

then we in New Zealand have paid that price. This right—that the world is unquestionably one world now, that there can be no lasting peace and prosperity in New Zealand unless there is peace and prosperity throughout the world. And our demand for a voice is a modest one. We ask no veto. We ask no predominant or decisive voice. We ask for our proportionate voice in those Councils which will influence the affairs of man as far ahead as we can see—our proportionate voice, no more and no less.

NEED FOR EFFECTIVE SECURITY SYSTEM

I turn now to a more fundamental discussion of the voting-powers of the Security Council and the question of their possible revision. As a country which, at San Francisco, offered emphatic opposition to those provisions, we feel it essential to make our position clear. We dislike the veto as much as ever. We believe that, side by side with a resolute effort to remove economic injustices, there must be provided a completely effective system for the prevention of aggression, not at all to preserve the *status quo*, but certainly to prevent any alteration even of the *status quo* by individual national force. We wish to see established an effective system of collective security under which all contract that aggression against one is aggression against all, and will be met and defeated as such. We believe that nothing short of this can in the long run be permanently effective—an agreement by all the right-thinking peoples of the world that lawless force will always be met and defeated by lawful force whenever, wherever, with whatever justification, for whatever reason and in whatever circumstances individual national force is applied. Such a system, properly and responsibly applied with due regard to economic justice, would, we believe, achieve the desired object. But we also believe that nothing less can be permanently adequate.

PRESENT POSITION

What have we now, in this effort of ours to achieve collective security? We have a system that is not collective and is not security. We have an organization which cannot act against a Great Power—because of the veto. We have an organization which cannot act against a small Power, if that small Power is supported by a Great Power—because of the veto. We have an organization, then, which can act only against a small Power that is not supported by a Great Power. What, then, is it that the world fears? Is it an attack on the peace of the world made by a small Power, not supported by a Great Power? The question is, of course, derisory. If the five Great Powers are all agreed in cases of attempted aggression, then the world has nothing to fear. What we have established, then, is an organization that can be admirably adapted to crush aggression by a small Power, admirably adapted to take action in those circumstances where such an organization as this is almost entirely unnecessary, but largely precluded by reason of the veto from acting in those cases, and in those cases only, where mankind is in danger.

Indeed, I suggest to you that it is entirely essential that, at some time, at some appropriate time and as soon as may be, the nations of the world, and particularly the Great Powers, must consider whether an organization so limited as this can confidently hope to achieve its object. Who ever heard of a Fire Department, each one of five members of which reserves to himself the right to say whether he will go to a fire,