

2. With respect to membership in the organization, according to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals this is to be open to all peace-loving states. That definition is pretty broad. Perhaps the underlying reasons are powerful for such a breadth of language, but some clearer definition would appear to be essential if misunderstandings in the future are to be avoided.

3. On the point of the principal organs of the organization there will be little disagreement.

4. But with respect to the composition, functions and powers, voting and procedural provisions of the general assembly there will doubtless be considerable criticism. It appears to be headed for the post of a discussion group. It can talk but it can do little acting other than the election of non-permanent members to the security council. True, there are other functions, but I choose only the more important. Nevertheless its membership will be largely obligated to provide armed and material and financial assistance to the organization without in my opinion there being any corresponding control or direction of those contributions, and, what is more important, they are to a large extent denied the right of deciding when or how they shall be used other than through the members they elect to that security council.

The assembly debates may have a powerful effect on public opinion, but they will fall short of bearing any semblance to the relationship between a democratic legislature and its executive so far as its status beside the security council is concerned. Its members, however, will have protection in disputes, or where acts of aggression are committed against them, and in the final analysis perhaps that factor cannot be lightly overlooked. An assembly that hampered or delayed the actions of the powerful security council in its mission to preserve peace could not be countenanced. We revert once more to the practical equation: peace or war very largely depends upon the great powers. That is no reflection upon the part that other powers will play.

5. The security council contemplated in the proposal constitutes the main part of the peace machinery. It is given wide powers and the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The council as proposed has eleven members, six non-permanent elected by the assembly and five permanent members, including the four great powers and in due course the republic of France. Agreement, as you know, was not arrived at at Dumbarton Oaks with relation

to the voting procedure on the security council, the issue being whether one great power should have a right of veto against action when it itself is involved in an international dispute, an issue raised primarily by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

At Yalta the big three, so-called, devised a new voting formula which was included in the invitations that last week went to the invited powers. The new voting formula may be summed up as follows: First, every member of the security council will have one vote; second, on procedural matters, that is, getting issues before the council, a vote by any seven members will suffice and, third, at the critical state, when the question of using force comes up, seven votes will be needed but they must include the great powers. This is intended, I presume, to give other nations a measure of reassurance as far as this part is concerned.

The practical effect of the voting compromise arrived at at Yalta is to make a distinction between the quasi-judicial functions of the council in promoting the specific settlement of disputes and the political functions of the council in taking action to maintain peace and security. When questions of the first kind are involved, that is, when the issue is whether any particular situation threatening peace should be investigated or what action short of recourse to force should be taken in order to deal with the situation, no nation which is a party to the dispute, whether that nation is great or small, will participate in the decisions of the council, and these decisions shall be made by a majority of seven of its eleven members, the eleven consisting of the five permanent representatives of the great powers and six representatives of the others. But when the issue goes beyond specific measures, when the question is actually one of using force to prevent or restrain aggression, then a different voting procedure will be followed, or is proposed to be followed, should I say. In this case there must be unanimous agreement among the representatives of the five great powers before action can be taken. Each of these great powers, therefore, in effect has the right to veto action against itself.

Canada stands in a different position from that of the other smaller or so-called middle nations, although I think those terms are pretty loosely used in view of the significance sometimes attached to them. Her close relations with the two great Anglo-Saxon powers give her freedom of fear unique among nations, small or large. No nation is more wedded to peace. We have not a single national objective which cannot be gratified by peaceful means. We have not a single national objective which can be gratified by war. How