

## APPENDIX 2

### FINAL SPEECH OF THE NEW ZEALAND DELEGATE, HON. H. G. R. MASON, THIRTY-FOURTH PLENARY MEETING, 9 OCTOBER, 1946

Mr President, I shall not traverse the ground which has already been covered in this general discussion. After weeks of detailed Commission work, we have reached our conclusions upon the issues of this Conference, and the repetition of utterances by two rather than by one delegate will hardly alter the judgment we have reached after long discussion and examination.

We have reached the stage of final voting, and, as we study the questions put forward for the vote, we see how we may have modified our original viewpoints, how we have made adjustments as we come to realize the special problems of our fellow-victor-nations at this Conference. We have come far towards fulfilling the injunction of Mr. Manuisky at one of our early plenary sessions two months ago to-day, "that the best way to settle international relations after a war is that of mutual understanding of the interests of each of the parties, which should be reflected in the decisions adopted by all members of this Conference."

In this result we see illustrated what Field Marshal Smuts said about the spirit of our meetings—that the spirit of co-operation has been present and realization of it has been obscured by the undue emphasis placed by others upon our differences. Differences are, of course, inevitable. But the clear and emphatic expression of divergent viewpoints, perfectly proper and necessary at a Conference, has been quite wrongly represented to the outer world as a manifestation of ill feeling or ill will. I have been astonished to find this. It is not fair to the people of the world that frankness should be so represented as to cause them to believe it to be ill will, and induce in them despondency as to the cause of peace.

New Zealand has made many adjustments in recognition of the needs of its fellow-United-Nations. We have no self-righteous feelings about this. Clearly, adjustment is easier for a country which has no direct material interests involved in the settlement. We recognize that it is not as simple for others.

We are, let us speak frankly, unhappy about some of the compromises we have made as a result of our recognition of the present state of world power and of world organization. Our conscience is uneasy, but—whatever may be correct individual conduct—we do not think it would be helpful at an international meeting if we maintained our stand tediously against that of twenty.

I cite one example. Our primary aim, like that of other delegations, is to secure a peace settlement which is just and has the prospect of enduring. We believe that such a settlement would be assisted if the United Nations Organization were associated with many of the matters dealt with by the treaties. We believe that these might be better solved by the United Nations than by the Council of Foreign Ministers. It seems to us that all the United Nations are interested in the peace treaties because those treaties are setting the international framework within which the United Nations will work, and by which they will be bound. And if *all* the United Nations are responsible for keeping the peace—if peace is indivisible—it is not satisfactory that the pattern of peace should be woven by only *some* of the United Nations.