

of the illness of Mr. Loring Christie; but from the information I have gleaned since the Prime Minister spoke on the seventeenth I have no doubt in the world that there is an immediate necessity for the appointment of an outstanding Canadian citizen as Canadian minister to Washington, and that he should not necessarily be a career diplomat. In fact I think the appointment should be given to a man who is not a career diplomat. It should be given to one who can represent Canada with dignity and authority; one who, on occasion, can speak to the people of the United States as Lord Lothian did and as Lord Halifax will—and as Mr. Christie did not. Recently I have seen the suggestion that Mr. Leighton McCarthy, K.C., of Toronto, is to be appointed to this position. Mr. McCarthy is an outstanding Canadian citizen, and if he is appointed I am sure he will do good work for Canada down there at a time when it is absolutely necessary for us to have the best possible representation.

I suggest further, Mr. Speaker, that there should be associated with the minister an outstanding industrialist—not a mere departmental official such as Mr. Mahoney or Mr. Carswell—who will work in close cooperation with Mr. Purvis and the British mission. I am not casting any aspersions on either of those gentlemen I have named. I know Mr. Mahoney well; I am indebted to him for courtesies on more than one occasion. He knows his way about Washington, but he is a departmental official and has not the status that an outstanding industrialist would have down there representing this government. I recall that during the last war Mr. Lloyd Harris, of Brantford, an outstanding Canadian industrialist and a man who at one time occupied a prominent position in this parliament, was appointed to head a Canadian mission in Washington. It is true that this was before we had a minister, and there was great necessity for such a mission. I suggest that from the standpoint of coordinated effort in production the necessity of such an outstanding industrialist, standing side by side with our Canadian minister to Washington, is just as great to-day as it was then. And as a tribute to our vital interest in the United States and the importance of our representation in that country, might it not be wise to raise our minister there to ambassadorial rank? I invite the Prime Minister to give consideration to this suggestion. Rank means something, even in the United States.

The Prime Minister definitely closed the door to the appointment of an overseas minister. In my view, it is unwise to do so. I think I suggested early last session that this might be a good move. The circumstances

which led to the appointment of an overseas minister in the last war may well recur. At that time Sir George Perley was there, and he certainly was a trusted confidant of Sir Robert Borden, certainly as trusted as Mr. Massey is by the Prime Minister; but the appointment of an overseas minister became necessary in his time to help and assist him and to coordinate effort; and the circumstances which led to the appointment at that time may well recur, if indeed they have not already done so.

But there is a matter of much greater importance looming up. Is Canada to be represented in the consultations which must precede the planning of the campaign which will develop after the battle of Britain has been fought and won? Is Canada to be represented in the task of planning the offensive in 1942? I know we have in Lieutenant-General McNaughton a soldier of first-class rank and importance and ability. But can he represent Canada in such conferences and speak with authority for the Canadian government? I suggest that no one but a minister of the crown, who is a member of our cabinet and bound to the principles of cabinet responsibility and solidarity can speak for Canada in such matters, acting always on the advice and responsibility of the chief of our overseas army.

Has Mr. Massey, in his present position, the authority to represent Canada in such matters and in such manner? I think the answer is no; that he must merely be an intermediary between the cabinet here and such conferences, and that he will have no authority. Indeed, he would not assume such authority. No one who is not of cabinet rank would presume to do so.

Reverting again to the question of an imperial war cabinet, may I recall to the minds of hon. gentlemen a statement made in the War Memoirs of David Lloyd George, volume IV, at page 1765, in which he says:

But the value of the cabinet and conference were vastly greater than their immediate utility as an instrument for discussing our common war problems, and with the extent and method of the help which the dominions could supply.

I should like the house to note these words:

The meetings had an immense importance for the consolidation of the British empire. The imperial cabinet did not end with a discussion of common problems; it directed common action in events of solemn magnitude which were shaking the earth and shaping the destinies of the people in every clime and continent. The fact bred alike a new individual dignity, and a more conscious solidarity. In our discussions there was less concentration, in the minds of the dominion premiers, on the sectional interests of the part of the empire which each represented, and more eagerness to pull