

conferences between leaders at or below the "summit" - important though they are - so much as it is in the hearts and souls of men.

Apart from our deficiencies as Christian citizens, as individuals, it can hardly be denied that the lack of unity in Christendom itself stands in the way of a wider international community. It also presents to non-Christians a perplexing contrast between our principles and our performance. I think, however, that it is true to say that Christendom itself is now moving forward toward a greater unity than it has achieved for centuries. Its divisions have passed from violent and bloody discord through a more reasonable but not always very positive stage of co-existence until it is now, I hope, reaching a new era of co-operation and collaboration. No better evidence of this new spirit can be found than in the work which has been done in recent years to bring together representatives of diverse Christian creeds, not for the purpose of compromising our respective beliefs, but of understanding what is good in all beliefs. There have been heartening examples of church unions in recent times and greater contacts between religions which have helped to dissipate old conflicts and prejudices. And there is no doubt that this process of unification and the extension of understanding and tolerance, both as facts and as examples, have promoted international understanding and co-operation in other than church fields.

Unity as an end in itself, however, can be a false god. The pursuit of truth itself is a more sacred obligation even than the laudable desire to reach agreement with everyone. I do not mean to suggest, therefore, that it is essential for all Christian Churches to unite if they are to play their role in an inter-dependent world. Unity is no doubt a good thing, but it is charity and tolerance which are essential.

Although I would not like to suggest that there is anything like a clear parallel between religious faith and political allegiance (indeed efforts to assimilate the two has in the past caused wars and bloodshed) I would like to draw an analogy between them which has at least a partial validity.

The desirability of the greatest unity possible consistent with free choice does not mean that there cannot be many varieties of religious experience and many different ways of approaching religious truth. The world is richer for the efforts of many men to find God in their own ways, nor do these efforts have to be all directed into one narrow channel. The important thing is that they should co-operate with and not conflict with each other - understand, not betray each other.

So too the political world is richer for the infinite variety of peoples and cultures that make it up. We in Canada know from our experience that we are wealthier in our heritage and stronger in our national development for having as the basis of that development two peoples, two languages, two traditions, constantly enriched by the flow of peoples and cultures from many other lands.