

on Human Rights and in this Committee have merely served to emphasize these differences in interpretation and have not resulted in the universal approach which we believe to be essential before any further progress can be made in this field.

It is important, Mr. Chairman, before proceeding any further, to clarify one or two points so that there can be no possible misinterpretation of the position of the Canadian Delegation - and perhaps that of some other delegations who, it seems to me, share our views in this matter.

Given the nature of our organization and the obvious division of opinion on the subject of self-determination, I am led to ask very earnestly whether any group of nations represented in this Committee considers that further progress in finding an acceptable solution will be facilitated by an attempt to formulate or define so-called rights or principles which another group of nations is - for reasons which I will mention later - not prepared to accept. Is it not more in keeping with the spirit of our organization and, I would add, more practical and sensible to recognize that there are differences in approach to the subject? Would it not be better to attempt to seek solutions or arrangements which will narrow these differences and -- without impairing the all important goodwill and understanding which should inspire our deliberations -- make it possible for all of us to advance, agreed step by agreed step, towards a mutually satisfactory arrangement?

Now I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that those who regard self-determination as a right take their stand as a result of deep conviction -- often in the light of bitter historical experience and under considerable and understandable pressure of public opinion. Is it unreasonable to appeal to fellow members of this organization, to approach differences with moderation and with a willingness to seek reasonable compromises; to consider that other countries which do not share their view on this particular subject are also motivated by the same high purposes, guided by long-established national traditions and a most earnest desire to do only what is right and fair?

This leads me, Mr. Chairman, to the crucial point. Members of this organization, when they signed the Charter or adhered to it, have repudiated, one and all, the idea that any human being -- and, even more, any group of human beings -- should be held in political subjection or be the object of any kind of exploitation. The very principles of our Charter proclaim in the most solemn fashion that alike in the relations between individuals and between nations or peoples, the golden rule is one of service, of dedicated and generous assistance. It is not helpful to suggest, therefore, in anything we say here that some members of our organization are not prepared to abide by these principles and are influenced by any purpose other than those which have been enshrined in the Charter. Is it not better to assume that in all this the main difference between us is not one of principle but perhaps one of method, not one of goals but rather one of approach. All of us here should seek what will be most beneficial to those peoples or areas which are not self-dependent or self-governing. We are all of us committed under the Charter to enlarge as far and as fast as possible the area of freedom in the world, in a manner which is consonant with the provisions of the Charter as a whole.