

1315
~~1322~~

of principle and of practice.

Leaving aside London, the question had not been an issue in 1911, when the Laurier Government was succeeded by the Borden Government, for there was no diplomatic representative, other than the Commissioner-General at Paris. The question did not arise during the shortlived administration of Mr. Meighen, for there were still no diplomatic representatives except the High Commissioner at London and the Commissioner-General at Paris. The question first arose only in 1930, when Mr. Bennett's Conservative administration succeeded Mr. King's Liberal administration, at a time when there were three diplomatic ministers serving abroad, an Advisory Officer in Geneva, and a High Commissioner at London.

The London Post

The High Commissionership in London had always, and by both political parties, been regarded as exceptional. It was regarded, almost unquestioned, as a political office, closely integrated with and representative of the government of the day, in Ottawa.⁽¹⁾ Mr. Bennett summed up this traditional assumption, without denial by Mr. King, when in 1935 he said:

In the case of the high commissioner at London I think that the position can be put very simply. He under statute is a political officer. The statute itself indicates that he is a representative of the government, and in

⁽¹⁾ For a review of this question, see Skilling: Canadian Representation Abroad, pp.101-104; 118; 267-270. Also H. of C. Debates, May 15, 1931.III. p.1647.