But, to their credit, they stayed on. I believe they are lovers of peace. No nation, either Russian or any other, through its government or through its people, will ever dare to bring on another war. Russia would not dare to carry the responsibility of bringing on a war in which she would be involved.

I just wish to say a few words about our delegation, and I should like to add again my word of praise for what they did. But they must have had when they went to the San Francisco conference, a sense of frustration, because it was really a big power conference. It is true that the smaller nations were invited there, but one has only to read the speeches made by our own delegation, the speeches made by Mr. Forde of Australia, the speeches made by Mr. Evatt, to realize what the situation was. Mr. Evatt fought, fought, fought for recognition of the component parts of the British empire, as did also Mr. Fraser, Prime Minister of New Zealand. The people whom I have mentioned, the delegates to whom I have referred, our own, knew what the situation was. I wish to offer them my sincere thanks and admiration for what they have done.

As I said a minute ago, the Canadian delegation did not go there empty-handed. They had no axe to grind with anyone. We had no special demand to make for ourselves. We did not want any concessions in the Pacific or Atlantic. We were satisfied that Cana-dian territory should remain in its full integ-That is why eventually the voice of our Canadian delegation, and those of Australia and New Zealand, had their repercussion throughout the world, and how we won our case and the recognition of the smaller nations' viewpoints. There was a recognition that those intermediary or smaller nations should have a place in future conferences. More than that, if it was not included immediately, it was at one time included under the charter.

There is no doubt that wonderful work has been accomplished, but in every human deliberation and every human conclusion we must not expect to have perfection. If we had not had the San Francisco conference, what would we have had? As has been so well said by hon. members, it was a marvellous step in the right direction, because the nations of the world have shown to the world of the future and to the whole of civilization the fact that the future resides in understanding, cooperation and peace. There can be no getting away from that. On that score alone I know that the whole of the Canadian people are 100

per cent behind our delegation, and will be behind the parliament of Canada when it passes this resolution.

I should like now to say a few words about what has been said so well before respecting the supremacy of moral law, the rights of human beings, international law as the basis of conduct and universality of approach. These matters were taken up by our delegation, and for that alone they deserve praise from Canadians.

May I say only a few words about the five great powers which were really the leading powers at San Francisco. First of all I would refer to the United States. There can be no doubt that to a large extent the spirit which prevailed at the San Francisco conference emanated from that great spirit, the thought and the drive of the late President Roosevelt. He had seen the dangers which confronted not only all Europe but every section of the world. There is no doubt that that great spirit which had been calling and begging for many years for international collaboration was present at the conference, and that the doctrine of isolationism was absolutely dead. Everyone has read about the eagerness and the sincerity of Mr. Stettinius, the then secretary of state, and his efforts to create an international league. One has only to look at that to realize that the United States fully comprehends its responsibility, not only to the people of that country but to the peoples of the whole world. .

Then at that conference were representatives of the United Kingdom-great, Great Britain, which had suffered so much, which stood alone for more than a year against the hordes of barbarism in Europe. This was the Great Britain that suffered economically, and suffered physically in her blood and in her flesh. The British people recognized that they were near exhaustion; and there is no use in covering it up, because the people of Britain would have been the first to recognize the fact that they were near exhaustion. They were cut off from commercial contact with other peoples for five years, except for purely war purposes. For five years they lived under high tension, and have had no physical security from the air, land and sea. They were reduced to the narrow limits of their own British isles, caught on the fringe of Europe between the soviet advance; and I am not suggesting it is an unfriendly advance, but we might as well face the fact that it was a new and to some extent troubling factor. There are now factors arising in Europe in which Great Britain must necessarily take part. On the other hand, she faces the United States. She has not approached the conference as a mendicant; she has not gone there to ask for sympathy.