British envoys. The business was intricate; and often had to deal with secret diplomatic matters. Parliament in general was not very well informed, and sometimes could not be taken into the government's confidence. Members were representatives of their varied constituencies; there were economic, regional or racial cleavages, not to be accentuated by controversial debate; there was sectionalism of one kind or another, and always party factionalism. Canada's international relations must be kept free from such domestic tension. Parliament was by-passed or only perfunctorily consulted. In consequence, debate was restricted, and relatively small parliamentary interest was shown.

In recent years a new factor seems to come into play which affects the role of Parliament as the centre of discussion on foreign policy matters. In earlier times, Parliament served as the government's forum, sounding-board, and the body representing the national electorate. In latter times, the government leaders often address the body politic of the nation more directly, over the radio and on the television screen. They can announce their political programmes, declare policy, participate in panel discussions, and explain external as well as domestic affairs. Foreign policy speeches and statements are now made by government leaders over public address systems more often than in the House. This direct approach to the public,