

hopes which might have been entertained as to the outcome of the proposed meeting of the Great Powers. Indeed, after an interval of a few days the problem returned to the Committee, the conversations between the Great Powers not having produced any positive result.

The Australian representative (Mr Hasluck), in opening the renewed debate, said that Chapter VI of the Charter gave the Security Council the duty to apply certain methods for the pacific settlement of disputes which every member of the United Nations, great or small, had pledged itself to use. Australia wished to see that these methods were applied so that every nation could have complete confidence in the Security Council and a reasonable expectation that its case would be handled promptly in accordance with Chapter VI and with the principles of justice and respect for the rights of nations contained in the Charter. Past experience showed that this objective could not be realized unless moderation was shown in the application of the voting procedures laid down in Article 27.

The Cuban delegate (Mr Belt), in defending his twofold proposal for revision and for appointment of a committee to receive proposals for amendments to the Charter, expressed, incidentally, the opinion that when experience showed that a State invoking a just case would obtain a majority, it would not be surprising if the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asked for abolition of the veto.

The representative of the United Kingdom (Sir Hartley Shawcross) tabled the set of suggestions which the United Kingdom delegation had submitted for consideration in the discussions which had been held between the Great Powers. He said that although, to his regret, no agreement had been reached in these discussions, the United Kingdom intended to act in accordance with the suggestions put forward. It would not, however, vote for any proposal which condemned any of the Great Powers or led to the revision of the Charter, for the fact remained that the "veto" was necessary for the Great Powers lest they be outvoted on a matter vital to their interests. Under an effective system of collective security, machinery would exist to secure the legitimate needs of States, and the "veto" could be abandoned and replaced by a rule of law. In the meantime, its excessive use was a symptom of the suspicion among the Great Powers and their tendency to take sides according to political ideologies.

The representative of the Soviet Union (Mr Vyshinsky) also presented a resolution of a very general character. He considered the revised Australian resolution inadmissible because it condemned the activity and efficiency of the Security Council, and asserted, in his opinion unjustifiably, that the Council had not acted in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter. His Government did not believe the Charter could not be improved, but thought the United Nations should accumulate experience rather than alter the Charter now.

The remaining debate showed the usual division of opinion.