

leave them with the details."(1) Echoes of this attitude were to be found in Canada, where Parliament at times expressed a general mood or desire in foreign policy but allowed the Cabinet, as the executive branch of the government, to make detailed arrangements with foreign governments.

In part due to lack of parliamentary knowledge of the intricacies of foreign affairs, lack of information on confidential negotiations or remote crises, and an apathy toward matters not visibly of direct concern to Canada, parliament to some extent abdicated its powers and responsibilities in external affairs, and left them to its ~~delegated~~ representatives in the Ministry and their expert advisers. The corollary to this was that the government, with some degree of justification, arrogated to themselves those powers and responsibilities. Whether rightly or wrongly, Mr. R.B. Bennett attempted to justify this attitude in 1938, after he had left the Premiership. He asserted:

Parliament never makes foreign policy. His Majesty's advisers make the foreign policy of the country and parliament approves or disapproves. Parliament says yea or nay. That is the old constitutional practice, a practice as old as the hills themselves. Ever since our institutions have developed to what they are now we have provided that His Majesty's government, always with a majority in the Commons, shall initiate and formulate policies - foreign policies. It is not given to me nor to any private members of this House to indicate the foreign policy of Canada. . . You can express your views, as I am expressing mine; you can offer your criticisms, as I am, but the declaration of external policy in this country must

(1)Max Beloff: Foreign Policy and the Democratic Process. p. 75.