

(d) The final argument was perhaps more ambiguous. Mr. King had repeatedly professed to wish, in due course, to relieve himself of the double portfolio and to appoint a separate External Affairs Minister, and indeed at this date sponsored the enabling Bill making provision for this. But he still clung to the External Affairs portfolio, not only for the practical reasons mentioned above, but, also, in the view of some of his critics, for reasons of personal prestige and egotism. This is of course hard to prove. He was suspicious of the motives of his opposition critics. "I appreciate the solicitude of hon. members opposite for my health and strength and the rest of it that on occasion they have been kind enough to express. But I take all that with a grain of salt. I must say, I ask myself, why do they want me out of the office? I question a little what some of them, at least, may have in mind." I want to say this to my hon. friends opposite: I am prepared to accept from them as much in the way of advice as they may wish to tender and to consider it carefully. . . I have not found among my colleagues thus far a desire that I should give up this particular post at this particular time, nor have I found that wish among members of my party."<sup>(1)</sup>

(e) A factor which was not discussed but which was mentioned in passing during the debate on the Bill was that for the appointment of a separate Secretary of State for External Affairs, an additional salary, already provided for by statute, of \$10,000, would have to be paid.

(1) Ibid. p. 492.