

non-separation were along the following lines:

(a) The two departments were interdependent and were so interwoven, from an administrative point of view, that a separation seemed hardly feasible, and would be seriously damaging to the Prime Minister's Office.

(b) The nature of the direction of foreign policy, especially during the war years, brought the roles of Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs into a fusion which was essential and inseparable. Like Mr. Borden, and allegedly Mr. Bennett, the Prime Minister was the formulator of external affairs and acted as his own "foreign minister" both at home and at high-level imperial and international conferences abroad. The head of government was obviously more responsible for external policy than any subordinate Minister could be.

(c) Applying this argument personally, Mr. King was aware of his own exceptional experience and qualifications. In earlier years he was a seasoned diplomat. He was a uniquely intimate friend of President Roosevelt and Mr. Winston Churchill. "May I remind my hon. friend, when he undertakes to tell me what should be done in the Department of External Affairs, that I have had experience in that department which runs nearly to twenty years. . . . Twenty years experience with international affairs is worth a great deal more than one year, or a few months." Mr. King's supporter, Mr. Paul Martin, loyally endorsed this view. "During the war important conferences were held at Quebec and, recently, at Washington. Mr. Churchill