

The Rush-Bagot agreement is a self-denying ordinance of mutual disarmament. The International Joint Commission is an instrument for the peaceful adjustment of differences. The permanent joint board is a mutual arrangement for common defence. All three may appear an inevitable progress dictated by ordinary common sense. But we need only to pause for a moment's reflection to realize that, in the madness of the world to-day, common sense is the highest statesmanship.

I doubt if any act by a Canadian government, and certainly no development in our international relations, has ever received such unanimous acclaim in this country. So far as I have been able to ascertain, not a single newspaper from coast to coast uttered a syllable of disapproval of the Ogdensburg agreement itself. Though estimates of its importance and of the contribution made by myself may have varied, almost no voice was raised to decry its significance.

To illustrate the reception given in Canada to the Ogdensburg agreement, I might cite three brief appreciations, all of which appeared in papers which are frequently critical of the government. The *Ottawa Journal* of August 19 stated:

Because they are joint trustees of this North American continent little can be wrong about Canada and the United States setting up a permanent joint board of defence. It is a measure of sane caution.

The same day, the *Toronto Globe and Mail* said:

English-speaking peoples, and all who love liberty, will applaud the arrangement, which welds the bonds of friendship that have grown steadily stronger in the last century and a quarter.

The *Quebec Chronicle-Telegraph* echoed the same sentiments in these words:

This decision, making the two countries a defence entity and revealing graphically how the greatly changing conditions in Europe are affecting North America's war problems and policies, will undoubtedly be warmly approved in both the United States and Canada. will be of considerable comfort to the British empire as a whole and to the entire Christian civilized world in general.

Although the presidential campaign was already in progress in the United States, and some effort to make political capital might perhaps have been expected, an examination of American press comment reveals a similar unanimous approval of the Ogdensburg agreement. The general sentiment in the United States seems to have been aptly expressed by the *Chicago Tribune* on August 21 in these words:

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Each nation is obliged to defend the other because that is its own best defence. Common sense dictates that arrangements for such defence should be made in advance, to assure efficiency and economy of force if the necessity for cooperation arises. The making of these arrangements is to be the function of the permanent joint board on defence which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister King have agreed to establish.

The realization, both in Canada and in the United States, that each nation is obliged to assist in the defence of its neighbour because that is its own best defence, has grown in the two years which elapsed between the Kingston and Woodbridge declarations and the Ogdensburg agreement.

The events of those two momentous years have served, as well, to allay the fears of those in Canada who felt that closer relations with the United States would weaken Canada's ties with Britain. Throughout my public life, I have consistently maintained the view that the friendliest relations between Canada and the United States, far from weakening the bonds between the nations of the British commonwealth, would, at all times, prove a source of strength. Moreover, I have always held that in the promotion of Anglo-American friendship, Canada has a very special role to play. This belief, I am happy to say, is shared, in all three countries, by those who have worked for closer relations between the English-speaking communities. It is shared in fullest measure by the present Prime Minister of Great Britain. More than ten years ago, at a time when he himself was holding no public office, Mr. Churchill expressed this belief in terms which I should like to quote from an article of his which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* of February 15, 1930.

The words gain a prophetic significance in the light of all subsequent developments and of none more than those of the present day. I quote:

Great Britain herself has for centuries been the proved and accepted champion of European freedom. She is the centre and head of the British commonwealth of nations. She is an equal partner in the English-speaking world.

It is at this point that the significance of Canada appears. Canada, which is linked to the British empire, first by the growing importance of her own nationhood, and secondly, by many ancient and sentimental ties precious to young and strong communities, is at the same time intimately associated with the United States.

The long, unguarded frontier, the habits and intercourse of daily life, the fruitful and profitable connections of business, the sympathies and even the antipathies of honest neighbourliness, make Canada a binder-together of the English-speaking peoples. She is a magnet exercising a double attraction, drawing both Great Britain and the United States towards