

When war came again in 1939, Canada's status had become different. We were not automatically at war; we had to make our decision for ourselves in law as well as in fact. We did decide to go to war, but many of us made the decision with a heavy heart and some misgivings. A large number of our people asked themselves uneasily whether it was the fate of Canada in each generation to sacrifice the finest of its youth in the interminable quarrels of Europeans. On the other hand, we all shared your horror of the regime Hitler had fastened on Germany, and his brutal aggressions against Germany's neighbours. We could not believe that so long as the Nazi system lasted, any country would be safe. The danger to our North American society became even clearer when Japan by that attack on Pearl Harbor dragged you in and proclaimed to the world its confident expectation that with Germany and Italy they were going to overcome us all. We knew they could not do it, but nevertheless we were thus twice in one generation forced into wars which neither of us had had any share in starting, and which we did not want, and in which we did have to commit all our resources. Some felt that with more foresight those wars might have been prevented, but certainly we had not wanted them we had not started them, and yet we had not been able to keep out.

Speaking for Canada, I can say that, by 1945, our people were overwhelmingly convinced that the only way that they could keep out of world wars was to help establish the kind of world in which there would not be any war. I can speak with some assurance for Canada on this point because we debated the issues in our Parliament, and reached virtual unanimity on them, before sending to San Francisco a delegation representing our main political parties to share in founding the organization of the United Nations. The main reason we were unanimous in 1945 was precisely because we had not been able to keep out of war in 1914 and 1939 and because you had not been able to keep out of war. Our conviction was greatly strengthened because of the almost revolutionary change which had come over opinion in the United States between 1940 and 1945.

The conference at San Francisco had been called by your President. The proposal for a worldwide organization to maintain peace and security in the world was sponsored by your government, and was already receiving the support of the best elements in both your historic political parties.

It was reassuring to us in Canada to see that your conclusions were the same as ours; that you had become convinced the United States could not again turn its back on the rest of the world, and that this country must actually take the lead in international affairs.

There are many people who feel that the calling of the conference at San Francisco and the establishment of the United Nations, with the United States as its leading member, represents a revolution in your foreign policy. I venture to suggest to you that this is a superficial view; that, in fact, it represents a revolutionary change only in method, and that there has been no real change in the fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States.

I said at the beginning of these remarks that the real aim of your Founding Fathers was to have this country left in peace by the rest of the world to develop a free and expanding society on this continent. I believe that is still the real aim of the American people, and I know it is the