

their outlook and their way of living. These are, first, a belief that poverty, ignorance, dirt and disease are evils in themselves and, as such, are to be fought and defeated; secondly, a tolerance which is not indifference, but an active habit of the mind, expressing itself in political thought and action.

I need perhaps elaborate only on the second point. While the subtleties, the endless permutations, that are possible in your evolving society, with its roots so deep and its traditions so old, are unknown in Canada, there is in our young and comparatively uncomplicated country a resemblance to your own in the habit of accommodation, of tolerance and compromise that we have developed. With us - as with you - it was essential that we should develop these qualities if political unity, indeed, if national existence was to be preserved. This development, furthermore, has taken place within certain political concepts which are completely familiar to both our peoples; belief in the rule of law, in the dignity and worth of the individual, and in the responsibilities as well as the rights of citizenship.

Canada does not share by any means the cultural and linguistic variety of your country, but we are also a plural society. In creating the Canadian nation we have had to consider at all times the relations between our two main ethnic groups - French and English - and the necessity for accommodation between them. This necessity is something that Canadians have been brought up on, and it means that not only the varying aspirations and needs of these two groups must be taken into account when decisions are made, but also the stresses of a federal form of government. Each group must act with the interests of others in mind. Hence, simple, massive, dogmatic solutions are no more acceptable to us in Canada than they are to you in India. This predisposition toward give and take, mutual accommodation and the finding of workable solutions, has, I believe, much to do with the nature of the policies pursued abroad by both India and Canada.

More than five years ago when I made my first visit to India and Southeast Asia in connection with the founding of the Colombo Plan, there was little reason for optimism about the trend of world affairs, and there was much to discourage bold international initiatives in the social and economic field. Nevertheless, faith governed the efforts of those who drew up the Colombo Plan at that time; faith that through co-operative human effort the world could be made a better place in which to live.

Notwithstanding the international climate at the time of our 1950 meeting in Colombo, that meeting generated a spirit of enthusiasm which has never flagged. The results of the Plan achieved up to date justify that enthusiasm.

I have just returned from the Singapore meeting where, as you know, we unanimously decided to be associated together for at least five more years in the Plan. Long before the Singapore Conference convened, however, this has been laid down as an objective for the Canadian delegation. It soon became apparent that we shared this objective with the other members. Everybody wanted the Plan to continue; not merely because it has assisted in the economic development of the areas concerned, but because it has also assisted and