

when the bill was passed by parliament something was not done to implement the principle which had been adopted by parliament. I hope that we shall not continue any longer in Canada without a separate full-time minister of external affairs. Of course if the Prime Minister were here he would take umbrage at what I am saying and would say that I was reflecting on him. That is not a very good argument, particularly when no one intends to reflect upon him. I wish to say that the Prime Minister's position at the moment is the best argument that we could have for a minister of external affairs. He is finding the burden heavy; he has not been able to be in the House of Commons more than a small fraction of the time this session; and even at this moment, on the closing day of the session, he is unable to be with us. He ought to be the first one—and the government—to admit that if ever there was a need for a full-time minister of external affairs it is now. I hope the government will not try to face parliament any longer in another session without a full-time minister in that department.

May I also say by way of criticism that I do not think the Department of External Affairs or the minister of that department should carry all the information about external affairs in their vest pockets. The people of Canada and parliament have not been taken as fully into the confidence of the ministry on matters of external affairs as the country was entitled to. Let me give an example. We had a commonwealth conference of prime ministers. The Prime Minister went over and came back. There was no report to parliament, and no chance for discussion. The whole matter is still standing over and parliament is proroguing. That is a pretty good argument for the fact that the Prime Minister did not have time. Of course he did not have time. The reason he did not have time is that there was not a full-time minister of external affairs to handle at least part of the work in connection with it. In addition to that, before the Prime Minister in his capacity as Secretary of State for External Affairs went to the peace conference no opportunity was given to parliament to discuss the whole problem of peace and Canada's possible participation in the conference, as was done prior to the San Francisco conference, which was of great value to the delegates who were in attendance. May I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that on these two occasions I think there was a flouting of parliament, because we should have known something both about the common-

wealth conference and about the peace conference. In all fairness that information should have been given to the people's representatives.

We have another situation which calls for some remedy and much more severe criticism than I am going to give it. Through you, Mr. Chairman, may I say, I do not think we should go out of our way to attack the government, nor should we raise criticism unnecessarily in regard to external affairs. But I tell you, sir, that what I am saying to-day is much more restrained than what under ordinary circumstances the conditions call for.

In the matter of external affairs, as they affect this country, we must stick together, regardless of what our other difficulties may be. Canada must have a united voice in world councils if at all possible. But that must not be used as an excuse or a cover to stop normal criticism by parties in the house on those occasions when we believe that certain reforms are required. For instance, let us consider our position with respect to the United Kingdom. The right hon. Vincent Massey has been back in Canada since last May, and since that time there has not been the slightest hint of any appointment being made to fill his place in one of the major diplomatic posts created by Canada outside this country. In a delicate time like this, in this critical period of international affairs, there should be no such hiatus between one man's leaving a post and another taking his place. Yet no excuse or reasons are given. We are told simply that the position is open and that it has not been filled.

The same could be said with respect to Australia. Since last May no attempt has been made to fill that post. Yet we know that Hon. T. C. Davis left there last May. There is no suggestion of any appointment to fill his place.

With respect to South Africa the situation is even worse. No appointment has been made there since Mr. Burchell left, a year ago this month. We have had no permanent commissioner in South Africa in all that time.

Our position with respect to Eire is not quite so bad. Since Mr. Merchant Mahoney died last spring no appointment has been made. But that is not as serious as our position with respect to South Africa.

Chile is one of our major South American posts, but it has gone vacant since a year ago last July.

So far as India is concerned—well, I am tired of asking in the House of Commons when this country is going to accept India's invitation to exchange high commissioners. That invitation has been in the hands of the