

Commonwealth Secretary General, Mr. Arnold Smith. Mr. Smith, as all honourable senators know, is a Canadian. He was trained in our Department of External Affairs. He addressed the delegates in the House of Commons on Friday, September 30, and I should like to express to him the deep appreciation of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association for the way in which he approached that task and for the manner in which he discharged it. I was very proud of him, as I am sure all the delegates were, for what he is doing in the discharge of his heavy responsibilities at a time of great difficulty for the Commonwealth.

I should like to touch upon some of the events of the meetings, both the plenary sessions and the committee meetings, which took place in Ottawa. They began on September 28. Before I do so I want to say that because of the persistence and the insistence of Senator Grosart the proceedings were reported in the way the proceedings of Parliament are reported, by *Hansard*. This *Hansard* type of report is an invaluable document. It was most helpful to the delegates at the time of the conference, and I commend a reading of it to all honourable senators.

In referring to some special parts of this report I am perhaps undertaking an invidious exercise, because it is difficult to select one person and comment upon his remarks without selecting a good many more. But, at the risk of offending some, I think it might be of value if I say something of the discussions which took place.

The important debate was that on international affairs, and one can understand the great interest in it in view of the fact that some 27 countries from every continent of the world were represented. This debate was opened by the Canadian Minister of External Affairs, Honourable Paul Martin. His contribution was both valuable and helpful. The delegates certainly appreciated it, and said so. As soon as the debate began, it was clear that within the Commonwealth, and between the countries of the Commonwealth, all is not sweetness and light. The Kashmir situation, for example, was one upon which there was some comment, although I must say that the key of the debate was very low, mainly because of the tentative agreements that were reached at Tashkent, Russia, a little less than a year ago. I regretted, as I think a great many of us did, the fact that the settlement between India and Pakistan reached on that

occasion was not an intra-commonwealth settlement. It is correct to say that there was disappointment expressed in the fact that there is not a Commonwealth agency to deal with intra-commonwealth disputes. Mr. Bhargava of India referred to this question. Mr. Pannell of the British House of Commons referred to it at page 91 of the proceedings, as did Mr. Soomro of Pakistan at page 67. The debate on this issue was not as hot or difficult as the one that took place in New Zealand a year ago.

The debate on Rhodesia was another matter, but it was somewhat overshadowed by the fact that the Prime Ministers had recently come to certain conclusions about the problem there. I think many of the delegates questioned whether Rhodesia is in fact a microcosm of the Commonwealth, and whether there will always be in the Commonwealth antipathies between blacks and whites, between race and race, and between creed and creed. I am bound to say that there was condemnation on the part of some delegates for the way the Rhodesian situation is being handled. The leader of the debate, the Honourable J. S. M. Ochola from Uganda, made a speech in which he expressed very strongly-held views that force should be used. His criticisms were pungent, and he had the support of speakers from southeast Asia, Africa and the Caribbean area. His speech appears at page 45 of the report.

But there were other views expressed, and I think this was partly due to the influence that emanated from the meeting of the prime ministers which had concluded shortly before the conference began. I was particularly impressed by the moderation of the speeches of the delegates from Malawi.

I was impressed also, as I think all delegates were, by the responsible way in which the leader of the British delegation, the Right Honourable Arthur Bottomley, the Minister of Overseas Development, discussed this issue. He did it objectively, calmly, and very effectively. Mr. Bottomley brought distinction to both the meeting and the debate. I was delighted that the British Government had seen fit to send a minister of his rank to this meeting, especially in view of the situation in Rhodesia.

South Africa was discussed. Southwest Africa was mentioned, and the conditions there deplored. The situations in Ghana and Nigeria, and the military dictatorships that have been established in those countries were commented upon, particularly at the council