

government for years. Yet we have no suggestion that an appointment will be made even in the near future.

In my opinion this constitutes a series of dangerous diplomatic defaults on the part of this country. I am sorry to see it taking place, and I should like to be sufficiently severe with the minister that he would see to it that the condition is remedied immediately, in the interests of Canada.

As to the department itself, let me say that without having a full-time minister we are following a dangerous course. In the department one finds public servants whose competence is unsurpassed by any others in the public service of Canada. I make no reflection upon them when I say that we cannot allow a department, even one with good men in it, to grow up like Topsy, without a full-time minister. Everyone knows what it means to have team-work between a full-time minister and those who serve under him. I suggest we cannot allow this default to continue, because a departmental reorganization is needed, one which would include a new minister of external affairs.

Canada is in a position where she should take a more forthright stand respecting her Arctic problems. Our failure to assert ourselves and to announce a clear and definite policy in Arctic matters may have a damaging effect upon Canadian-United States relations of the future. One of our greatest friends is the republic to the south of us. I hope that in the days which lie ahead Canada's position with respect to her Arctic relations may be defined and clarified.

I am hopeful that the bonds of unity which exist among the various units of the commonwealth will be strengthened as time passes. I believe I would not be transgressing my rights in the matter of speculation if I were to say that I look forward to the day—and I suggest we should be preparing for it—when Canada will be the centre, the heart, of the great British commonwealth of nations. I hope that day may come. It may not be in the near future, but, after all, there are some things concerning which we must take a long-range view.

My observations have been somewhat hurried, because of the reasons I set out earlier. But I must say in my closing remarks that this party, as well as the government, is interested in our position in international conferences. I cannot help thinking of the vital importance of some of these meetings. As I sat watching the atomic energy commission meeting in New York last June one of the things which struck me most forcibly was this: Sitting in the second row of the visitors' gallery, while

atomic energy was being discussed and measures drawn up for its control, was a little eleven-year-old girl, with the customary pig-tails and ribbons. She was there with her mother, and I suppose no one was taking less interest than she was in the discussions. But whether she had any interest in it or not, as I sat there I thought that there was no person around the council table or in the galleries that day who had a greater interest in decisions with respect to atomic energy than did that child in the audience. In this day and age, with a world so concentrated, when distance has been reduced to an almost irreducible minimum and the world instead of being a great globe has become a shrunken ball, a world in which science has placed its most destructive weapon, it takes no more than a layman like myself, and those who surround me in the house, to realize what this means in future world affairs.

It is all very well to talk about the stopping of military aggression. But an aggression just as important as military aggression is taking place to-day: ideological aggression must have defences placed against it. I say with every bit of conviction at my command—and indeed I would say more if it were not this late hour in the session—that this country has to give what lead it can in seeing to it that we do our share to meet that ideological aggression. Make no mistake about it; it is serious and vital. This country cannot afford either domestically or internationally to adopt anything which savours of reaction, no matter where one finds it. So far as this country is concerned, human values must come first—and I am not using the word "maybe" when I say that. I am sure I shall have support from all over the chamber when I make that statement. The cornerstone of peace must be based upon economic and social justice in this world. Without that we cannot have permanent peace, as I understand it, in the days that lie ahead. The little peoples of the world have to have a break. I believe their era is just around the corner and I would hope that it is here to-day. I want to conclude, and this is my last sentence.

Mr. MacINNIS: Your last conclusion.

Mr. GRAYDON: My last conclusion. I am getting more like some ministers of the gospel every day, but this is definitely my last conclusion. I am not an expert on external affairs, and there are not many of us who are, but there are some simple conclusions which laymen like myself can arrive at from considering the world picture. I refer particularly to the communistic doctrine which I regard as a pretty dangerous thing for this