

CANADIAN RESPONSE TO DR. KISSINGER'S PROPOSALS FOR
MINING SEABED

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I have one brief supplementary for the Prime Minister. In his address to the Law of the Sea Conference on April 8, Dr. Kissinger said that if the deep seabeds are not subject to international agreement, the United States can and will proceed to explore and mine on its own. However, he said he would favour partial international control through a council which should reflect the interests of producer and consumer states most concerned with deep sea mining. Canada is clearly one of these. He also said that the United States would agree to accept a temporary limitation for a fixed period only on the production of seabed minerals tied to the projected growth in the world nickel market. After this period seabed production should be governed by over-all market conditions.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister what the Canadian response has been to these proposals as put forward by Dr. Kissinger.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will inquire, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTION CANADA CALL CONFERENCE TO DECIDE
BOUNDARIES OF LAND AT BOTTOM OF THE SEA

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is on the same subject, and it is also addressed to the Prime Minister. In view of the failure of the Law of the Sea conference of yesterday, and in view of the fact that the present international law is based on the Canadian proposal of 1958, namely, that the land at the bottom of the sea belongs to the littoral state, would the Prime Minister now consider, since this was a Canadian proposal in 1958, that Canada now should take the lead and call for a conference of the nations of the north Pacific and the north Atlantic to decide what the boundaries of the land at the bottom of the sea in these two respective oceans are?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who will be returning from the Law of the Sea conference, will be interested in these suggestions.

PRIORITY OF NEGOTIATIONS WITH UNITED STATES
CONCERNING EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES 200 MILES
SEAWARD

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Prime Minister can say whether the Canadian government has assigned a very high priority to negotiations with the United States on the determination of the boundaries between our two countries on the west coast, on the north coast and on the east coast, as they will extend out to the 200 mile limit. There are extremely important matters at issue here, and I wonder if the Prime Minister is really aware of how high a priority must be

Oral Questions

attached to those negotiations and when they are going to begin.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I heard the Minister of State (Fisheries) answer a similar question a few days ago. I agree that, in view of the results of the Law of the Sea Conference, this question has added urgency. I am sure it has rather high priority.

* * *

[Translation]

BILINGUALISM

INQUIRY AS TO WAY FEDERAL SUBSIDIES ARE SPENT

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State.

With regard to bilingualism in education, could the minister tell the House how federal subsidies for bilingual education are divided among provinces. Can he assure us that those funds are indeed devoted to provincial bilingual education programs?

[English]

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to do that. In the case of the province with which I think the hon. member is concerned, it is roughly \$8.9 million per year. As to exactly how that is expended I would have to give him a more elaborate answer, probably later this day.

* * *

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

PROTECTION OF RIGHT OF PROVINCES TO OBJECT TO
AMENDMENTS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. I know he was busy yesterday discussing with the premiers the energy problem, but with reference to the constitution, was there any agreement with regard to that? Second, will the Prime Minister assure the House, and in particular the small provinces—I am perhaps speaking now out of a little selfish interest in reference to western Canada—that whatever the mechanisms in the criteria for amending the constitution are there will be some mechanism to protect the small provinces, and that it will not be only Quebec or Ontario which will have the right to veto any changes when the constitution is home?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on the first part of the question, the premiers informed me that they are having their ministers meeting, I believe within the next fortnight, on this subject, and that they would be in a position to report to me on the success or otherwise of that meeting at the first ministers meeting on June 14.

On the second part of the question, if the hon. member refers to the letter I tabled in the House which I addressed to all the premiers about a month ago, he will see that under the various options there are indeed ways in which