

The CHAIRMAN: Would you give us an example?

The WITNESS: I take it there is some fundamental distinction between such community philosophy as there might be in the western world as against the philosophy which prevails behind the iron curtain. It is a difficult matter to reconcile those things but on the other hand, as it may become apparent, it may not become necessary—indeed I do not think it is necessary to proceed effectively in this field—to attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable. For practical purposes what is necessary is a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly of United Nations. It must be acceptable to two-thirds of the members of the United Nations.

Hon. Mr. GOUIN: Do you think it is too optimistic to say that even between what we would call the western world and the eastern world, for lack of a better distinction, on that which is the same in theory we might be able to find common ground. There are for instance three fundamental principles of the French revolution which I shall express in French, *liberté, égalité* and *fraternité*. I am rather inclined to believe those expressions are just as acceptable to Moscow as they are acceptable in Paris and throughout the English speaking world. The interpretation of those three single words might give rise to different philosophy but my own suggestion—if I may very modestly make a suggestion—would be that we try in good faith to discover what I would call common ground. It would be rather academic I admit, but I think it would be rather a good start.

The WITNESS: No one would be happier than I if it were possible. I think it is a laudable end but there are certain obvious difficulties which need not necessarily be faced before the document would receive the necessary majority in the United Nations. I would not wish to close the door on any philosophical synthesis but as I have mentioned there seem to be some objections which these gentlemen foresee.

Mr. STEWART: Liberty to us might mean allowing our political opponents to exist but to others it might mean liquidation of those opponents.

The WITNESS: I do not think what I have said is germane to the main thread of what I was about to say.

*By Mr. Hansell:*

Q. Before Mr. Hopkins goes on I understood him to say these great principles of human rights and fundamental freedoms have in reality not yet been determined? Is that what I understand?—A. They have been determined in various ways by various philosophical and moral systems.

Q. Yes, but the signatories to the charter signed the charter with their own particular understandings?—A. That is right.

Q. With respect to human rights and fundamental freedoms?—A. Yes sir.

Q. They may, in reality, differ in their various opinions.—A. Yes.

Q. My next question is would it not be basic for each of the signatory nations to define those expressions in their own way before there could be an understanding as to what they meant?—A. I entirely agree. The task of any United Nations body endeavouring to determine what is generally acceptable would be enormously facilitated if the committee or commission had before it the considered views, of the member states of the United Nations.

Q. I rather gained the impression while Mr. Riddell was speaking that there would be some truth in the statement that we are putting the cart before the horse. In other words the various committees and commission of the United Nations are drafting documents, declarations, bills, or whatever you want to call them, while we are sitting here attempting to do the same thing. It appears to me that we, in reality, are expecting to endorse that which is only now being done and that is why I say it seems to me that basically, before we can go any