

ence of Guarantees of the Implementation of the Paris Agreement. We have assumed responsibility in this field and I suggest it is time we showed some responsibility.

I now turn to the last subject I want to discuss, and that is South Africa, a key area in the whole future of the world. Canada, consistent with its ambiguous stance as announced in its foreign policy papers has supported UN resolutions which condemn Portuguese colonialism, apartheid in South Africa and the illegal regime in Rhodesia. The government policy papers are abundantly clear—and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) has spoken in this vein himself—about the moral revulsion felt by Canadians toward these racist regimes. Canada's actions have been very different from her rhetoric. Canada has aided and assisted the development of trade relations with South Africa and Angola. Canada still extends to South Africa a preferential tariff, supposedly based on membership in the Commonwealth many years after South Africa left the Commonwealth on the very issue of racial policies.

Canada has failed to give adequate recognition to the liberation movements in Angola, Guine-Bissau and Mozambique whose populations are fighting for freedom. Some people talk about them as terrorists, but I suggest they are not more terrorists than any other people fighting for liberation and freedom in their countries, and these people occupy in most instances the greater part of the area of their countries and have the support generally of the international community.

In 1972, I think in December or November, Canada supported a resolution in the United Nations which recommended—this is an almost literal quotation—that all governments render to the people of those countries, and in particular to the populations of the liberated areas of those territories, all moral and material assistance necessary to continue their struggle for the achievement of the inalienable right to self-determination and independence. Canada, with 97 other nations, voted for this resolution. I suggest we committed ourselves to it. It is true that the Canadian delegation then proceeded to explain away its support for that resolution with reservations and qualifications.

Recently, the Secretary of State for External Affairs announced that Canada would in fact give, through CIDA, non-military support to non-governmental agencies, one of which is the World Council of Churches, which have been assisting the development of those areas which have been liberated from colonial occupation. There were a few critical editorials and letters to the newspapers which seemed to have caused this government to hesitate. I hope this hesitation amounts to a mere tactical retreat and that the government will stick firmly to its announced determination. I suggest to do otherwise would be to signal to the people of Africa and to people throughout the world that there is no consistency between our words in the United Nations and our actions, and it would indicate that in the struggle for freedom Canada is neutral.

We should take such practical steps as withdrawing trade commissioners from South Africa and Angola, as trying to persuade Canadian companies with investments in that area not to exploit the apartheid practices prevalent there, and we should withdraw the preferential

The Address—Mr. Baker

arrangements with South Africa and give practical but non-military aid to those liberation movements.

There are other subjects I should like to pursue, as obviously international affairs range pretty widely, but time does not permit me to do so. However, I should like to make one reference to the fact that, despite the contempt that is sometimes heaped upon the United Nations and despite the disillusionment expressed by this government in its foreign papers with peacekeeping forces, the UN and its peacekeeping forces constitute an essential element in the maintenance of precarious peace in the Middle East.

The views which I have expressed may be thought to be idealistic. Personally, I am not afraid of that word. Unless our international policies are at least tinged with idealism, we will condemn ourselves to futility. I understand that the foreign policy of any country must be based upon self-interest, but that self-interest should be enlightened self-interest. I think enlightened self-interest in fields of development, in our relations with Viet Nam and in our relations with South Africa requires the policies I have outlined.

In closing, let me assure the government and this House that more and more people, and I include among them particularly young people and church people, are in fact deeply concerned about these issues and look to the government for the leadership they have not received in full measure in the past.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I should first like to join my leader and other colleagues in the House in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I think they undertook this duty in commendable fashion. I was very pleased to be here to listen to their speeches. I did not agree with everything they said; none the less, I thought they carried out their duties extremely well.

I listened with great interest to the speech delivered today by the Postmaster General (Mr. Ouellet). I was very heartened, in fact I was absolutely delighted, to hear him open his speech, as so many other members have on the other side of the House, by attacking the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). If there is any great sign for optimism in our party, it is the fact that members on the government side have not exhausted their energies in attacking the opposition, and I for one want to express my thanks to the Postmaster General and others who have contributed.

● (1640)

I say to the Postmaster General that rather than extoll all the virtues of his own leader, of which I would not call him the most unbiased judge, I would suspect that he should have expended his energy, or the natural gas he exuded in this House, in improving the performance of his department which has perhaps the most disappointing record of any Post Office Department of any democracy in the world and, more than that, has among its staff perhaps the lowest level of morale since confederation. So I think that perhaps if he extended the same amount of energy to those things as he did in extolling the virtues of his leader, there might be great improvement. I do not wish to denigrate the hiring practices of the Postmaster General, but I