

far from having achieved success. Its success or failure would appear to have been dependent upon the extent to which the application of the veto has been in accordance with the general consensus of view of the member nations. In areas where it is clear that the veto has not been applied to further the special interest of one or more member nations rather than the general interest, procedures of negotiation and compromise, mediation and adjustment have been undertaken, and have proved helpful and constructive. However, in every area, and on every subject where it is obvious that the veto has been applied to further some particular interest, rather than the general interest, the process of compromise and adjustment has been ignored, and little or no progress as a consequence has been made.

The stalemate which has resulted from this state of affairs affects many situations which are of direct and imperative concern in the life of all free nations. Its continuance cannot fail to lead to threats to freedom arising not only from aggressive aims at territorial expansion, but, as well, from sinister plans to undermine the structure of free government within the borders of individual nations.

There is no nation, however great, which, in a world such as the one in which we live today, can defend its freedom solely with its own resources. All nations are, therefore, interested in security. Where existing machinery for the prevention or settlement of international disputes has proven or is proving inadequate to effect security, additional means must be sought.

Security for individual nations, under such circumstances, can be assured only by the effective co-operation, and the united power of those nations whose determination to maintain their freedom constitutes a strong bond of community between them. It is not surprising therefore that certain nations, knowing that their security depends on collective action in some form, and which are not yet able to achieve that security on the universal basis which the United Nations contemplates, should, pending this large accomplishment, seek to achieve their security on a less than universal basis.

As nations, we are all members one of another. The good of each is bound up in the good of all. This sense of community of interest cannot be too highly, too rapidly, or too widely developed. It is vital to the defence of freedom to maintain a preponderance of moral, economic and military strength on the side of freedom - all else is wholly secondary. To direct its energies to this imperative end seems to me to be the supreme task of the United Nations today.

There is a further all-compelling reason why a world community sense cannot be too completely developed. I mean, of course, the urgent necessity for the effective control of atomic energy. Scientific achievements have in recent years placed this terrible weapon of destruction at the disposal of mankind. The processes by which atomic energy is released are now well known to the scientists of all nations. The ability to make and release the atomic bomb will, in the course of time, be available to any nation which possesses and devotes sufficient skill to that purpose. The international control of atomic energy might change it from a force of terrible destruction into a power which could greatly benefit the whole of mankind.

In the presence of the menace which atomic energy constitutes, every nation, in the interest of its own people as well as those of other lands, cannot strive too earnestly to ensure this mighty transformation. The hope of the world is, I believe, centred today in the United Nations as the one world organization capable of establishing this international control.