

today in another place, that we have reminded you of your own Parliamentary institutions because after all they are modelled more or less in the same way. And not only in that but in so many other matters too our institutions are similar. Our ways of approach to many problems are also, if not very similar, at any rate not very far apart, and yet obviously conditions in Canada and conditions in India differ greatly. Our backgrounds differ, our history differs. Everything -- not everything but many things that have gradually moulded us in past ages are different from what has moulded the Canadian people. Here are those great differences and here is also that thing which makes us similar in many ways and so many common things between us. People talk about the East and the West. Perhaps it has some meaning but I have never been able wholly to grasp its meaning. In a few days time you will be leaving India and going east to Canada, not west. And so even geographically and much more so otherwise, these conceptions of East and West get rather mixed up and overlap and certain differences remain not of East and West but rather of the conditioning factors in the past which go to make a country or a race or a people and at the same time other factors in which make them come nearer to each other. It is not always true that countries that are very near to each other are necessarily similar or have much understanding of each other but anyhow today all of us are nearer to each other. During the past five or six years I have often met representatives of Canada, Prime Ministers -- you, Sir, and your predecessor Mr. Mackenzie King -- at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. Those conferences as you said in another place, are unique in their own way, in the sense that every one there is completely independent and free to say or do what he likes in his own country or there and yet some invisible bond brings them together and makes them try to find the common ways. At these conferences, we always found, we who went from India that we were peculiarly close to Canada in spite of the fact that in many ways their approach may have been different. In fact, I hardly remember any occasion when, though we may have differed in some matters, there was any marked difference between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Prime Minister of India. In the United Nations also we have been close to many countries and we tried to be friendly with all. But there are few countries with whom we had such close contacts in our working at the United Nations as with Canada. That is rather unique and I do not quite know why that should be so. It is a very welcome thing. But why that should be so because after all the problems we face here are different and our backgrounds are different. Nevertheless, we found the kinship of spirit with the representatives of Canada there and elsewhere. I cannot explain it except that there was some kind of deeper understanding, deeper attempt to understand and a successful attempt to understand even though perhaps in some matters we could not wholly agree which was natural of course. And so it led me to think that perhaps what is almost more important than the final acceptance of another's viewpoint is that approach to understand not merely the outer meaning of the words but the inner significance. And if that earnest and friendly attempt is made some good result is bound to follow. There are many differences in the world today, differences which sometimes become rather