

without consultation have tended to be very cautious about using their power. In Canada, we have always had to proceed on the basis of co-operation between the federal and provincial governments. Where a treaty can be implemented through federal action or establishes a framework for co-operation between two countries, the Federal Government has, of course, been able to act on its own. For many years, however, we have consulted the provinces about treaties which would require provincial legislative or other action in order to be implemented. I have mentioned that only the Federal Government can make treaties. It is also the case that only the Federal Government can accredit delegations to international organizations. Only sovereign states can, as a rule, belong to international organizations. No such body has accepted separate representation by the constituent members of a federal state. The sole exception to my knowledge is the participation of Byelorussia and the Ukraine in the United Nations, which was a result of the postwar political settlement and has not established a precedent for other countries or organizations.

The reasons are simple:

If provinces were entitled to become members of an organization such as UNESCO, in which many are interested, there could be as many as 11 separate delegations from Canada at its conferences. They might have 10 per cent of the votes, even though Canada pays only 3 per cent of the UNESCO budget. And if Canada were given this privilege, what of the United States which could claim 51 seats? UNESCO could have several hundred members.

Secondly, there has been a growing tendency for international organizations, when concluding agreements, to specify that their provisions shall apply to all parts of federal states without any limitations or exceptions. They have made the state concerned responsible for harmonizing the interests of its component parts. In face of this tendency, they would be unlikely to agree that a country could splinter its participation, with some parts favouring an agreement and others expressing reservations or objections directly at the conference table.

Lastly, many problems which arise at organizations such as UNESCO are not directly related to education or culture, but to matters of general foreign policy. UNESCO conferences have, for example, discussed the problems of Communist China or apartheid. Obviously, the provinces cannot take an independent stand on issues of this nature in international forums so long as they remain part of the federation. Is it conceivable that on such matters, some Canadian provinces will vote one way and others in an opposite way? Instead of one Canada in the world, there would be a number of entities with different foreign policies. This approach to Canadian representation in international organizations would, therefore, involve the dissolution of Canada as a single state and the creation of a series of smaller states.

In Canada, we permit and even encourage different approaches to certain problems among the various provinces or between the provincial and federal governments. This has always seemed to me healthy. The essence of our federal system is that our various governments can respond to the needs of the people they serve according to the way they think best. But I do believe that in