

debatable interpretation of the Charter. The Charter only provides for one "representative" from each country on the Board of Directors, adding that the representative "may be" (not "will be") accompanied by an alternate.

It seems to me that the consent of the other member states would have to be obtained before a second "position" is officially allocated to Canada. Naturally, it was very clever to have chosen the word "position", which is not the wording used in the Charter; that term could apply equally to the representative and the alternate, and even to the advisers. The same comments apply to Article 6, which grants Quebec "one of the two positions allocated to Canada in the group of experts in administrative and financial management". Moreover, consideration must also be given to the question of the voting rights to be enjoyed by this Quebec "position" on the Board of Directors. Will it be able to vote on all matters brought before the Board or only on the points which are under Quebec constitutional jurisdiction? Will the procedure adopted for the General Conferences apply to the Board of Directors? These are questions to which the Agency's practices, and not its regulations, will certainly provide the answer. Actually, a strict interpretation of the Charter would probably require Quebec to occupy a place as an alternate within the Canadian delegation, but still having a right of veto. Quebec has indicated, however, that it wanted more than that.

In the second place, it is hardly astonishing to note that the emphasis is placed on "consultation" (Articles 3, 4, 5, 12 and 16). One of the grievances most often voiced by the Canadian Government about Quebec's activities abroad concerned the lack of consultation between the two governments and the fact that Ottawa was often faced with a *fait accompli*. Since this agreement was reached, the situation has changed, at least so far as the Agency is concerned.

Limits for Ottawa

The government of Quebec must inform Ottawa about its activities within the Agency. Must we conclude that, if Ottawa were to disapprove of a particular Quebec action, the Federal Government would be able to demand that it be "reformulated"? Has the Federal Government acquired a peremptory right to watch over Quebec's activities within the Agency? Of course, it was necessary to set up machinery for consultation and exchange of information, but such machin-

ery will be effective and beneficial to everyone only in so far as the Government of Canada does not feel itself called upon to narrow-mindedly supervise and approve of Quebec's slightest actions.

Finally, it is important to note the very "special" nature of Article 14, which provides that the Agency's Secretariat "shall send directly and simultaneously to the Government of Quebec copies of the notices of official conferences and meetings of the Agency that are sent to the Canadian Government". No other document could show more clearly that Quebec is not a full member of the Agency. Quebec is entitled only to copies of the official invitations, the originals being sent to Ottawa. Another "simple matter of formality" I shall be told again

Accepted by majority

These "terms and conditions" will undoubtedly be the subject of a number of masters' theses in Canada Nevertheless it must be admitted that they have been accepted or tolerated by the great majority of member states, though some participants expressed the idea that the Charter had been interpreted in a "very loose" manner.

Relieved for the time being of the Canada-Quebec burden, the Agency must still face a number of problems relating to its role and its programs. Although Paris has agreed to increase its contribution to the Agency's budget (from 45 to 46 per cent), France and Belgium do not now wish the institution to operate on too great a scale. Moreover, it is significant that arrangements have been cleverly made for the only two permanent institutions so far created, the Secretariat and the Bordeaux International School, to be located in France. Simply a matter of geographical convenience and economy, it was said.

As a participating government, Quebec will be able to make a substantial contribution to the Agency in the fields over which it has jurisdiction, such as education and culture, in so far as the Quebec leaders will give real support to such "participation". For it is possible that, in the event of a very engrossing politico-economic situation, the Quebec leaders may be unable to give such participation all the attention necessary. Quebec's participation may be even more significant if the Agency's spheres of activity, as defined at the close of the General Conference in October 1971, coincide for the most part with those areas in which Quebec has jurisdiction. Moreover, this is one manifestation of the precise framework that has

*Burden relieved
but agency still
faces problems*