

some interesting debate in 1935.

Mr. R.B. Bennett, at that time Prime Minister, stated his views in the following words:

Frequently I have endeavoured to make it clear that in my judgment the position of high commissioner in London is entirely different from that of a diplomatic representative of Canada. One is surely a representative of the government and the other a representative of the Sovereign. The diplomatic representatives who serve us at Tokyo, Paris and other countries are not necessarily representatives of the government, in the narrow political sense. I have acted upon that. If the doctrine suggested had been acted upon we would have retired Sir Herbert Marler from Tokyo and Mr. Roy from Paris shortly after we took office. That has not been done. They have continued in their positions because they were representatives not of a government but of the country and the King. So long as they continued to discharge their duties in a manner acceptable to the government their former political faith we believed should not be the governing factor in connection with their retention in office. We have acted on that principle.

I make clear the distinction between the diplomatic position that a minister who serves his country occupies and the position of high commissioner. It has never been the case in England that a minister is retired because there has been a change of government, so far as I have been able to ascertain. If the minister is thought not to be the best available appointment for a particular position he is transferred to another post and somebody else takes his place. That is my information from enquiries.⁽¹⁾

Mr. Mackenzie King, then leader of the Opposition but soon to become Prime Minister again, accused Mr. Bennett of having expressed different views.

The diplomatic service is somewhat different from other branches of the public service. I have heard my right hon. friend say - he said it expressly in connection with the London appointment - that in making an appointment to that position

(1) H. of C. Debates, July 3, 1935. IV. p.4204.