to the Committee and it is the intention of the Canadian Delegation to raise these points at the appropriate time during the detailed reading of the Covenants.

For the time being, I should like to state our position on provisions which are common to both Covenants. The Canadian Delegation considers that one of these provisions should not have been included in the Covenants. I am speaking now of Article 1 dealing with self-determination. I need not emphasize here that Canada is, to use the expression of our distinguished Vice-Chairman, "100 percent in favour" of self-determination and independence. Were it not so, Canada would be repudiating not only the United Nations Charter but also its own history of recent decades. We continue to believe in the principle of self-determination which we think deserves the fullest respect and support of all and we attach the greatest importance to its recognition. It is our view, however, that self-determination is more a collective right than an individual human right and for this reason we do not consider that it is in its proper place in the Covenants any more than it would be in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Nor do we think that it is proper to invest the Human Rights Committee with the responsibilities provided for in Article 48 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. On the subject of the functions of the Human Rights Committee, the Canadian Delegation considers that it would be inappropriate both from a legal and practical standpoint to grant the right of petition to individuals and non-governmental organizations. The system envisaged in the Commission's draft whereby each state party to the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights would be able to appeal to the Human Rights Committee should, in our opinion, prove to be an adequate instrument for ensuring effective implementation of this Covenant.

There are two other provisions which appear in both Covenants with which the Canadian Government wishes to express its disagreement. One of these articles is the so-called territorial application clause. I do not think it is practicable nor indeed fair to expect states administering non-self-governing territories to apply, overnight so to speak, all the provisions of the Covenants to all the territories over which they have some jurisdiction "be they Non-self-governing, Trust or Colonial Territories". Many of these territories already enjoy a certain measure of autonomy of which they are understandably jealous. There is no doubt that a good number of the provisions of the Covenants which, as we all know run so deep into the life of the community, already come under the purview of colonial governments and legislatures. To insist on the inclusion of the territorial clauses (Articles 28 and 53) as they now read is to make it impossible for a number of states administering non-self-governing territories to become parties to the Covenants. To prevent these states from becoming parties would not be in the general interest.