

discussed are likely to extend to areas of federal jurisdiction, I feel that the federal ministers and Quebec minister could each act as Co-chairman. Incidentally, I wish to point out to you that it is not correct to indicate in the example which you give on page 3 of the Appendix to your letter that M. Marcel Masse acted as Vice-chairman and Deputy Head of Delegation during the first Niamey conference.

2. As for voting, we prefer the principle of the formula already agreed on between us for previous conferences, notably for the first Niamey conference, that is, that Canada abstain if there is no agreement within the delegation. However, to provide for situations involving matters falling entirely within the competence of the federal government, we would agree that this formula should not be applied in such cases and that the Co-chairman appointed by the federal government should then vote in accordance with the instructions of his government.

3. As for signature of the convention, I would refer you to that part of the Appendix to this letter which deals with this question.

B - ARRANGEMENTS CONCERNING THE QUEBEC GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN PARTICIPATION IN THE AGENCY:

I need not go into detail regarding these arrangements. The changes which I propose in the Appendix stem from principles previously stated.

On page 5 of the Appendix to your letter, you make reference to the juridical statutes of the Agency. I would have preferred you to indicate in your letter what you thought of these proposals. To make them more flexible our officials suggested several changes in our initial proposal. We have never received any official response to these suggestions and your new counter-proposals make no mention of them. On this subject, I would draw your attention to the fact that the changes which we would like to see made in the proposed statutes are aimed essentially at clearly defining the role, place and specific nature of the Quebec government's participation in the Agency, and furthermore to conform with the constitutional positions we have taken. Since we have already suggested that it should be clearly recognized that there be a single Canadian representative having a single vote, I would like to know what you think of the changes we wish to make in the draft constitution in order to dispel any misunderstanding. Even if I do not again refer to them in the Appendix, I would like you to consider these changes as still being an integral part of our proposal.

In short, through this affair, it seems to me essential that we reflect outside the country the constitutional, historical and demographic reality of Canada, as its people know it. It seems essential to me that the aspirations of Quebec and its Government should be respected. In this respect, the changes I would like to see brought about in your counter-proposals are fundamental in nature.

Yours faithfully,

J.J. Bertrand.