

A suggestion has later been made that the reason why Canada did not develop a diplomatic representation abroad, under the Department, until 1927, was the lack of trained men. But there is no evidence that there was any intention or desire, in Pope's period, to develop such an outside service. If there had been, men could probably have been found and trained, as the Trade Commissioners were.

In the result, Pope's aim at building up a corps of trained men or international experts, within the Department, was not realized in his lifetime. There continued to be only two senior officials, Mr. Pope and Mr. Walker, and ultimately a third, Mr. Christie.

This question of trained men, too, received some passing notice in the Debate; but mainly by the critics of the Bill, some of whom thought that Mr. William MacKenzie, in the Privy Council, was a sufficient "expert" in the matters under discussion, others of whom felt that staff might be sufficiently trained in ^{the} existing Secretary of State's Office without necessitating a separate branch. (Many years later, when the question of appointing a Parliamentary Under-Secretary for External Affairs was being discussed, one of the arguments in favour was that it would offer training to selected Members of Parliament in the intricacies of foreign affairs, and prepare them for possible ministerial posts, as was frequent in England.)

Altogether, the Debate in the House of Commons was slight. The criticism was not severe either in tone or content, and not more than eight members took part in the Debate which lasted only a little over two hours.

During this Debate, it may be noted, discussion