

not with uncritical acclaim but with sober satisfaction because they may give opportunities to create a better atmosphere and to solve some concrete problems. We should guard against excessive optimism on the one hand and cynicism on the other. The one will lead to hopes that cannot be realized, with consequent disillusionment. The other will prevent us from making the most of the new opportunities that may present themselves.

It would be unwise, and might be dangerous, to expect immediate and exciting results because four heads of governments will come together and exchange ideas. Peace, firm and final peace, will not come from one meeting at the highest level, but from many meetings at lower levels. The talks ahead are only a beginning, not an end, and all men of goodwill should be very happy if they begin something constructive and worthwhile.

So, if there are proposals from the other side, which seem to promise an easing of tension. I hope they will not be rejected but tested, explored and made the most of. It would be tragic indeed if fears and suspicions paralysed our diplomacy and made us incapable of moving forward and responding to any genuine advances that may be made.

But it would also be tragic - and might be fatal as we move forward - if we grew careless and complacent and indolent in protecting our security; if we thought that the millennium had arrived because communist kisses have been thrown from a balcony in Vienna and from other places! We should remember the difference between tactics and strategy, between means and ends; that dictatorships are capable of very sudden changes of policy, and in either direction. A sense of proportion and a sense of balance will be valuable, and may be essential, in the weeks ahead.

Meetings at a high political level can be, and I hope will be of great value. But our ultimate goal must be friendships and fellowships at the grass roots. Security which shows itself in a relaxation of tension and a limitation of armaments can ultimately be based only on understanding and goodwill; on a feeling of community between peoples. That will take a long time, even with the incentive of sure knowledge that if we fail and nuclear warfare results, it would be the end of us all.

This knowledge of the certainty of co-destruction if war comes makes this talk about "co-existence" - another one of words - sterile and meaningless. Of course we must "co-exist" with Russians and Chinese Communists and everybody else. I get no particular comfort out of that. What we must work for is not "co-existence", but conditions which will convert co-existence into co-operation; the kind of "co-existence" that we find between the United States and Canada and which is based on friendship and good neighbourhood.

Though I am aware of the fact - and rejoice in it - that this is no mere United States-Canadian occasion, it is far wider internationally than that, I hope that I may be permitted to say a few words on this somewhat narrower, but to us in Canada vital subject of U.S./Canadian relations.

I am aware that in certain quarters it is fashionable today and at times possibly exhilarating, to pluck, or try to pluck feathers from the American eagle. It is a political sport