

Although reluctant to enter into a full discussion on the proposals before the Committee, the United States delegation also made clear their attitude on several of the points raised. The veto power should continue to apply, they considered, to decisions on action to be taken in relation to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression. With this exception, they were favourably disposed towards limiting the application of the unanimity rule; it need not apply, for instance, to the pacific settlement of disputes or to the admission of new members. The present procedure could undoubtedly be made more flexible without amendment of the Charter.

Mr. Gromyko (Soviet Union) and Dr. Manuilsky (Ukrainian S.S.R.) opposed the move to refer the problem to the "illegal" Interim Committee. Abolition of the veto, it was argued, would mean the end of the United Nations and pave the way to a new war. The Soviet Union had used the veto only to prevent decisions contrary to the Charter and to protect the interests of small Powers.

The views of the New Zealand Government had been expressed by Sir Carl Berendsen in the opening debate. In insisting upon the right of veto, he said, the great powers were making it completely impossible for the world to achieve its highest objective—an effective system of collective security against war. Such a system could not be achieved by words alone. No power, great or small, could obtain insurance against war without paying the premium of submission in the last resort to the combined judgment and conscience of the world. Great Powers could not retain their right to take their own course in all circumstances and at the same time expect the United Nations to be competent to enforce peace; the two propositions were mutually exclusive. The Great Powers must, however, have their proportionate voice in the enforcement of peace. To this end the introduction of a system of weighted voting, which would be difficult but not impossible to devise, was worth consideration. In the meantime New Zealand would support the valuable proposals made by the United States, although these, unhappily, did not extend to the vital question of enforcement. She would support as a temporary compromise a veto by any two, instead of by any one, of the Great Powers. Indeed, she would support, as in the past, any proposal tending towards the moderation or elimination of the veto power.

In spite of a renewed attack by Mr. Vyshinsky (Soviet Union), who warned that his country would continue to use the veto whenever it thought fit, the United States resolution was passed by 38 votes (including New Zealand) to 6, with 11 abstentions. Since by its terms the Argentinian and Chinese proposals would be referred to the Interim Committee, they were withdrawn.