

notes on May 29. It is not necessary to repeat these reasons, which lead to the conclusion that war needs make the increased diversion essential. As explained on May 29, the advisers of the Canadian government and representatives of Ontario and Quebec are satisfied that the increased diversions will not be detrimental or harmful to Canadian interests.

Turning now to the constitutional question of the proper procedure to be followed in such cases, as indicated in my reply of yesterday, under the British and Canadian constitutions, the crown enjoys the sole right of conducting all foreign relations, which includes the making and, if necessary, the ratifying, of international agreements of all kinds.

In the United Kingdom, it is a rare thing for the government to ask the approval of parliament or of the House of Commons before making or ratifying treaties, even formal and important ones.

In Canada, without derogating from the legal rights of the crown, a custom has developed different from that in the United Kingdom. On June 21, 1926, this house adopted a resolution which I moved, the final paragraph of which reads that the house considers that:

. . . before His Majesty's Canadian ministers advise ratification of a treaty or convention affecting Canada, or signify acceptance of any treaty, convention or agreement involving military or economic sanctions, the approval of the parliament of Canada should be secured.

On April 12, 1928, in the course of the debate on the International Sanitary Convention in this house, I said:

I submit that the day has passed when any government or executive should feel that they should take it upon themselves without the approval of parliament, to commit a country to obligations involving any considerable financial outlays or active undertakings. In all cases where obligations of such a character are being assumed internationally, parliament itself should be assured of having the full right of approving what is done before binding commitments are made. I would not confine parliamentary approval only to those matters which involve military sanctions and the like. I feel parliamentary approval should apply where there are involved matters of large expenditure or political considerations of a far-reaching character.

Since 1928 the custom in Canada, both under the government of Mr. Bennett and under the present government, has moved even farther away from the United Kingdom practice in the direction of more parliamentary control of international agreements. The present practice is that, except in the case of very unimportant agreements or in the case of great urgency, the Senate and House of Commons are asked to approve formal treaties, conventions and agreements, before they are ratified by or in respect of Canada.