

I was interested in the adjective "new". I wondered what are the "new forms of discrimination," but when I looked into the resolutions I understood what was meant. They were referring to the monopoly control of world trade by the developed industrial nations. The manner in which it is being carried out is creating among the new nations a form of economic discrimination which, as Mr. Pearson, the former Prime Minister, said only yesterday, may lead within ten or twelve years to an international catastrophe. That was Mr. Pearson's comment on the conduct of this monopoly control that the Western industrial nations are intent on maintaining in world trade.

Canada has given some leadership in the field, but I regret the stand that Canada has taken in regard to preferences for the products of some of the developing countries. I know why we have taken that stand, but I know also that it has been misunderstood abroad. In spite of the reasons we and others have given, the developing countries continue to insist that in their view some form of trade preference is an essential part of the narrowing of that gap that threatens us with the catastrophe of which Mr. Pearson spoke.

The fourth main point in the resolutions of the IPU concerned the provision of aid to developing nations, and here I am again wondering if the message will be carried back to our own Government. I wonder what mechanism there is, for example, for this very fine delegation that attended this conference to come back and tell our Government once again that a very powerful, influential, effective, and thoughtful international body has said: "You must stop tying your aid." I wonder if the Government has been told that.

I am fully aware that there are two sides to this question. I know it would mean some considerable economic sacrifice to untie our aid, but the fact remains that every detached body that has looked at this problem has said: "The donor nations must untie their aid." I shall not go into further detail as to why we insist on tying our aid. I know that there is an escape clause because of the problem we face in respect of our balance of international settlements, but I would hope that the message from Lima, Peru, will be carried to our Government.

Honourable senators, I have said that I feel a second chamber such as this is in a unique

position to make a contribution in this particular area. I mentioned the fact of permanence of appointments, and I conclude by saying that I hope those who have responsibility in this matter will so exercise it that this special feature of our tenure of office here will become a national asset, which it can be, and not a national liability, which it also can be and which some think it is. I see hope for developments—I will not say "constitutional developments"—which will in the very immediate future make the Senate, this House of Parliament, a body which has the respect and esteem of the parliaments of the world.

NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE AT BRUSSELS, BELGIUM—DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from Tuesday, December 17, 1968, the adjourned debate on the inquiry of Hon. Mr. Aird calling the attention of the Senate to the Fourteenth Annual Conference of the North Atlantic Assembly held at Brussels, Belgium, 11th November to 15th November, 1968, and in particular to the discussions and proceedings of the conference and the participation therein of the delegation from Canada.

[Translation]

Hon. Jacques Flynn: Honourable senators, I hesitate a little to resume the debate after the speech we have just heard, because my topic is somewhat in the same vein—our external relations—as I intend to deal with our participation to the annual NATO assembly, held in Brussels from November 11 to 15 last.

It was only at the insistent suggestion of several of my colleagues that I agreed to be a member of the Canadian delegation to the meeting of the NATO Assembly held last November in Brussels. Those colleagues assured me that the meeting would have particular importance because of the events in Czechoslovakia and that therefore it could be a most useful experience. I must admit that they were right.

I would keep you a long time if I were to tell you about all the impressions and convictions I brought back from my trip. But, have no fear, I shall limit myself to those points I feel are essential.

As a preliminary remark, I should like to say that I agree with Senator Aird about the role played by the Canadian delegation.