

S.O. 29

● (1620)

I must say, I feel a deep disappointment when I and my colleagues ask, as we have, that we move forward now, to hear the Government respond that it is as concerned as we are, and I do not deny it, but that it wants to do this together with others. Of course, we want to do this together with others, but if the others are unwilling or unable to move, we certainly cannot justify standing still. Damn it, if one is in the streets and needs help, we do not say: "Well, if no one else will give a hand, I am not going to do it". If we see someone in distress, someone drowning, we do not stand on the shore and look around hoping that others will join with us in rescuing that person before we take action. That in a nutshell is the attitude the Government is displaying, unwittingly I suspect, during the course of Question Periods. I find it upsetting and frustrating when we know that Canadian enterprise continues to subsidize that regime and the Government takes the easy way out at every turn.

One does not need a first-hand knowledge of the system to appreciate the evilness which lurks within it. What would lead anyone to believe they should have laws which limit certain people to certain parts of their own country? What would lead anyone to believe that one needs to have controls on the movement of people from one part of a country to another simply because of their colour? What would lead anyone to believe there should be black migrant labour laws which inflict upon those people the worst possible circumstance without any recourse of any kind? Why should there be group area acts or, the most recent of all, the Government declaring what is tantamount to martial law?

Martial law means one can be imprisoned for six months without charge. Someone can be picked up off the street, thrown into jail and no one has to tell them where they are or what they have done. There is no court for them. They can be taken away and forgotten. We would not tolerate that here and we ought not to tolerate it anywhere else. I have heard colleagues on the Conservative side speak about regimes in the eastern part of Europe and decry certain aspects of a particular political system. I would ask them to join in decrying these aspects of this political system.

What have we seen as Canada's response? To begin with, I must say in fairness, a strongly worded statement. There were good statements from both the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs. They indicated a heartfelt desire to see an end to apartheid. I do not for one moment depreciate the efforts of the Prime Minister in Nassau. I think he worked hard and no doubt played an important part in getting the kind of preliminary work done to set the stage. But what followed? Canada, when faced with choices, has taken the mildest possible choice. We continue to make strong statements but every time we are faced with making a choice, we opt out.

In the case of the Nassau statement, which of the options did we choose when it came time to impose sanctions? We chose to put a ban on flights to and from South Africa, but

there were no flights to ban. We banned the flights however, and that was our first step. We took away the credentials of four diplomats, two of whom live in New York, one who lives in Los Angeles and another who lives in Washington, D.C. That was strength. It was movement. It was living up to the commitment of Nassau and to the strong statements made about the evils of apartheid.

We continue, however, to export \$151 million worth of goods to South Africa for the benefit of that regime. We continue to import into Canada \$228 million worth of goods from South Africa which helps to support that evil regime. We continue to have \$1.1 billion of capital investment in South Africa which assists the maintenance of that evil regime. I say through you, Mr. Speaker, that if we had really meant it, if we had intended to take the lead, if we had intended to live up to these statements, we could have begun by cutting all the imports of agricultural products into Canada. That would account for about half of everything we import from South Africa, including canned and fresh fruit and sugar. I put it to you, Sir, that we could easily find an alternative source. There are lots of other places which would be willing to sell us those products.

We could look at immediately reducing exports such as sulphur, which was raised earlier by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Vancouver—Kingsway (Mr. Waddell). Our exports amounted to \$71.4 million last year and \$18.1 million this year to this point in time. Some people might say it has been shown that if we did this it might cost us jobs. I am going to admit quite bluntly that it would cost us jobs and for that I would be sorry. However, when we remember the television pictures of the people on the streets and what we heard from Bishop Tutu about the hardship these people face, the 380 jobs it would cost Canada to take economic sanctions which could be taken are a very little sacrifice indeed measured against the potential good which could result from such a measure.

The sanctions we proposed through my colleague, the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett), and supported, I think, by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry, are also supported by countless people around the world. One need only turn to the news media to find that 77 per cent of the black people in South Africa who would be most affected support sanctions now, now while there is still something to say, now while lives are still intact. There are 4.8 million white people and 24 million black people, more or less, in South Africa and 77 per cent of the 24 million support sanctions now. If they, who are faced with the day-to-day atrocities, are willing to make a further sacrifice and are asking us through their leader to take the economic measures available to us now, who are we to say no? What right have we to say to them: "No, our profits are more important. Our 380 jobs matter more". I say to the Government that although I support its statements, I find its actions fall short of its rhetoric.