

Soviet Union would continue to fight for the implementation of the fundamental principle of the unanimity of the Great Powers.

In view of the great emphasis placed by the Russian delegation not only in the "veto" debate, but in other discussions in the Assembly, on the principle of the unity of the Great Powers, it should be explained that no analysis of this conception was furnished. Critics of the voting arrangement under which the Security Council can reach decisions *only through* the unanimity of the Great Powers—that is, the veto principle—were supposed to be criticizing also the *desirability* of the unanimity of the Great Powers. However, most critics of the veto not only professed to desire the unanimity of the Great Powers, but saw in the use made of the veto a striking lack of that unanimity in practice.

The representative of the United Kingdom (Mr Noel Baker) said that he would not vote for any proposal to amend the Charter. His attitude was not based on the merits of the arguments on Article 27. One decisive objection was the unwillingness of the United Kingdom to ride roughshod over the strongly-felt convictions of an ally, the Soviet Union. Secondly, to attempt to change the basic Charter instrument after only ten months' experience was premature. Thirdly, he was not convinced that amendments would ever be required. The task of the Assembly and of the Council was to build peace, establish political, social, and economic justice and co-operation in all spheres of human life. The United Nations institutions must be made to work and to effect decisions, and to that end custom might accomplish what was wanted in a process similar to the adaptation imposed on American and British instruments of government by time and circumstance. Mr Noel-Baker then expressed support for the following specific proposals :—

(1) He approved a suggestion made by the representative of France that nations should first try negotiations on such problems as might come before the Council before taking them up in the Council.

(2) He hoped that, in practice, neither abstention nor absence of a permanent member would be counted as a "veto."

(3) He hoped that agreement could be effected on the definition of a "dispute."

(4) He hoped that agreement could be obtained to set up commissions of inquiry in order to obtain the true facts of a dispute for the Security Council.

(5) He approved the further study of the Rules of Procedure to look into further possible advances.

There was also much support in the Committee for a suggestion by the representative of China that the permanent members should confer with a view to drawing up an agreed line of conduct on the application of Article 27; and for a suggestion by the French delegate that the debate should be adjourned for a few days to enable this to be done.

At the end of the discussion the French proposal was put to the vote and carried, but not before a further uncompromising statement by the representative of the Soviet Union had dissipated any excessive