

August 7, 1930, but were not presented until nearly a year later. Mr. King argued that, theoretically, Mr. Massey consequently had not been withdrawn from his post; and that Mr. Bennett, therefore, could have retained him. On May 15, 1931, Mr. Bennett declared:

Had he [Mr. Massey] remained at Washington he would not have been dealt with differently from Mr. Marler or Mr. Roy. These gentlemen are still occupying their positions as ministers, and Mr. Marler is a former member of the Liberal association. He has not been removed from his office, and it has not been suggested that he should be. Mr. Roy was a former Liberal senator, . . . but Mr. Roy occupies his position still and no one questions it. No one has suggested that Mr. Marler should resign. I have not done so. Nor has anyone suggested that Mr. Roy should resign; I have not, nor has the government . . . The same considerations that moved the government with respect to the positions of Mr. Marler and of Mr. Roy would undoubtedly have moved the administration with respect to Mr. Massey had he remained at Washington. (1)

Later Mr. Bennett repeated that:

I assure the committee that had the letter of recall not been issued, Mr. Massey would still be Minister at Washington as Mr. Marler is at Tokyo and Mr. Roy is at Paris. (2)

To this, Mr. King replied:

The fact is at this moment, while we are discussing this matter, His Majesty's letter recalling Mr. Massey has not yet been presented to the President of the United States. . . If my right hon. friend had wished to use the letter of recall as a means of keeping Mr. Massey at Washington, he could quite easily have taken advantage of the fact that at the time the letter of recall had not been presented to the president of the United States; up to the present time it has not been presented, and until the letter

(1) Ibid. pp.1660-1.

(2) Ibid. p.1675.