

Committee and of the Assembly took in 1950. No changes have taken place: no new factors have emerged.

My country attaches the highest importance to the signature which it places on an international instrument. When we place our signature on such a document we want to be able to stand behind it: we want it to mean what it says: we do not want it to promise more than we can deliver. That is why we are convinced, from our own intimate knowledge of our Canadian constitutional position, that a federal state clause is absolutely indispensable. That is why we have no alternative, regretfully, but to oppose the Egyptian resolution.

In our statement, we have concentrated our remarks on the draft resolution submitted by the distinguished Representative of Egypt, because it has some direct bearing on the Canadian position with respect to the draft covenants on human rights. We reserve our right to offer our comments on the Australian draft resolution at a later stage, if necessary.

The paragraph which I have quoted constitutes the latest possible direction and authority to the Human Rights Commission to work on the preparation of a federal state clause. Three years ago the General Assembly pronounced itself in favour of this in no uncertain manner. In this third Committee for example, only 3 votes were cast in opposition to the paragraph relating to the federal state clause, out of a total of 48 members present and voting. 31 votes were cast in favour of the inclusion of a federal state clause: only 3 were opposed; and there were 14 abstentions.

When the paragraph on the federal state clause was voted on in plenary, the result was equally decisive: 37 votes in favour; 7 opposed and only three abstentions.

The official records of the debates in 1950 do not show the names of the 37 delegations who voted in plenary for the federal state clause. The records of the Third Committee do show, however, the names of the 31 delegations who in plenary voted for it. Here they are:-

- "In favour: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, India, Iran, Israel, Lebanon, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela."

These 31 delegations, as well as the additional delegations who voted in favour of the federal state clause in plenary in 1950 must ask themselves the question as they look at the Egyptian proposal now before us: - "What has happened since the debates of 1950, what new factors or arguments have emerged, what changes have taken place which would justify us now in reversing the position we took in 1950, together with the overwhelming majority of members, and in supporting now the Egyptian proposal."

The answer to this question is very simple. The answer is "None". Nothing has happened since 1950 which could possibly justify a change in the position which the majority of this