

such as these, they do not expect to exercise an equal influence with their greater partners, although they do require their views to be taken into account.

In an alliance of democratic states each government must be able, through its own constitutional machinery, to satisfy its own people that its accepted part of the joint effort is wise and just. Our contemporary world is bewildering. There will never be complete agreement among free nations, with their very different backgrounds and current problems, on what at any given time ought to be done by them all to meet a particular danger. There cannot be any satellites in a democratic alliance, for that would deny the faith on which it is based.

I am trying to make a very simple, indeed obvious, point: that we must not expect even countries as closely associated as Canada and the United States to come to exactly the same conclusions and to interpret their international obligations in exactly the same manner at the same time. We and the associated countries of the free world have travelled a remarkable distance in a short space of time, under the impulse first of the Nazi and then of the Soviet menaces, towards a common assessment of the threat to our heritage and of the need for meeting it by concerted action. And the free countries are not doing badly. But we must not ask or expect too much, or think that the partnership is going to pieces because all the partners are not keeping exactly in step all the time.

There has never been a period of modern history when the facts of international affairs were more frustrating, or the consequences of mistakes likely to be more disastrous. Frustration is a mood which stimulates the emotions rather than the intellect. Yet what the leaders of the free world must try to do is not to outbid or out-bluff the leaders of the Soviet world and collect the pot after a show-down, as in poker, but to engage with them in a cautious, prolonged and carefully thought-out matching of wits, as in chess. And their supporters, the peoples of the free world, must try not to make it harder for their leaders to concentrate by shouting angrily across boundaries and oceans that the last move was wrong or that a new gambit should be tried or that the game would have been won long ago if only the opening moves had been different.

This involves a hitherto unparalleled degree of national and international restraint and mutual understanding. We have gone quite a long way in developing this between Canada and the United States, but we have in both countries further to go, and there is still more to do in adjusting our attitudes towards our more distant friends and allies.

In trying to explain a little of what I think is the central truth in the platitudes about Canadian-American relations, I have been specially concerned to show that there has been nothing automatic or inevitable in the process whereby our countries have reached a position in which they can proudly say that their relationships with each other are an example to the rest of the world. This state of affairs is the product of hard work, mutual understanding, and tolerant respect for national feelings and national prejudices. It is not to be taken for granted. The qualities which have produced it are continuously needed to maintain it and to strengthen it. They are needed especially at times of danger such as the present. They are needed in a much larger context than the preserving of the unity of purpose of the United States and Canada, in order to foster and strengthen the larger alliance of free peoples.