

practice would permit Quebec's voice to be heard on the world scene; but it would also give another dimension to Canada's French voice, which could thus reach beyond Quebec's borders and, at the same time, assist in its development both in this country and abroad.

If, as I hope, I have shown that the clear interests and ideals of Quebeckers, French-Canadians and all other Canadians are more accurately reflected in the international French-speaking community by French-oriented federal action than by exclusively provincial and necessarily more restricted action, it goes without saying that, in those fields that do not relate exclusively to the French-speaking community, Quebec's interests must also be served within a Canadian context. In saying this, I may appear to be tilting at windmills, inasmuch as no one, to my knowledge, is contesting the Federal Government's jurisdiction in external policy; the only fields where there is, in fact, any disagreement are those relating to the French-speaking community and those under provincial jurisdiction. But it is essential, in my opinion, to distinguish very clearly between Canada's internal and external relations. Within our borders, there is no hierarchy among the various governments. We have a central government which has jurisdiction in certain fields; and we have provincial governments which have jurisdiction in certain other fields. Our constitution (or what passes for one, the British North America Act) was written 100 years ago and naturally contains a certain number of vague points that must be clarified in the light of modern reality. On this, the Prime Minister and the provincial premiers agreed at the federal-provincial conference that took place early in February. Whatever changes they may make to the constitution, jurisdiction in internal matters will remain divided between the Federal Government and the provinces. Education, for instance, is clearly within the competence of the provinces, while national defence is a federal responsibility. Thus, each government, whether federal or provincial, is completely sovereign in its own field.

We are so used to this situation that the division of powers between the Federal Government and the provincial governments seems quite normal - as, indeed, it is in domestic matters. At the international level, however, the situation is quite different. As seen from abroad, Canada, like all countries, whether federal or unitary, is a single entity and international law is not concerned with whether this agreement or that convention falls within federal or provincial jurisdiction. In international law, there is only one Canada possessing international personality and it is the Federal Government which represents this Canada. There could no more be any question of a sovereign country or international organization signing a treaty with a province of Canada than of that country or body signing an international agreement with the Canton of Berne in Switzerland, Croatia in Yugoslavia or the State of Massachusetts in the United States. This rule of international sovereignty, which was not invented by Canada, derives from international law, international usage and plain good sense. Under this rule, therefore, each federal state must settle within its borders the problem of how each of its component parts is to obtain the benefits which accrue from contacts and relations with foreign countries and international bodies. In almost all federal states, the central government has maintained exclusive control over international relations. In Canada, we have acted differently; the central government has long had a flexible policy in the field of external relations. You will not see a