

We accept wholeheartedly and with conviction the position that peace is indivisible—that the security of a small, isolated and comparatively unprotected country like New Zealand depends on the maintenance of world security. The instrument of world security is the United Nations, and our policy is to do all we can to strengthen its authority, and to demonstrate our confidence in it, by giving it responsibilities.

We know that UNO contains many serious imperfections, but we trust that good sense, time, and experience will assist in their removal. It may also be possible that the 50-odd member nations do not all share the same sense of responsibility as compared with the twenty-one nations at this Conference. We know, too, the argument that the infant UNO might perish under the heavy burden of premature responsibility. But States and Organizations, like people, become responsible by doing responsible things, and we see no valid reason for shielding the full United Nations body from difficult tasks and leaving them to be done by four or seven or twenty-one nations.

We realize that a good argument can be made for keeping UNO out of the peace settlements, thus sparing the infant organization the opprobrium that will be associated with the necessarily unpopular clauses of the treaties. But the present draft treaty already gives the United Nations several tasks, in connection with Trieste and with the Italian colonies, to mention only two.

We should have wished to see the United Nations associated with the peace treaties in many other instances, but, realizing that the Conference clearly did not agree with our view, we decided to refrain from making proposals which would take time and get nowhere. But, in this particular case, we state our view because a United Nations solution is already provided for in the draft treaty.

All the United Nations are interested in territorial redistribution, because the areas now being disposed of have been, and may still be, trouble spots in this part of the world—places that may disturb the peace. And if all the 50-odd United Nations are responsible for keeping the peace, it is not entirely satisfactory that the pattern of peace should be woven only by *twenty-one* of the United Nations.

So much for our general position. A few words now on our amendment.

Sovereignty

First of all, there is the question of sovereignty. We wish to settle this by vesting the sovereignty of the Italian colonies in the United Nations. It should be possible to reach agreement in principle about this because we have all renounced ideas of territorial aggrandizement. Some of us who accept the principle may, however, be influenced by the narrow legal viewpoint that the Charter gives the United Nations no authority to accept sovereignty over territory. The United Nations is admittedly not obliged to do a great number of things which, in our view, it is competent to do, if it so decides, in accordance with the broadest interpretation of its functions. For our part, we are convinced that the United Nations may, *by agreement*, undertake any function consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter. We all know that the Assembly and the Council of the League undertook highly important political functions not specifically provided for in the Covenant.