

Oral Questions

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MINING NICKEL FROM THE SEABED—INVOLVEMENT OF WORKERS IN DEVELOPING STRATEGY FOR NEGOTIATIONS—POSITION TAKEN BY INCO

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the grave concern felt among residents of predominantly nickel producing areas such as the Sudbury basin concerning the possible effects of the development of undersea nickel, can the minister inform the House and assure the people of these areas that the workers' representatives will be involved in the development of any strategy or negotiations between Canada, the United States and other nickel producing countries?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out that this proposal, which surfaced at the Law of the Sea Conference, has not even been discussed in the committee responsible for the international seabed authority, let alone negotiated. As I stated earlier, Canada finds this proposal quite unacceptable. The Law of the Sea delegation has authority to involve industry and union representatives in discussions, particularly with respect to the fisheries and I am sure this particular approach could be followed in consideration of mineral production.

Mr. Rodriguez: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I certainly hope that the minister will invite representatives of the miners to participate. In view of the fact that the International Nickel Company is Canada's major producer of nickel, in view of the importance of nickel to Canada's economy and in view of the reports that International Nickel Company is involved in the consortium which will be taking the nickel from the floor of the ocean, has the minister been able to determine whether INCO, and particularly its Canadian subsidiary, has been supporting the United States proposal? Can he inform the House whether INCO will support this government's position rather than what is in the best interests of International Nickel?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm either point of the hon. member's question but I shall make inquiries.

* * *

GEOGRAPHICAL SITES

POSSIBILITY NAME OF MOUNT EISENHOWER WILL BE CHANGED TO ORIGINAL NAME OF CASTLE MOUNTAIN—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on a matter of national importance with particular relationship to our friendship with the United States. In 1946 the Right Honourable Mackenzie King designated Castle Mountain in British Columbia as Mount Eisenhower in appreciation of the tremendous services rendered by General Dwight Eisenhower during the days of the war as Supreme Commander. In the last couple of weeks it has been stated in the press that the name is to

[Mr. Trudeau.]

be changed, that name Eisenhower is to be removed and Castle take its place again. May I ask the minister what the position is in this regard because I feel that this change of name cannot but have a detrimental effect on the feelings of our veterans in Canada who honoured Eisenhower as he honoured them and Canada?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I believe the name of Mount Eisenhower has the support of the vast majority of the Canadian people. Many Canadians served with great distinction and many members of this House served with great distinction under the leadership of the Supreme Allied Commander. I have been made aware that from time to time residents close to the scene have requested that the mountain revert to its former name. I, for one, think it would be a great pity if General Eisenhower's name were dissociated from that particular mountain. I can assure the right hon. member that no decision has been taken to re-name the mountain Castle Mountain.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the answer given by a very distinguished soldier of the last war who served under General Eisenhower. I bring to his attention, however, that the board in charge of naming geographic sites in Canada has announced that the change has been made and will be effective in a very short time with the approval of the government of Canada. May I have the minister's assurance that no matter what that board recommends, this name will not be changed because that could only result in bitter feelings among those who served, as he did, as well as to Americans in general on the occasion of their bicentennial?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the right hon. gentleman that the matter has not come to cabinet and has not received the approval of the government of Canada.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

POSSIBILITY OF DISCUSSION BETWEEN GENERAL DARE, COLONEL BOURNE AND PRIME MINISTER CONCERNING INVESTIGATION OF LEAKED LETTER

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I should like to ask whether he had any discussion with General Dare or Colonel Bourne last Wednesday or Thursday or both of them during which the matter of the Dare-Bourne leaked letter was discussed? If so, did either General Dare or Colonel Bourne or any RCMP officer or official inform the Prime Minister of any action intended to be taken to determine the explanation of how the letter was leaked?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I had no such meeting with any or either or both of those gentlemen. The headline to the effect that I was summoning General Dare were completely erroneous, in fact without any foundation. I have not spoken to General Dare in, I would say, months.