, if I have directly or indirectly imputed any improper motive to the hon. member, I withdraw it. I did not mean to say that he was insincere. Certainly I have a constitutional right to point out that any member who introduces a bill usually speaks with greater fervour about some of the conditions recited in it.

There is another reason why this bill should be looked upon somewhat askance by this House. The question of the economic boycott relates to what has happened over the past six months in this country and to our foreign policy, and is of such a delicate and sensitive nature that it would be irresponsible not to wait until the Hon. Robert Stanfield makes his report. Regardless of what is considered to be separate from the matter that Mr. Stanfield is dealing with, there is no way that it would be inseparable in the public mind.

I agree with what the hon. member for Burlington said when he suggested that there are means by which international commerce can satisfy whatever trading aims that commerce may have. We might ask ourselves if there is any way that the provisions of this bill, even if amended by committee, could hope to do what it sets out to do. There is no way whatsoever that what Mr. Stanfield has been asked to report would be dissociated from this bill in the public mind, and certainly not in the points of views of those countries which have been upset by this matter, which was originally thought to be a matter of domestic politics in this country. It was a principle of French foreign policy, and the most urgent thing to do—

● (1800)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCain):** It is now six o'clock and the hour provided for consideration of private members' business has expired. The hon. member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen) on a point of order.

**Mr. Friesen:** Mr. Speaker, I want to be on record as saying that this is the first time in my career in this House that I have