

1470
~~1477~~

discussion.* This general statement may be made without particular illustrations, some of which will, however, appear in these pages. Mr. Mackenzie King was a master of conciliation, and in avoiding contentious issues in open debates; and in matters of external affairs he apparently sought to evade discussion or debate in parliament of diplomatic matters which might arouse party dispute. His procrastination in appointing a Canadian Minister to Washington after the way to do so had constitutionally been cleared, was attributed to this caution in action and restraint of discussion in Parliament, as well as division in his own Cabinet. On the other hand, it was sometimes the practice to win over beforehand by consultation, press and platform statements, public opinion and the support of opposition parties in parliament on foreign policy before the question came up for debate in the House. Thus, there has usually been a fairly wide support given to Canadian foreign policy by the opposition political parties. Open clashes are avoided by trimming policy to the mood of the public and estimating the acceptability of any particular proposed policy before any commitment. (1)

* Lord Strang has commented on this dangerous result of discussion over government foreign policy. "Once foreign affairs are brought into the arena of party politics, two things are likely to happen: genuine divergence of outlook, corresponding more or less to the internal political pattern, will be liable to manifest themselves as loudly-expressed differences of opinion concerning the best foreign policy to pursue; and, in addition, the parties not in power will be under strong temptation to oppose merely for opposition's sake, using the complex of external affairs as a sort of stalking-horse for their internal manoeuvres. . . . Few people would wish to dispute that in general the broadening of democratic control is at once a necessary and a welcome thing. Nevertheless so far as foreign

(cont'd)

(1) See page