

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: His Majesty has his deputy here in the person of the Governor General, it is true; but in the appointment of ministers to foreign countries I assume it will always be the desire not only of His Majesty but of this parliament that the formal letters of credence shall be signed by the King.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He is the king of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With respect to this appointment it is, I think, desirable to direct attention to the fact that there are no two countries in the world between which there exists so extensive a boundary as that which separates Canada from the United States. Probably there are no two countries in the world in which the respective citizens have as much in the way of business transactions with one another as have the people of these two countries on the North American continent. Fortunately we have not inherited the military feuds of the old world, nor have we racial hatreds to contend with. But there are many matters of immediate concern both to the United States and to Canada, and we believe that a minister from our own Dominion will be in a position to deal more expeditiously and effectively with such matters than has hitherto been possible. Let me say at once that we in Canada have reason to be profoundly grateful for and appreciative of the splendid services which up to the present time have been rendered this country by the British ambassador at Washington. Certainly no one could have been more solicitous of the interests of the Dominion than Sir Esme Howard, the present ambassador to the United States. Sir Esme Howard, as many members in this House have heard him say, himself welcomes the appointment of the Canadian minister to Washington. I think he feels that a colleague coming direct from our Dominion and dealing especially with those matters that immediately affect this country will prove in every way not only of advantage to the Dominion but, as well, of considerable assistance in the relations between the British Empire and the United States.

I have only this to add: in my opinion the country is indeed fortunate in the person of the gentleman who has received the appointment of minister at Washington. The Hon. Vincent Massey is exceptionally well qualified to fill that high position. He has

[Mr. Bennett.]

the advantage of having had a university training not only in Canada but at Oxford. He has had large business experience. He has held important administrative posts. He is still a young man, is possessed of a high public spirit and is so admirably qualified in other particulars that I doubt whether a better choice could possibly have been made.

I come now to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) with respect to the Imperial conference. I confess that I was somewhat surprised at the comments he made upon and the questions he asked in relation to the conference. He seemed extremely critical of the results that had been achieved. I would remind him, as well as hon. gentlemen opposite, that the criticisms he has directed, apparently at my colleague and myself, apply in equal measure to the representatives of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the Irish Free State, Newfoundland, and Great Britain, inasmuch as every resolution that appears and every line of the report has the unanimous approval of all the representatives at that conference. When my hon. friend suggests that possibly there has been some ulterior motive in the use of the word "crown" instead of the word "king", when he finds possibilities of disruption of the empire in other sections of the report, he is adversely criticising the Prime Minister of Great Britain; he is criticising Lord Balfour, the leader of the British government in the House of Lords; he is criticising the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain. In a word, he is criticising every member of the British government and every one of the representatives of the other dominions who took part in the conference. If my hon. friend will for a moment forget altogether the political bias which he may feel he is expected to some extent to show, and will look at the report as all those who were present at the Imperial conference certainly looked at it, he will realize that what is therein embodied expresses only what the representatives of every part of the empire, after the fullest and most careful examination, felt to be in the interests of all concerned. That is the point I wish first of all to impress upon my hon. friend.

The second point to which I call his attention is the contradictory character of his comments with respect to the question of equality of status. As I listened to his remarks it seemed to me that the first part of his speech was an effort to show that nothing had been attained which had not been accepted for some time. I gathered that in his view, Sir Wilfrid Laurier had con-