

has been asked to contribute a contingent shall be invited to participate in decisions concerning the employment of its own military forces. Inclusion of this provision was owing to the tenacity of the Canadian delegation. To have accepted anything less would have been contrary to a principle established over the years whereby Parliament is called upon to decide whether or not Canadian forces should be despatched for overseas service. Although the principle enshrined in Article 44 was accepted, it remains untested. The principle of special representation for non-members at meetings of the Security Council at which atomic energy questions are being discussed was, however, adopted later.

At Dumbarton Oaks the representatives of the great powers concluded that, respecting certain matters, the proposed international organization would be able to act effectively only if the five powers were in agreement and that, conversely, any one of them would be able, by its negative vote, to veto a proposed decision. At San Francisco, Canada accepted the necessity of great-power unanimity (and hence the veto) in applying coercive measures for the maintenance of peace under Chapter VII of the Charter, but considered that the extension of the veto power to the peaceful-settlement provisions in Chapter VI was undesirable and unnecessary. The Canadian delegation was also opposed to granting any one of the five great powers a veto over the admission of new members. In both cases, however, the great powers overrode the opposition of the middle and smaller states at San Francisco. The Charter accordingly provides that the rule of unanimity of the permanent members (or, in practice, the absence of a negative vote by one of them) applies to the admission of new members, as well as to decisions of the Security Council relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes. The veto power thus extends into many fields and has affected the entire character of the organization. While the Canadian delegation did not regard the outcome as satisfactory, it felt that the veto was not too high a price to pay for a world organization that promised to be highly acceptable in so many other respects.