

and went on to say that if the Soviet Union had a complaint to make about the Atlantic Treaty, and its relation to the Charter, it could find redress within the United Nations by placing the subject on the agenda, instead of taking the present illogical position because it found itself in a political tight corner.

After pointed reference to the Soviet Government's system of alliances with its satellite States in Eastern Europe, Mr McNeil went on to refute Mr Gromyko's accusations against the pact. He maintained that there was no intention on the part of the signatories to establish military and air bases designed for an attack on the Soviet Union; that it was Marshal Stalin, if anybody, who first repudiated the Anglo-Soviet Treaty; that the pact was based squarely on Article 51 of the Charter; and that it was obviously defensive in character and in intention. Those countries, concluded Mr McNeil, which were for international stability, for settling disputes by the means provided for in the Charter, those to which the thought and methods of war were truly repugnant, would welcome the Atlantic Treaty, and only those which contemplated aggression had any reason to regret it.

For the *United States* Mr Warren Austin stated that the North Atlantic Treaty fitted clearly within the framework of the Charter and was designed to warn the aggressors of the right of self-defence specifically set out in Article 51. The inter-American system was a similar collective defence arrangement. Mr Gromyko complained that the Soviet Union was being isolated, but who was responsible for that isolation? Not only had the Soviet Union refused to participate in the programme to rebuild Europe's shattered economy, but it had placed every obstacle in the way of contacts between the Russian people and the people of the non-Soviet world. This self-made isolation could be ended any time the Soviet Union decided to join whole-heartedly the peaceful family of nations.

The lack of certainty that the Security Council would be able to function with full effectiveness was one of the reasons why it was necessary for member States to find other means within the framework of the Charter to ensure their own security. The North Atlantic Treaty was designed to serve as one of such means. It represented "a friendly association of freedom and peace-loving countries to assure peace and security in the North Atlantic area and so to contribute to the foundation of peace in the world generally."

The representatives of other countries such as *France*, *Norway*, *Canada*, and *Peru* also defended the compatibility of the North Atlantic Treaty with the provisions of the Charter.

Speaking for *New Zealand*, Sir Carl Berendsen confined his remarks to the subject on the agenda, the question of voting procedure in the Security Council. In reply to an assertion made by Mr Gromyko to