

John Turner. He very quickly made himself one of the outstanding figures at the conference. It was the first time in years—if not ever—that Canada had appointed a cabinet minister to lead the Canadian delegation, and there were many who felt that this was a long overdue tribute to the other Commonwealth countries who have, over the years, almost invariably appointed members of their cabinets to lead their delegations. Mr. Turner more than justified the principle, and one would hope that he has established a precedent which will not be departed from in the future.

Senator Connolly has also referred to the contributions of Senator Leonard and Senator Hugessen to the success of the conference, and I am in the fullest agreement with him.

I think some of us rather enjoyed that brief experience of having seats in the House of Commons; and, speaking personally, when one of the sessions was held in this chamber I thought it was a good omen of better times ahead that I found myself once again sitting on the right of the presiding officer.

There are many others to whom congratulations are due. Senator Connolly has mentioned all of them, and I join with what he said about Mr. Vanderfelt, Mr. Grey and others of the London office; and Mr. Imrie, Colonel Bowie, Miss Macpherson and others of our own secretariat; and of course the invaluable Mr. Montgomery.

In that connection I think it is a real sign of progress that we have in Canada now established a parliamentary conference secretariat under Mr. Imrie. It may not generally be known that his office handles all the arrangements for all parliamentary conferences and, naturally, that office is developing experience and skills which I think are adding greatly to the success of delegations coming and going to these conferences.

I said that Senator Connolly had some Gordian knots to unloose. That, I suppose, is to be expected when 170 or more politicians from various countries meet in legislative chambers. It should be said that these conferences are anything but a joy-ride for those who attend them. The discussions are factual, down-to-earth, penetrating and at times heated, but always, I think, instructive. I cannot but believe that the *Hansard* of the proceedings—which, as Senator Connolly said, we produced for the first time in Canada this year—will be both useful and influential at the decision-making levels of the governments of the countries represented.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Grosart: The sessions on Rhodesia, for example, were often of the "gloves off" variety, although as far as I could see there were no blows below the belt. There was a detailed statement from the Right Honourable Gordon Bottomly, who was the leader of the United Kingdom delegation, on the constitutional aspects of the Rhodesian crisis from the British point of view. It is recorded in the conference *Hansard*, and I suggest it is well worth reading, regardless of what one's views may be on the solution of this problem. I know some delegates—particularly from the western countries—were surprised to find not all the African delegates in favour of immediate military sanctions; some of course were. There was certainly no unanimity among the Africans and Asians on this subject or, indeed, on the status of Nigeria or Ghana, who are having their growing pains at the moment.

The subject of trade and aid was prominent on the agenda of this conference, as I think it will be in many conferences in the future. This is so because of the very startling facts that were put before us in the debates and in the data papers prepared by the London secretariat and by our own.

The most startling fact of all—and I have referred to it before—is that the gap between individual standards of living and national productivity of the developed nations and the developing nations is still widening after a quarter of a century of aid. Of all the aid that will be given by all aid-giving countries this year to developing countries, at least one-half will have to be paid back to the donors in principal or interest on previous loans. This, to me, is appalling.

The situation facing us is that the total level of international aid has not increased in the last few years. I am happy to be able to report that Canada is an exception to this, both in the quantity—which is probably just as important, if not more so—and the quality of our aid.

When I reported to this chamber on the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association's Conference in Jamaica two years ago I said that our total aid in 1965 would reach \$190 million. Actually, it was a little more than that, being just over \$200 million. This year it will be \$300 million. If all the developed countries were to make a similar increase in