

Oral Questions

Does he intend to yield certain powers to Quebec in the matter of telecommunications and what position will the government take before Quebec representations?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, we are quite aware of Quebec claims at the present time and we have expressed our intention to discuss any matter whatever which Quebec or any other province would want to discuss, provided Quebec or any other province, in making their claims, also accepts to discuss all its legislation as well as its position up to now.

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Speaker, would the minister also say what part the provinces are going to play in the field of communications? Will the central government give up part of its jurisdiction to the provinces and will the owners of cable TV firms be submitted to two jurisdictions?

Mr. Pelletier (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, when you undertake with the provinces a discussion on the matters that the hon. member is raising, it is most difficult to give the answer before the discussions take place. We wanted to rush things with the provinces. They are trying to stall them. They wanted the next conference to be held in June. We managed to gain three months. But obviously I cannot give the answer before we get to some conclusions since this is a discussion in good faith on our part and also, I hope, on the part of the provinces.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

**CANADIAN POLICY RESPECTING PORTUGUESE COLONIALISM
AND SUPPLYING OF ARMS—POSITION AT FORTHCOMING
NATO CONFERENCE**

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In view of the fact that, at the United Nations on several occasions since 1962 and recently at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' meeting in Ottawa, the government of Canada has recognized the right of Angolese people to a freely chosen government and in view of the unfair advantage taken of 15 million black people by 700,000 privileged whites, what will be the position of Canada at the next NATO conference concerning the use by Portugal of NATO arms or of NATO member countries against Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the Canadian government toward the colonial policies of Portugal has been stated many times, both in the House and outside, and I have expressed our view personally to the foreign minister of Portugal. We are opposed to Portuguese colonial policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: We do not supply arms to Portugal and I think, if I may suggest this, that it is misleading to talk about NATO arms. There are no such things as NATO

[*Mr. Latulippe.*]

arms. There are arms supplied by individual countries which would probably supply them whether they were members of NATO or not.

[*Translation*]

ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS OF FAMINE IN ETHIOPIA

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In view of the recent CBC revelations concerning the thousands of starving Ethiopian children, can the government tell us what further action it plans to take so that Canada may take part in the relief of these victims whose fate is troubling the conscience of the world?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to refer to a committee, I announced in the miscellaneous estimates committee that Canada had decided to contribute \$1.5 million to the relief of suffering in Ethiopia. This is our second contribution. Our first was a nominal amount to the Canadian Red Cross of \$50,000.

**PORTUGUESE COLONIAL POLICY—REASON FOR
CANADIAN ABSTENTION FROM UNITED NATIONS VOTE
RESPECTING RECOGNITION OF GUINEA BISSAU**

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs with respect to the first question concerning Portuguese colonial policy and the government's abhorrence of that policy. Can the minister explain Canada's abstention in September with respect to the recognition of Guinea Bissau and, in addition, whether any action will be taken by our government at the NATO conference to determine the legitimacy of the government now commanding the support of more than 90 countries with respect to Guinea Bissau?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we would welcome the independence of all of the Portuguese colonies, including what has now been called Guinea Bissau. As soon as the group that is supporting the independence of Guinea Bissau establishes itself throughout the country as a government that can discharge its international obligations, we will recognize it.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I wonder whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs could be a bit clearer. In view of the fact that some 90 countries, I believe, voted at the United Nations in recognition of the government of Guinea Bissau, and as we moved for the recognition of the government of Chile with a good deal less public support than that, may I ask what further evidence it will take for the government of Canada to recognize the legitimacy of this regime?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, we recognized the new government of Chile because it was in effective control of the country. Unfortunately the militants, guerillas or whatever you want to call them that are now trying to establish an independent government in Guinea Bissau have not been able to establish themselves in the capital and are not able to be in a position to discharge their international obligations. As soon as they are, we will recognize them.