

Mr. Lapointe: So far as being forced to recall them, that is very seldom done, but in the diplomatic service of any country which has a large number of ministers they are being recalled all the time. As a matter of fact, France since the opening of its legation here has had three ministers within seven years. Mr. Knight was recalled and was replaced by Mr. Arsene Henry; Mr. Henry was recalled and was replaced by the present minister. Of course the case is different with Canada because we have only three ministers, but the doctrine is the same. They are, under international law and practice, envoys, and may be recalled at any time; there is no question about that. . . I agree with my right hon. friend that the minister represents the King, but he also represents the government. The King appoints the minister upon the recommendation of the government and he negotiates for the government and represents the government in everything concerning the public business of his country in the foreign country to which he is accredited. (1)

#### Practice

With these enunciations of doctrine by the leaders of the Conservative and Liberal parties, it is of interest to see how they were applied in practice. There were some inconsistencies, and exceptional circumstances which made consistency difficult. In 1935 and 1938 the question of Mr. Roy's recall and retirement came up together with a question of a special pension for him; but these aspects were based on his age and infirmity, and not on political grounds, or due to change of government. The question of recall and replacement on political grounds was interestingly debated, but, in fact, had current applications to only two incumbents, Mr. Roy in Paris, and Mr. Marler in Tokyo. To some extent they established precedents, both

(1) All these extracts from H. of C. Debates, July 3, 1935, IV, pp.4203-4206.