

opportunity to speak. Therefore, I am not entirely clear that he will have an opportunity to continue his statement unless he adjourns the debate. Other honourable senators on this side may wish to speak in the meantime. We may therefore have a procedural problem.

**Senator van Roggen:** Honourable senators, if that should become a problem next fall, I would certainly defer to other members of the committee, who could speak quite as eloquently on this matter as I, following my remarks today.

● (1430)

Honourable senators, in June 1982 my committee received a reference from the Senate to study and report upon Canada's relations with countries of the Middle East and North Africa. We commenced taking evidence in the fall of that year. In the spring of 1983 a subcommittee of the committee was formed consisting of Senators Buckwold, Hicks, Lapointe, Macquarrie, Roblin and myself to visit the Middle East in connection with our study. I regret to report that on the very day we were to leave I took ill. I was taken to the hospital and was unable to join the group, in spite of the exciting arrangements that had been made for the trip. Senator Hicks acted as chairman of that subcommittee in my absence. The subcommittee visited Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Jordan and Israel. In every one of those countries it was received at the very highest level by a large number of government and other representatives. The report of the subcommittee, approved by the full committee, was attached to the committee's proceedings in March, 1984 and thus became a public report. I shall digress here to say that the Canada-Israel Committee made a comment in its publication to the effect that for the most part the subcommittee report was sensitive and perceptive.

More evidence was taken during the spring of 1984 and drafting of the report was under way when Parliament was dissolved in June of that year. As you know, we did not come back until October of 1984, a time when once again I was ill. However, the committee was re-formed with several new members who had not been present to hear the evidence that had been given up to that time. Senator Macquarrie, my deputy chairman, obtained a new reference from the Senate in September 1984. We continued working into the spring of this year and then commenced drafting the report, which was concluded after the Easter break. I might say that because of the time taken for translation and printing, the report became available only yesterday afternoon. Therefore, I am tabling it at the first possible opportunity. The report begins with a summary of conclusions and recommendations which runs to about eight pages.

I move, honourable senators, that the summary be included as an appendix to today's *Debates of the Senate* and to the *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate*. If that is agreeable, I have the summary in both French and English.

**Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Your Honour, I rise on a point of order. Should we express our agreement on whether the summary should form a part of the *Debates*?

[Senator Roblin.]

**Senator Roblin:** I am at a loss as to why the motion should be moved at this time. The motion before us is that the report of the committee be taken into consideration at this time. How do we fit this second idea into that motion? Perhaps it should be done at the conclusion of the discussion on the consideration of the report.

**Senator Frith:** It is normal practice for a senator in the course of a speech, even though it may be on a motion, to ask that a certain part of whatever he or she is dealing with be made a part of the *Debates*. Of course, if there is any objection then Senator Roblin is quite right. When an honourable senator makes such a request during the course of a speech, the Speaker usually says, "Is it agreed, honourable senators?" If we say, "Agreed," then it is done. If there is some objection, it is another matter.

**Senator Roblin:** What caught my attention were the honourable senator's words, "I move." Perhaps if he would simply ask for the unanimous consent of the Senate that the summary be appended to the record, I for one would have no objection.

**Senator Frith:** Yes, that is right, "ask" is the better word.

**Hon. Gildas L. Molgat:** Honourable senators, on a point of order, may I ask Senator van Roggen how many pages are involved?

**Senator van Roggen:** Approximately seven pages.

**Senator Flynn:** Less than seven.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Is leave granted, honourable senators?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

(For text of summary see Appendix A, p. 1159.)

**Senator van Roggen:** Honourable senators, by requesting that the summary be appended to the *Debates of the Senate*, I was not suggesting in any way that it was being adopted by the Senate. It is just that the report itself is now in the public domain as a result of my tabling it today, and it seemed to me that the *Debates* might as well include the summary.

After careful consideration of widely divergent views presented by witnesses, the committee report in every instance concurs with the position taken by different Canadian governments and which have evolved over recent years. The first thing that we endorse, of course, is the continued existence of Israel as a free and democratic country within secure boundaries. This matter was never in question. I might say as an aside that many senators, and, I am sure, many Canadians will be most interested to read in the report about the role Canada played at the United Nations in 1947 when the State of Israel was created. I certainly did not know until we carried out the study that Mr. Justice Ivan C. Rand of Canada was credited with being the principal author of the majority report of the United Nations Committee that was the basis for Resolution No. 181. Our former Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Lester Pearson, was at the time referred to by some as the Balfour of Canada. I was not aware of this background until the study and I found it most interesting.