

access and which are considered to be indispensable for an acceptable standard of living. That applies also to other blanket definitions based on the existence of disparities.

Of course, poverty also depends on circumstances of time and place—and somebody could be poor in Canada and yet be considered as almost rich in an underdeveloped country—although I am quite aware that this comparison is not of much comfort to those who are considered poor in Canada.

It would be preferable to turn to the definition of the basic rights of the individual as it appears in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It states that everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services.

Everyone has the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

Alas, after a quarter of a century, we are unfortunately still far from that goal, in the world, and it is strange that such a motion should be moved in a country whose standard of living is one of the highest, a country which has a system of social security quite properly considered the best and the most comprehensive as compared with those in effect in the other free countries of the world.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It being 10 o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that pursuant to Standing Order 58(11), the time allotted for the consideration of the motion is expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

[English]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—SOUTH AFRICA—GOVERNMENT POLICY RESPECTING POSITION OF NON-WHITES

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, on November 4 I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) whether Lieutenant-Colonel W. Kenneth Robinson, a Member of Parliament, was expressing government policy when he stated on a short summer visit to South Africa that—and then I was called to order. I continued my question as follows:

Is it government policy to suggest that South African non-whites should realize they are not yet ready for full political independence, as was indicated by Lieutenant-Colonel W. Kenneth Robinson?

Again I was called to order. The question I asked on November 4 stemmed from an article in the *Durban Mercury* of South Africa, dated August 8, 1971, and headlined "Canadian MPs impressed by practicality". It read:

• (10:00 p.m.)

This is the general opinion of four Canadian MPs who arrived in Durban yesterday for a short visit as part of their itinerary arranged by the South Africa Foundation.

The four men, including three members of the ruling Liberal Party under Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, are: Lt.-Col. W. Kenneth Robinson (Toronto-Lakeshore), Mr. Harold Stafford (Elgin), Mr. Marcel Roy (Laval) and Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shelford). Mr. Rondeau is a member of the Social Credit Party.

The article continues:

The South African non-whites were anxious to avoid "the mistakes made by Zambia and some other black African states" and were prepared to advance slowly towards the development of their own country within a country.

The four MPs said they would report back on their visit and agreed that South Africa's image in Canada had been tarnished by "bigots".

All the information we get over there is hopelessly biased. We don't get the full picture at all and some of the facts that we do get are badly distorted," Col. Robinson said.

Col. Robinson said that there was a feeling in Canada that freedom was more important than anything else—regardless of standards of education and conditions of living.

In my opinion, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from hunger and freedom from fear are the fundamental rights of all people in this world. I repeat, everybody living in a democratic nation of our world should subscribe to that philosophy. It is fact that these MPs went to South Africa to see for themselves what apartheid and racism was all about. I imagine they stayed in an integrated hotel when they were there. It is also a fact that three members were recognized as members of the ruling Liberal party under Prime Minister Trudeau and one of them used the real scare tactic of the domineering military mind, with the handle "Lieutenant-Colonel W. Kenneth Robinson". It is strange, indeed, that the same member is shown in the "Parliamentary Guide" of 1971 simply as, "Robinson, William Kenneth (Lakeshore), first elected to House of Commons 1968, party politics: Liberal," and then his address. His attitude is certainly striking so far as our country is concerned.

The real issue before us is indicated in a statement made by Lester Pearson speaking about the Commonwealth, in South Africa. He stated:

If the Commonwealth does not condemn racialism in any form and wherever it shows itself; if it does not reject and fight discrimination in race and color, in any form; if any of its members base their politics on such discrimination; then the Commonwealth is not going to survive in its present—or indeed in any acceptable—form.

That was a speech by Lester Pearson to the Royal Commonwealth Society in November of 1968, which is not very long ago. Now that these Canadian Members of Parliament have associated themselves with the Trudeau Liberals, I wonder if what they had to say in South Africa is really government policy. This is what I am wondering, because we have to decide when Members of Parliament go on trips such as this whether they are speaking as government people when associated with the Prime Minister of this country. This is the real issue and the question I should like to ask tonight.

One must ask questions already asked of these Members of Parliament visiting South Africa, and one must also ask the latest group of two Conservatives and one Liberal who visited South Africa at the invitation and