

be of great value for the future, within the limited sphere of operation which is permitted under the United Nations Charter. But, I emphasize again that this is limited, and that the United Nations Assembly can do nothing except carry out the wishes by voluntary action of two-thirds of its members.

There is another limitation of which we are, I think, becoming increasingly conscious. Again, the events of the last two to three months have driven this home. I have talked about the necessity of getting a two-thirds majority for recommendations. You can understand what that means in terms of manoeuvring and lobbying and trying to work out the necessary majority for your particular resolution. We operate down there, of course, on the basis of the sovereign equality of all states. One state, one vote. That means that the vote of Liberia is just as important as the vote of the United States of America when the roll is called. Now, in the Security Council there is not this equality of voting privilege because the big powers, the permanent members of the Council, have a veto. This is a recognition of the differential of power and responsibility between members. In the Assembly there is no such recognition; there is no such distinction. Yet in the exercise of this new authority that is being given to the Assembly, because the Security Council has so often failed to act, we are beginning to see that the same kind of differential is working itself out, although in a different way. Whereas you have the single power veto in the Council, we are now beginning to develop in the Assembly -- and this is a development which has possibilities of great danger for the future of the United Nations bloc voting and bloc veto. More and more members of the Assembly are getting together in trying to pool their voting power. Up to a point this is perfectly all right, but if it is carried too far the bloc vote of the Assembly can have just as damaging an effect on the United Nations as the individual veto has had on the Security Council.

There are, of course, blocs and blocs at the United Nations. There is the Communist bloc which always votes as a unit, and which has four new members this year. It is a solid vote and it has never been known to split.

Over the ten years of United Nations existence there has never been one deviation in the voting record of that bloc; no one member of that bloc has ever voted against the wishes of the Soviet Union. On one occasion, 2 or 3 years ago, when one of the satellite states put forward a motion of its own, it apparently had not cleared it with the Russians, who did not like it. When the voting came, this country had to vote against its own motion. Well, this is one kind of bloc.

But there are other blocs. There is the Commonwealth bloc. Now the Commonwealth bloc, I assure you, does not always vote as a unit. The Commonwealth, and we should not forget this, consists of the United Kingdom as its heart