

23. In his telegram of March 12, the Prime Minister of Canada agreed that the words "in the name of Quebec" be inserted in the text of the agreement; this form of words had already been employed in ad hoc arrangements for earlier conferences (see page 5). There was no question of thereby recognizing, for Quebec or any other province, an international status distinct from that of Canada. More than anything else, this arrangement allowed the experiences of the various Canadian provinces to be voiced at the conference. Although somewhat ambiguous, the expression "in the name of Quebec" in fact added very little to the text originally proposed by the federal government and accepted by that of Quebec. The Prime Minister of Canada considered that such a simple question should not be a stumbling block to Ottawa-Quebec agreement, and accepted the following clause: "The Minister or senior official of the Quebec government can speak in the name of Quebec on any subject within the constitutional competence of the Quebec government". The meaning given to this clause is fully explained in the telegram of March 12 from the Prime Minister of Canada.

#### VOTING

24. The matter of the vote was somewhat more complex. In its initial proposal, the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs adopted a formula used at earlier conferences (page 2). This formula provided that the Canadian delegation would have only one vote and that, if the members of the delegation could not agree among themselves, Canada would abstain.

25. This formula had proved to be satisfactory at earlier conferences because, in fact, no decisions involving budgetary allocations or adoption of a convention were taken on those earlier occasions; in addition, had any such decisions been taken, it would have been by means of consensus, that is, without a vote. This was not, in any event, the situation which would prevail at Niamey II, where a budget and statutes would be adopted and where decisions would be taken on the basis of the unanimous vote of members present and voting. For these reasons, while leaving it open to the provinces to express their points of view on proposals made at the conference which bore on matters of exclusive provincial competence, the federal government could not agree that a province could prevent the federal government from using its right of veto if faced with a proposal at Niamey which involved foreign policy considerations and to which the federal government was firmly opposed. This right was, in addition, not contested by Quebec.

26. The Department of External Affairs therefore proposed a different formula to take account of the foregoing considerations. Proposals and counter-proposals followed one after