

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."

It is important, of course, to recognize the distinction between "policy" and "negotiation". Parliamentary control must not be so rigid that it destroys the flexibility and freedom of action that may be frequently necessary in confidential negotiations. Principles and policies should be discussed in Parliament and conclusions reached by the Government should be submitted for parliamentary approval, but the execution of the policies agreed upon -- whether it is called "diplomacy" or "negotiation" is quite another matter.

As Harold Nicholson has put it: "Once an electorate fully understand that they are safeguarded against secret policy, they may not worry themselves so acutely over the imaginary terrors of secret negotiation."

In maintaining popular control over foreign policy, we have one great asset in Canada -- a remarkably alert and vigorous Press, which is not at all reluctant about pointing out to the Government what it considers to be its shortcomings, whether in being too venturesome or too indolent. We have also a large and articulate body of commentators on public affairs -- many of them in Canadian universities -- who are quite capable of pointing out, in no uncertain terms, the defects of governmental action or the lack of it. We have, too, I am glad to say, an Opposition in Parliament which rarely fails to seize upon an opportunity to remind the Government of its shortcomings.

What, then, I am suggesting to you is simply that the formation and the implementing of foreign policy in Canada is not a prefabricated job which goes on in secret and then is sold to the Canadian public by various devices. There is, on the contrary, a constant interplay, with the Government and Parliament, the Canadian press and Canadian public opinion continually taking part in these momentous affairs. And it would be difficult indeed to suggest the precise province of any one of these controlling or creative factors.

I understand that, last year, the general theme of the discussions which were carried on at this Rochester meeting was "The Economic Interdependence of Canada and the United States". I believe that, among other things, it was clearly established that between 1939 and 1954 there had occurred, in Canada, nothing less than an economic revolution. Since 1939, and more particularly since the