

to which Government of China possessed the lawful and practical authority to commit the whole Chinese nation to permanent engagement. It seemed unfair therefore to penalize Japan with continued occupation because of the lack of agreement among the Allies on the credentials of one or other of the two Chinese Governments. It seemed reasonable that Japan should be allowed to determine its own future relations with China and the treaty was framed so as not to prejudice the exercise of that sovereignty which the treaty restores to Japan. In framing the treaty, every effort was made to safeguard the interests of the Chinese people, even though no government signed it on their behalf. The Secretary of State for External Affairs in his statement to the Conference expressed sincere regret at the absence from the Conference of any delegation from China. He continued:

"The Peking Government, however, must bear the blame for this absence. Had that regime not participated in the aggression already committed by the Communist forces of North Korea; had it lent its efforts to discouraging rather than extending that aggression, it might have spoken for China at this conference. But the Peking Government must realize that just as it cannot shoot its way into the United Nations, neither can it force its way either by violent acts or threats into a conference which has as its prime purpose the making of peace with Japan."

I have spoken of those who were not present at San Francisco. Let me turn now to those who were there. It was natural that special attention should be given at the Conference to the words of the representatives of the Asian States who must for ever live close to Japan. Ceylon, Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines and the Indo-Chinese States were represented at San Francisco. It is probably fair to say that they were thorns in the flesh of the Russian propaganda campaign attempted there. The U.S.S.R. set out to pose as the spokesmen of Asia against the machinations of the "imperialist powers" of the West. This attempt failed in the face of the public support given to the treaty by the delegates of the countries I have just mentioned. The representative of Ceylon was particularly effective in this regard. In his statement to the Conference he said:

"It is true that I can speak only on behalf of my Government but I claim that I can voice the sentiment of the peoples of Asia in their general attitude towards the future of Japan... The main idea that animated the Asian countries, Ceylon, India and Pakistan, in their attitude to Japan was that Japan should be free. I claim this treaty embodies that idea in its entirety... It is interesting to note that the amendments of the Soviet Union seek to ensure to the people of Japan the fundamental freedoms of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion and of public meeting - freedoms which the people of the Soviet Union themselves would dearly love to possess and enjoy."

Mr. Carlos P. Romulo, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippine Government, registered the dissatisfaction of his Government with certain details of the treaty. He pointed out that the Philippines in proportion to area and population had been the most devastated of all countries in Asia as a result of Japanese aggression. He added: