## adoption of the Egyptian resolution. 1911 as othe emeldors established

effectiveness I ask each member of this Committee to remember, as we take the vote on this important resolution, that a vote in favour of the Egyptian proposal is a vote to slam the door in the face of certain federal states: for in the absence of a fair and reasonable federal state clause these states are consitiutionally debarred from accepting the responsibilities and obligations set forth in the covenants. 220000 on 200100

Because of the importance of this question the Canadian Delegation requests a roll-call vote in this Committee. It will also ask for a roll-call vote in plenary: for, if, by the adoption of this resolution the door is to be shut in the face of federal states who have this problem, the Delegation of Canada wishes to have the record show whose hands were on the door. distinction should in our opinion be drawn between the reserve clause and the federal state clause. The reserve clause is clearly an escape clause by which states can declare their intention not to assume certain obligations which they are con-stitutionally quite capable of assuming. The federal state clause on the other hand would not relieve the Government of Canada of sincle cher hand would not relieve the Government of Canada of

Capable of assuming. Possible under the reservetion with respect to all clauses of the venerate the reservetion with respect to all clauses of the ovenants to the extent that the subject matter of the covenants Les within provincial and outside federal jurisdiction. What this amounts to is giving permission to a federal state to write federal state clause into the covenants by way of its own i unilateral reservation. I doubt very much that this "back-door" solution of the problem would be regarded as a happy or honest one with the problem would be regarded as a happy or honest one, either by the unitary states or by the federal states diemselves.

single obligation under the covenants which it is constitutionally

We are asking for no such back-door solution. We a Mot asking the Committee to mix oil and water by burying the problems of federal states in the reserve clause, or by offering them a devious and doubtful way out from their problem, - a means of escape which clearly was not originally intended for

I would emphasize again, that unlike the reserve clause <sup>10</sup> are not insisting on the federal state clause for the purpose <sup>00</sup> enabling us to escape from a single obligation which is con-<sup>01</sup> enabling us to escape from a single obligation which is con-Attitionally within the power of the covernment of taimeds, we are not asking for the federal state clause for the purpose of enabling us to apply the covenants in certain provinces of Canada and not in others, as our Egyptian colleague seems to think. We are not asking for the federal state clause for the purpose of alping out the colonial powers. The colonial powers can take are of themselves.

The Delegation of Canada is asking for the rejection the Egyptian resolution for only one reason, and that is I believe a worthy one whose motives all members of the Committee, host of all the Egyptian representative will understand. We do ot want the door to be closed forever on the possibility of ederal states like our own signing, ratifying and implementing the covenants. Yet that, I must state in all seriousness to the Committee, is exactly what will be the consequences of the