

world, I should think Ireland has some claim to that title after the experiences of the last ten years. But the Irish application for membership was rejected, not on legitimate grounds but because the U.S.S.R. did not have diplomatic representation in Dublin. This might well be considered as an irresponsible use of the veto, almost to the point of frivolity.

What should we do to improve this situation? We can try to do three or four things. We can amend the Charter. Or rather, we can't amend the Charter, because the Big Powers have a veto on amendment, and any amendment has to be passed by all of them. We could agree on certain conventional rules and regulations for the exercise of the use of the veto, and get the Great Powers to accept those rules. This also will be difficult. If forced, we might make special security arrangements within the United Nations, inviting all those member states to participate in them who are willing to build up an agency within the Organization which would have the power which the whole Organization does not possess under the Charter. The Inter-American Pact, which was signed recently in Brazil, is an example of a special arrangement within the United Nations. There is no particular reason why that idea should not be extended to other countries in the United Nations, if they so desire and if there is no alternative. If it is desired to work out a special arrangement for collective security to include those democratic and freedom-loving states who are willing to give up certain sovereign rights in the interests of peace and safety, why shouldn't it be done? Especially as any arrangement of this kind would have to be consistent with the Charter of the United Nations. Such a development would meet the determination of certain countries now in the United Nations to get real collective security without breaking up the United Nations itself.

A final choice, one of last resort and not one that anyone desires, would be to scrap the present United Nations in favour of an entirely new organization, with power which the present organization has not, to preserve the peace. Every effort should be made to include in our international organization all states. If, however, this cannot be done because some states demand impossible conditions, such as the unrestricted and irresponsible right of veto, then the nations of the world will be faced with the decision, whether or not to sacrifice universality for effectiveness; whether to have a universal organization without power for peace, or progress, though power for mischief, or to have a really effective United Nations, even if that means dropping from that organization those countries who are not willing to accept essential obligations of membership. I repeat that that is a decision which, if the United Nations continues to develop as it has done within the last year, may some day have to be made. But I would repeat again, and repeat with emphasis, that it is a decision of last resort, because if we ever reach the situation, where we have a partial United Nations, with important countries on the outside, then we are indeed faced with two worlds. The only hope for peace, in this situation, would be the realization that the consequences of victory or defeat would be so disastrous, so catastrophic, that those two worlds would maintain an uneasy equilibrium rather than provoke a final, fatal clash.

No one who has any sanity left desires such a division as this. If it occurred, however, it might be used as a means to an end; the end of achieving again that universal peace organization which we must always seek. If, for instance, we were driven