

Prime Minister, if his letter to Mr. Heath is anything to go by. But what can one say in defence of the fact that Canada keeps South Africa's 250 Harvard aircraft operational, aircraft which when equipped to carry 19-pound fragmentation bombs, as are the 100 on active service, are excellent counter-insurgency weapons. Indeed, they would be useless in any other role.

It now would seem that we are also supplying some jet engines for the now obsolete, except for counter-insurgency operations, F-86 aircraft in a move that would seem to be counter to the implicit guarantees contained in Senator Martin's speech at the time the United Nations first requested the embargo. There is no justification for the continuation of these shipments and I am appalled that the cabinet has been unable to reach the same, obvious conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I dearly would have loved to employ this opportunity to discuss the broader implications of our policy toward South Africa, especially that of our total trade with and investment in that country. However, I have deliberately restricted myself to the narrower question of spare parts' shipments because I believe there is an open-and-shut case against these, and that the government could act and act rapidly to halt these shipments if it chose so to do.

[Translation]

Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I find it regrettable that the hon. member for Selkirk should have asked that his question be debated tonight because I am not yet in a position to inform him of the cabinet's decision on spare parts.

Had he shown a little more patience and waited for a few more days, I could probably have made in this House the statement which he requested on October 13 last, as recorded in *Hansard* for that date. Unfortunately, the cabinet has not yet made its decision. However, that should not take too long and I should ask the hon. member to show the same patience as shown by the African and Asian delegations to the United Nations, following the explanations given for our abstention.

[English]

The Canadian delegation studied with the greatest of care the text of the resolution before them in the report of the special political committee. The Canadian government was fully in sympathy with the underlying principles of this resolution. However, the Canadian delegation had to abstain on the resolution because its very essence, c'est-à-dire, the implementation immediately of Security Council resolution 282, was then and still is under review by the Canadian government.

When resolution 282 was passed on July 23 of this year, the Canadian government immediately began the very full and careful consideration which a subject of this importance requires. The resolution presented no difficulties for Canada, with one exception. Canada has been applying a general embargo on arms to South Africa since 1963. There have been no lapses in this general embargo. May I point out that in the survey prepared by the distinguished rapporteur of the special

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

committee on the policies of apartheid there was no indication to the contrary. However, Canada continued to furnish some spare parts for equipment which had been supplied to South Africa under contracts entered into before Security Council resolution 181 of August 7, 1963, was passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The time of the Parliamentary Secretary has expired. The Chair will now call upon the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart).

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—APPOINTMENT OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, today in the House I asked a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) with respect to the International Development Research Centre. I wanted to know why he had not named a Member of Parliament to the board of governors in the recent announcement appointing the president and 19 members of that board. Clearly the act, which was passed in this House on February 20 of this year, under section 10 allows that one of the governors may be a Member of Parliament. In this instance, since it was already written into one of our statutes, this was a sterling opportunity to open the door to have representatives on the part of the people on agencies that come under the aegis of the government but enjoy a certain independence.

I wonder why the minister did not bother to say a word about the presence of a Member of Parliament on this board when he made the announcement. If he has decided to do this at a later date, we would all like to hear it. If he ignores it completely as something that is not even in the act, that is another question. I suggest it is too bad if that is the case, because then he would just be ignoring the wishes of this House.

This question is much larger than that of who is a member of the board of governors of the International Development Research Centre. We shall see over the next weeks a number of private members' bills which deal with this very subject of placing Members of Parliament on the boards of directors of various Crown corporations and agencies. I believe this is a question of fundamental principle, because the people of Canada who sent us here expect us to look after their affairs and report back to them; yet in these instances we are not able to tell them anything. We are not able to represent them properly, simply because these groups are completely independent of Parliament.

Even when we ask questions of the minister in this House, we are not able to get an answer because he tells us they are independent bodies. The basic principle of this problem is before us and I hope that many hon. members will avail themselves of the opportunity to speak on the subject over the next weeks. But in the meantime when one of the bills has this principle written into it, I am at a loss to understand why the minister did not include a Member of Parliament on the board and why he did not mention it.