

the term of Mr. Bennett's Prime Ministership of this country it would have meant that we would have had a separate Minister of External Affairs in 1935.

"I mention 1935 as a significant date because in the years immediately following, the question of foreign relations became a matter of grave concern not only for a Secretary of State for External Affairs but very much a matter of concern to the Prime Minister. Those were the years when we were approaching the possibility of war in Europe, and it fell to my lot to have the administration of both positions at that time. I should have found it perillous and indeed impossible to have separated those two positions at that particular time, and had they been separated I am sure that once we came to the period of the war, it would have been almost imperative for the Prime Minister to hold the position of Secretary of State for External Affairs as well as the office of Prime Minister. There otherwise would have been duplication of the work all the way through with resulting confusion. Through the period of the war the work of the two departments became necessarily more entwined than ever. . . . If these offices were separated immediately a good deal of care would have to be exercised in untwining the threads that have formed so complete a strand uniting these two offices. If it were not for that difficulty I can assure hon. members that the severance would have been made some considerable time before this." (1)

Mr. King expanded his arguments at that time at considerable length; but on the whole the arguments for

(1) H. of C. Debates, April 2, 1946, p.490.