

chance to get to know each other, before the nations had a chance to get into the habit of co-operation through the United Nations, hard, bitter problems were thrown right at it. Though these problems may not have been solved, they have not yet killed the Organization, as they might well have done. Also, on the credit side, grievances and disputes have been dragged out into the open. That is to the good. The United Nations has become a forum for discussion. Any nation can bring any subject before it at any time. It has become the custodian and the prodder of the conscience of man. All that is to the good.

On the debit side, and we are a little more conscious of the debit side at the moment, there has been little evidence that the work of the United Nations is based on an international approach to international problems. There have been, on the contrary, many signs that certain members of the United Nations use it to promote selfish national policies, to stir up selfish national prides, to foment class and race prejudices, to trouble the waters so that they could be fished in; to use the United Nations as a platform for propaganda rather than a platform for progress. Both small and great countries have been guilty of this false approach to international co-operation. Some of the small members of the United Nations have taken advantage of their legal equality in that body unfairly to attack larger countries; to exploit grievances, not always with a view to getting those grievances settled peaceably, but to getting them settled advantageously to themselves. Small countries are not always right just because they are small, nor are all non-Anglo-Saxon countries always virtuous and right just because they are not Anglo-Saxon. There has been a tendency in recent months for certain smaller countries to exploit the sympathy felt for small countries and to adopt selfish and mischievous policies at both the Assembly and the Security Council.

But this is not the greatest menace. The greatest danger to the future of the United Nations, a menace which will kill it if it is not brought under control, is the irresponsible use of the veto power in the Security Council. I realize that I am on dangerous ground when I talk about this. The veto power itself is not necessarily to be condemned. It was argued at San Francisco, and there was a good deal of force behind the argument, that, as long as you have an international organization where every state has one vote and no state has more than one vote, where the smallest - Luxembourg - is on the same basis as the most powerful - the United States; where you must observe the strict legal equality of all sovereign states, you cannot expect Great Powers who have to bear the main responsibility for peace and war, to put the destiny of the world in the hands of a mathematical result of 29 against 27. It can be argued they should have greater voting power, just as they have more power and more responsibility in carrying out the decisions resulting from votes. However, though the veto itself may be right or it may be wrong, the way the veto has been used in the last few years in the Security Council has, to my way of thinking, been but irresponsible and indefensible. I remember that at San Francisco we spent hours and hours and hours arguing against the veto. Canadians were on the side of the angels in this argument. We thought that possibly two-thirds majority would be enough to protect the legitimate special interests of the Great Powers. However, we had to give in, because there could not have been at that time any agreement for a United Nations based on the basis of the veto. But, and this is sometimes forgotten, before the veto was accepted by the Conference, the permanent members of the Council who were given this privilege gave a solemn pledge that they would exercise it with responsibility and with restraint; that they would not use it in small issues and in procedural matters but only in vital questions; with a due sense of their responsibility and with a due recognition of the special privilege that they had in possessing it. That promise certainly has not been observed by those powers, or at least one of those powers, which possess this privilege. Take, for instance, the use of the veto in respect of election to the United Nations. Only a few weeks ago, the U.S.S.R. vetoed the election of a country like Ireland. Well, if there is any peace-loving country in