

The Address—Mr. Macquarrie

credo of Mao and of Chiang Kai-shek about one China, to finding some way whereby Taiwan could retain some association with countries of the world.

That is my comment on the situation. If I am wrong, then I shall be glad, but I do not expect those tremendous changes in the diplomatic patterns of world politics which are sometimes postulated and prophesied by those who after many years have brought forward this act of recognition. I repeat that if I am wrong on this, I shall be delighted, because if it makes for an improvement of the world situation I will not mind at all that Macquarrie was wrong and that things in fact are better. Time alone will tell.

I am very much troubled, and I do not see how anyone in Canada could be otherwise than troubled, about the escalation of troubles, anxiety and bloodshed in the Middle East. I was appalled when I looked at the multi-coloured white paper, if I may call it that, on foreign policy which came out in the last session and found how little emphasis, how little attention, and indeed how little script was given to our relations with the Middle East and to our concern for what is taking place there.

Today we are agonizing over acts of terrorism in our country—and, God knows, we should and must. But it is only a short time ago that the world was focusing its attention upon terrorist activity in the Middle East. However, it should not require some spectacular form of terrorism, hijacking or civil war to cause us to turn our attention in that direction. The Middle East is, and seemingly has been down through the long reaches of history, one of the most intense crisis-ridden areas of the world.

These tensions which come from history, from geography, from religion, from strategy and from much else, have made it a danger spot of explosive potential and the possibilities of a major conflagration are there every day. I agree with President Nixon who said some weeks ago that the dangers in the Middle East, in so far as the great powers are concerned, are much more acute and more portentous than in reference to Viet Nam or, I should say more properly now, Indochina.

In these days of instant communication and modern warfare we cannot assume that this is some remote area where Canada does not have direct and close contacts and precise and important responsibilities. Whoever wrote the white paper might have thought that, but he should not have thought that and Canadians should not think that. Canadians dare not think that, because what happens in the Middle East is going to be of major importance to us, whether or not we in our diplomatic structure regard it as an area of priority. There will be no escape for us if trouble comes in that area; and if we have given it a low priority, we had better think again.

The other day I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the government was considering further aid to Jordan, where there has been terrible destruction and loss of life. The minister's reply was, if I may say so, a magnificent example of pharasaic self-satisfaction. He said:

I believe it is considered that Canada has made a very generous contribution.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

What was the contribution? It was \$25,000 to the Red Cross and an additional \$150,000 to the UNWRA program, in the aftermath of a war which was terrible in its intensity and awful in the suffering which it inflicted upon so many people. Of course, I commend the government for doing that much—naturally I would—but in the immensity of the suffering, surely such self-satisfaction was a little out of place. I humbly commend a little modesty to the minister and to the government as to their contribution in this matter.

• (3:20 p.m.)

We must do a lot more. Even in times of our own domestic travail, sir, we must do more. We must assist with a greater measure than we have so far. Canadians have been involved with truce operations and in peace-keeping forces. Our men have done a splendid job. The name of General Burns is highly regarded in that area. But it strikes me that since the end of the six-day war, the Canadian role in the Middle East has been diminishing. In fact, one of the things that trouble me is that there are so many areas in the world where Canada's role has been diminishing.

For years we have paid our portion to the United Nations Works and Rehabilitation Agency, UNWRA. We have done more than many other countries. This is true, we can say with candour. But I feel that for too long we have made our annual contribution by way of taking part in the debates and listening to the Commissioner General's report. I have sat in the United Nations General Assembly and heard these debates. We have then seemed to let the matter rest. But the population in the refugee camps has mounted over the years. There are now 1½ million people living in tents, hovels and shacks throughout the Middle East. Some of them were born there and have known nothing but the squalor of that situation. After 20 years there is an increase in the population of displaced persons, and an annual contribution just to keep them existing is surely not enough. How could we expect that people uprooted from their homes and shut up in camps under these privations would not erupt into something a little more disturbing than satisfaction and complacency? What kind of human beings would they be if they did not manifest a different reaction from that?

A few months ago I was in the Middle East to attend a meeting of parliamentarians to discuss the Middle East situation. I remember very vividly the spokesman for the Palestinians, a most eloquent man. The fact that he is the son of a Presbyterian minister did him no harm in my judgment. Dr. Yehid Hammoudd began his remarks by saying, "There is no Middle East problem; there is only a Palestine problem." That was months ago. This is one of the things we are realizing slowly, and in some cases painfully—that at centre stage must be the Palestinian people.

For far too long we have talked about governments as a group of strategically located political entities and we have forgotten that wars are not about, and this problem is not about, a collection of governments. This problem is