

Mr. Prud'homme: He only left me three minutes, I am very sorry to say. He could have talked about our trade with Europe. In 1980 it went up to \$9.4 billion from \$7.2 billion in 1979. From 1962 to 1980, it went up from \$1.3 billion to \$9.4 billion. He could have talked about—

[*Translation*]

—Canada and Western Europe. We could also have mentioned Japan and our extraordinary trade relationship with that country which accounted for \$1 billion in the past and has now reached the level of \$7 billion. Unfortunately, time does not permit us to do everything in the same day. On the other hand, I wish to thank the hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. McGuigan) who asked our Committee of External Affairs and National Defence to study relationships between Canada and Latin America. We immediately undertook this review, which was urgently needed in my opinion because Latin America is a new territory for us in Canada, and I am very happy that my colleague, the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Dupras) was chosen as chairman. First of all, I had suggested it to him. He agreed to act as chairman for this committee, and I believe this is very important because we have overlooked Latin America for years. We now have a committee. I know that the former Secretary of State sits on this committee, and I hope that the department will develop a new approach concerning relationships between Canada and Latin America.

I would have liked to speak about something else, and I shall do so in the last two minutes of my speech, if the House grants me two or three minutes more as it did in the case of the hon. member for Edmonton South (Mr. Roche), but first, I would like to say a few words about the Department of External Affairs. The minister is here, and I appreciate it. I want to tell him—and this is something that he knows about and I know that he makes constant efforts with this in mind—that if one department should reflect bilingualism in the great federal machine, it is the Department of External Affairs. This department must reflect cultural duality, as I have always emphasized. We must spare no effort in this regard, concerning both recruitment and promotions. And speaking about promotions, I would like to see a great many more women in the higher echelons of the department.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the minister that we must see to it that departmental officials can adjust to a changing world. This is a very important issue in my opinion. Our universe is changing constantly, and the United Nations in 1981 are not what they were in 1945. They are no longer an exclusive club. They now have hundreds of new members. I hope that the Department of External Affairs can be sensitive to such changes, which go against what used to be the way in the old Commonwealth club, and adapt to such concepts as the French-speaking community and this whole new attitude, and I know that the minister is very aware of this issue. I would also like to take a few moments, since the House did not show

North-South Relations

enough generosity as far as I am concerned, to emphasize what I have pointed out every time I went to the United Nations, namely the importance of the Canadian mission.

Again in a changing global environment, we owe it to ourselves to have at the Canadian delegation to the United Nations people that have the understanding, awareness and knowledge of the friendship and an extended hand to these new nations that over these last few years applied with much difficulty, that might irritate older members by proclaiming their misery, their poverty, but it is the only forum in the world where they can be heard. I say we must be patient and understanding, we must know how to welcome them, how to understand them. In this year 1981, the United Nations is the number one priority of the Department of External Affairs. I would have liked of course to refer to our relations with the United States, however in conclusion I will deal with a subject that has been driving me for over 15 years, although I have been a member of Parliament for 18 years, namely the Middle East issue.

[*English*]

I am absolutely astounded that no member of the official opposition thought it wise to refer to one of the most remarkable pieces of work carried out by one of their own. I am talking about the report of the special representative of the Government of Canada and ambassador-at-large, Mr. Stanfield, the Stanfield report on the Middle East. I have read it six times, in French and in English, to ensure that I understood all the nuances Mr. Stanfield was trying to put intelligently to the Conservative government at that time.

I would not like to be cut off at this point because shooting from the hip when talking about the Middle East is always very dangerous. I have known that in the past. If I might have the indulgence of Mr. Speaker and the consent of the House to continue for five more minutes, I should like briefly to put my views on record on the question of the Middle East.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House for the hon. member to have an extension of five minutes' time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Prud'homme: My views are very simple. I do not understand people who have never understood me or the position of my party.

Anyone who has been to the Middle East, anyone who has visited Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Egypt, Lebanon, Israel and the other countries, knows that unless you solve the Palestinian question, you cannot solve the problems of the Middle East. I have not been able to understand, for the last 13 years of my life, how people do not understand that. Is it asking too much to expect people to understand that there is a group of people called Palestinians who live, breathe, multiply and who also have a right to an existence and a country? Is it anti-semitic to express these views? Those who think it is anti-semitic should read the report of Mr. Stanfield. Is it anti-Israel to say that we