

Oral Questions

the answer to his question on the order paper had been given. Actually, that answer is in course of preparation.

POSSIBILITY OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO GENERAL QUANG

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the Ugandan refugee payments were made under the Immigration Adjustment Assistance Program, can the minister inform this House if General Quang, who is also a refugee and about whom the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich asked questions last week, received any financial assistance under such a program?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the answer is that he has not.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

TRIPS OF MR. RICHARD DICERNI AND MR. DANIEL COATES—
INQUIRY AS TO MINISTER'S AUTHORIZATION

Mr. Sean O'Sullivan (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, may I return to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration who set the record straight? Since the question I asked did not appear directly on the order paper, those questions having taken three months to be answered, may I ask the minister directly if he authorized the expenditure of public funds for the extensive trips taken by the two members concerned on his personal staff?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, of course I have authorized trips taken by members of my staff, in the same way as every other minister in this House and of other governments has. The details will be available to the hon. member when the question is answered. I have not seen the answer myself yet.

* * *

POST OFFICE

REFERENCE TO EPIDEMIC OF MACKASEY 'FLU

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question could have been directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. However, to begin the week right, I will address it to the Postmaster General. It is about the recent epidemic of Mackasey 'flu which assumed its most virulent form in Montreal. Is it connected with tainted meat, how is it spread and what efforts are being made to provide immunity to the general public?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Greenwood.

[Mr. Andras.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REJECTION BY SOUTH AFRICA OF UNITED NATIONS' ORDER
TO END ADMINISTRATION OF NAMIBIA—GOVERNMENT
POSITION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. As the time limit given to South Africa by the Security Council of the United Nations to end the illegal administration of South West Africa, now known as Namibia, has expired with a rejection by South Africa, what action does the government of Canada contemplate in order to induce South Africa to respect and accept the decisions of the United Nations?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the question of Namibia and the United Nations deadline is still before the Security Council. Once the Security Council deals with the question of the deadline and with the question of mandatory sanctions, it will be possible for the government of Canada to take note of that situation. In the meantime, we cannot take much action because the matter is before the Security Council.

OPERATIONS OF FALCONBRIDGE NICKEL COMPANY IN
NAMIBIA—SUGGESTED ACTION TO END TAX CONCESSIONS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As Falconbridge Nickel Company, or some of its subsidiaries, are continuing to operate under the illegal authority of the government of South Africa in Namibia, and as Canadian tax concessions are being made to those companies which are operating without the consent of the legal authority, the Commissioner of the United Nations, what steps is the Canadian government taking to end such tax concessions and to require such companies to desist from all activities in Namibia not legally authorized?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to advise the hon. member in detail on the matter of tax concessions. In general, a number of departments of the government of Canada have been giving attention to the question of Canadian companies operating in Namibia. Of course, there is no way under Canadian law by which the government can force any mode of conduct on business operations of Canadian subsidiaries in other countries. Furthermore, as the hon. member knows, it is a principle of government policy not to interfere in the operations of Canadian companies abroad.

In a more general way the Canadian government, of course, does not recognize the authority of South Africa over Namibia. We have recognized the authority of the United Nations Commissioner and we regard the present situation as illegal. Corporations or subsidiaries operating in Namibia do so at their own risk and initiative. If they should be subject to nationalization or confiscation in Namibia, the government position would obviously accord with the acknowledgement that they are operating on their own initiative and at their own risk.