the Great Powers could not be subjected, with regard to the use of their combined military forces, to the vote of countries which were without commensurate responsibilities. But now, despite the failure of the Security Council, which had been turned by the veto into an acrimonious debating society, the Great Powers clung to this right at all costs because they distrusted one another; the spirit of comradeship and co-operation which had been built up among the Allies during the war years existed no longer. The nations had met at San Francisco to create an Organization that would prevent a new war; but because the Great Powers in their mutual distrust had refused to submit to an international rule, they had failed in the mission which had been entrusted to them.

The New Zealand delegation accordingly would support any resolution which offered hope of progress in solving the veto problem. The proposals of the Interim Committee embodied in the joint resolution were a fingerpost, a step in the right direction, but did not get to grips with the main question. However, it was a welcome sign that four of the Great Powers recognized that the situation could not remain as it was. His delegation would vote for the joint resolution and also for the Argentinian proposal for a special conference to revise the Charter.

It had been argued that a special conference would be premature, and would only increase ill will. But could there be greater ill will than at present? It was true that it was better to have discussions than battles; that explosive words were preferable to atom bombs exploding on the world. But that was not enough. The United Nations was created with the constructive aim of enabling nations to live in peace and of bringing to the entire world the benefits of progress and civilization. If the world remained hagridden with fear, we must call a halt to progress, but if we could make the world a fit place for human beings to live in, it would be a small thing for the largest or most suspicious nation to agree to march with the majority.

Mr Vyshinsky (Soviet Union) denied that his country had used its power of veto as a "weapon of aggression" or an instrument of national policy; that power had been used only as a result of "antidemocratic and aggressive tendencies" in the Security Council. As President Roosevelt had said, the unanimity rule was essential for the success of the United Nations. It was too often overlooked that the United Nations was not a world Government, and that it was not possible to impose on members of such an organization the voting procedure and working methods of national Parliaments.

The report of the Interim Committee and the joint resolution revealed a formalistic tendency which was as ineffectual as it was dangerous.