

DID NOT AGREE. YOU IMPLY THAT, IN SUCH A CASE, THE VOTE WOULD NOT BE BINDING ON US. THEN WHY INSIST THAT IT SHOULD BE CAST? THIS WOULD GIVE CURRENCY ABROAD TO A FALSE IDEA OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF POWERS UNDER THIS COUNTRY'S CONSTITUTION, TO SAY NOTHING OF THE FACT THAT SUCH A VOTE, RECORDED IN THE PRESENCE OF QUEBEC DELEGATES, WOULD INEVITABLY GIVE THE IMPRESSION THAT OUR GOVERNMENT REFUSED, AFTER THE EVENT, TO FULFIL COMMITMENTS TO WHICH IT HAD APPEARED TO CONSENT. YOU WILL READILY UNDERSTAND THAT WE DO NOT WISH TO BE PLACED IN A SITUATION WHERE WE WOULD BE LED TO ADOPT WHAT APPEARED TO BE CONSISTENTLY NEGATIVE ATTITUDES.

IN YOUR PROPOSALS YOU ARE ALSO NOT PREPARED TO ALLOW FOR THE POSSIBILITY OF QUEBEC'S SPEAKING IN ITS OWN NAME. IF YOU HAD AGREED TO THE QUEBEC MINISTER'S BEING CO-CHAIRMAN OF THE CANADIAN DELEGATION, IT MIGHT NOT HAVE BEEN NECESSARY, IN THIS CONTEXT, TO HAVE BEEN SO SPECIFIC. BUT THIS, TOO, WAS REFUSED, AND WHAT I INFER FROM YOUR LATEST PROPOSAL IS THAT NOT ONLY WILL THE QUEBEC MINISTER NOT BE CO-CHAIRMAN, BUT YOU DO NOT EVEN AGREE TO HIS SPEAKING IN THE NAME OF QUEBEC. HERE AGAIN, YOU ARE DEPARTING FROM THE ARRANGEMENTS WE HAD AGREED UPON, AT ONE TIME OR ANOTHER, FOR PREVIOUS CONFERENCES. I DO NOT UNDERSTAND THIS FURTHER CHANGE IN ATTITUDE ON YOUR PART. YOU GIVE ME TO UNDERSTAND THAT A FEW FRANCOPHONE COUNTRIES--AND NOTABLY FRANCE--COULD ADOPT AN ATTITUDE SIMILAR TO OURS ON THIS POINT, AND THAT YOU INTEND TO OPPOSE THAT ATTITUDE, AND YOU FEEL THAT THIS COULD PROVOKE A GRAVE CRISIS IN LA FRANCOPHONIE. WE ARE