

The United Nations is based on the principle of "one state, one vote", with no distinction between unitary and federal states. Federal states as such have neither more nor less power than unitary states. Can we imagine that Canada could have ten or 11 seats in the Specialized Agencies of the UN while France and Britain would have only one each? Why could India not change its internal constitution in order to have 20, 50 or 100 votes? This would be splendid for federal countries. But do you think the international community would put up with it?

Let us take a specific case, that of UNESCO. If international law or the international community accepted the theory of the extension of internal competence into the international field, UNESCO would be composed of several hundred members overnight. Can anyone seriously claim that it would be able to function that way?

In fact, the international community is simply not ready, for practical reasons, to agree to let itself be fragmented by admitting Canadian provinces to its organizations as sovereign or partially sovereign bodies.

In more general terms, since people are talking about the evolution of international behavior, is there anything more important in our world than dialogue, co-operation and cohesion? We live in a world of minorities. On a global scale, there are no majorities, religious, political or linguistic. Christians, Moslems, Buddhists are all minorities. White, black, yellow -- minorities. No ideology dominates any other -- no language, no culture. In this fragmented world, we do not need separatists' bombs; we need formulas for understanding, such as federalism, which bring unity out of diversity without crushing it. Federalism represents an agreement between different communities to act together. It is the hope of Europe, which is being constructed; the hope of Africa, which can overcome tribalism; the hope of Asia, where 50 cultures sometimes exist side by side in a single country; the hope of the world. Sometimes we are too modest. Our federal experience and our daring experiment in bilingualism are admired by many and have inspired them. President Senghor recently reminded us of this very eloquently, when he said: "More basically, French and English bring us additional resources. This is not to say that we reject Francophonia today. On the contrary, we cling to it and welcome our English-speaking brothers. This is why Canada can, in this area of culture, which is man's own, serve as an example." Bilingualism and federalism are formulas for the future which have been given greater life and depth in Canada than anywhere else, and which we can continue to develop. This is what the reality of our world requires from us: the improvement of our federalism and not its fracturing into ten different foreign policies.

(III) Sharing of external policy: the results.

Let us see where the logic of those who wish to share external sovereignty between the Federal Government and the ten provincial governments actually leads us. Let us take this working theory to its logical conclusions. It is not enough to draw up constitutional theories in the abstract. We have to see where they lead us.