

The main issue, so far as the possibilities of international agreement are concerned, is already perfectly clear. At the present moment one State only is in possession of stocks of atomic bombs and a knowledge of the full process of manufacture. That State offers to forego its enormous advantage on certain conditions. These conditions, and especially the right of international inspection, are by no means negligible, but are they unreasonable? The New Zealand Government think not. Indeed, we feel it incumbent upon the Assembly to acknowledge as a notable act of international co-operation the offer, albeit conditional, of the United States of America to forego its advantage.

Though it is unnecessary to debate constitutional problems at the present stage, it is clear that no method of inspection or control can be considered effective which requires at every point the positive assent of the Security Council. If, therefore, there is to be an international agreement at all, some organ must be empowered to take the necessary technical and administrative decisions without delay. To delegate a sufficient degree of autonomy to the proposed atomic authority to save it from being paralysed by any indecisions of the Security Council, will, we realize, be a difficult matter, but here, of course, is the crux of an effective system of control. But if it can be achieved, we see no reason to deny to the Security Council the right to direct the work of the atomic authority in its security aspects, a right which it undoubtedly possesses under the Charter. Let the Security Council by all means exercise its over-riding powers when it can bring itself to do so in a positive sense. It is not the resolution of the Security Council which is to be feared, but its irresolution. We therefore share the misgivings of those who think that the creation of an entirely independent atomic authority might impair the Security Council's position, and we see no inconsistency between the maintenance of that position and the delegation to the atomic authority of a wide range of powers.

THE VETO: NEW ZEALAND'S RIGHT TO SPEAK

What are the qualifications, the credentials, of New Zealand to speak on this subject? What, indeed, are our rights, and why do we hold that we have not only the right, but the duty, to express our views with clarity and with force?

What, then, are our rights? This right—that we have established in our homeland in the Southern Seas a true Commonwealth of Man, a home of liberty and of freedom, where wealth is more evenly distributed, I believe, than in any other country in the world, where all can live a full and ample life, and all can strive, as all do, to lay the foundations for a still better life for our children and theirs. Have not we, who have so much to lose, a stake in the maintenance of peace, in the prevention of war, which would destroy all that we have done so much to create? This right—that death or mutilation is just as stark and poignant a tragedy in our small country as it is to the people of a larger land. This right—that twice in our time, isolated though we are, we in New Zealand have been involved in tragic war, as the result of events at the opposite ends of the earth, freely and voluntarily pledging our all, in the fight for international liberty and decency which we recognized at once was our fight, too. This right—that in that cause we gave of our best in blood and in treasure. The graves of New Zealanders throughout the whole world who died in defence of our beliefs, are a constant and eternal witness to the fact that our support of the principles that we advocate is not confined to words alone. If blood and tears, anguish and sacrifice, are the price to be paid for our proportionate voice in the world to-day,