

patronage nominees of the government of the day,* it was and is the customary practice, on a change of President or Government, for each diplomatic Head of Mission automatically to submit an open letter of resignation to the incoming President, thereby enabling him, if he so chooses, either to replace the former diplomatic incumbent by a new patronage appointment of his own selection and political affiliations, or to renew the appointment of the man in office. This practice extended even to those American Heads of Mission, usually in the smaller or less important posts, who were career diplomats.

In Canada, the question of "permanency" of office for Canadian diplomatic representatives was not officially debated, on a basis of principle, until 1930, and only then over a misapprehension - the erroneous belief that the Minister to France, Mr. Roy, intended to retire.

The young Foreign Service was being built up on the basis of Civil Service appointment, which meant permanency and security as long as work was satisfactory, till the compulsory retiring age of 65, with superannuation pension thereafter based on contributions to a Superannuation Fund while in official service. Diplomatic representatives who were Foreign Service Officers could be transferred from post to post, but in principle they were not liable to dismissal or enforced retirement.

* Largely, it may be said, because the larger posts were too expensive to operate by most career Foreign Service Officers, whose allowances were not adequate to meet the social and representational expectations of the post.