

In so far as Russia is concerned, through her minister of foreign affairs, she gave her attitude on October 29 last at New York. Here is what Mr. Molotov then said:

Imagine, gentlemen, that the campaign to repeal this so-called veto were to be crowned with success. What would the political consequences be? It is quite obvious that the repudiation of the principle of unanimity of all the great powers—and this is what is actually behind this proposal for the abolition of the veto—would mean in practice liquidation of the united nations organization because this principle is the cornerstone of this organization.

These words were evidently an undisguised threat by Russia to put an end to the organization or to withdraw from it if her right of veto was repealed. In such case, would it be necessary to declare, with Mr. Richard Law, member of the opposition in the British House of Commons and former state minister in the Churchill government, that the possibility of a united nations organization without Russia must be considered? Let us hope that the world will never have to face such a solution, which would entail the declared hatred of the rest of the world against Russia.

There is another defect that I wish to mention briefly, even if its importance may be considerable; that is, the lack of a precise policy concerning atomic energy for war purposes. In an attempt to justify the use of the atomic bomb against Japanese cities, many reasons have been given. In a military sense it seems that the United States, which had given to Japan repeated warnings, could be excused for having used that weapon of destruction, the horror of which no human imagination can fully appreciate. But, morally speaking, it appears that the American conscience would have felt much more at ease if such weapon had been used against strictly military objectives. The results on the enemy morale would have been as profitable. But it remains to posterity to render a truer judgment on these facts. Fortunately, considerable benefit in having experimented with the bomb has been derived by the world in its quest for a lasting peace. The use of the atomic bomb may have served as an example and a good lesson. The world knows now part of the destructive powers of that horrible weapon and it is to be hoped that it will be of benefit to all.

The foreign minister of the U.S.S.R. subsequently protested against the adoption of the Baruch plan concerning atomic energy; in the name of his own country he submitted a new plan, but it seems to me that the Russian plan is not any better than the United States plan in that it would result in making known to the whole world the secret of the manu-

[Mr. Pinard.]

facture of these bombs. The conscience of all civilized human beings, even of those who happen to be the most warlike, would not dare to accept the principle that the use of atomic energy should be advocated for war purposes. But I still believe that the best way to prevent such a disaster remains in the acceptance of this double policy: first, the means of manufacture should not be made known, but should be kept secret; second, all the nations of the world should forbid the use of atomic energy in time of war. Let us hope that the united nations will discover a formula which will satisfy all peoples of good will and at the same time give to the world at large the peace of mind which it definitely needs in this matter.

Another step must also be taken; a general policy of disarmament must be agreed upon and adopted by all the members of the united nations. And the enforcement of such policy must be carefully instigated by the security council representatives. But in order to enforce the policy of disarmament, let me say that it is absolutely necessary that this iron curtain I was referring to, and which divides Europe from Russia, must be lifted if world security is to be attained.

But, all those deficiencies I have already discussed lose their importance if our attention is directed now to the only problem which dominates all the others at the present time, the solution of which is entirely indispensable for world security. I wish to refer to a more adequate and efficient organization of the help to be given to the peoples in need. How useless all the work accomplished by the united nations seems, if nations at large are to forget, neglect or lose sight of their main obligation, which is to help those populations which were devastated during the war.

From all sources, the most painful information is given to us. In a common voice, all correspondents, travellers and observers reveal a state of affairs which is nearly indescribable. From all theatres of war, from all regions where fate has struck, from all European countries, we receive the most alarming reports. Homes have been destroyed along with the houses themselves; families have been scattered and are constantly being divided; children who have not become orphans on account of the war do not accept any more the authority of their parents, who cannot help them and give them the essential necessities of life. So they have preferred to abandon the family idea, which only appears to them as a burden, and they run away in order to try themselves to obtain by all possible means what they need in order not to perish by hunger and cold. Every day, our newspapers