

2(1)(b) those submarine areas adjacent to the coast of Canada and extending throughout the natural prolongation of the land territory of Canada to the outer edge of the continental margin or to a distance of two hundred nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of Canada is measured, whichever is the greater;

In simple language this amendment says that the Government of Canada, without consent, without any joint federal provincial arrangement, owns the submarine lands adjacent to the coastlines of the Atlantic provinces. That is why we in that area have been, historically, on the receiving end looking for some economic strength and growth.

We finally started to see a glimmer on the horizon when we saw oil rigs offshore. I will not get into the question of who shares what, whether it should be 60-40, 50-50 or the back-in provision of 25 per cent. In my opinion those are iniquitous under the act. I know the formula has been changed. This is a principle which almost every Atlantic Canadian firmly objects to. We object most strenuously to it. Using the rhetoric, which is what we can use—in other jurisdictions they would use bullets—we will object until the cows come home, until we are forced to vote on this bill to unilaterally give away what we had historically even before Confederation. That is the point which makes us aggrieved, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: These are not my words. Unfortunately, in the 20 minutes I have I do not have the time to go through the entire history. But in view of the sincere comments made by the hon. member opposite, it would not hurt to repeat some of that history. Part of the problem in Canada is that we do not have instant pudding history. The situation becomes worse when you begin to pollute the pudding that you do have. The situation worsens when history is ignored. I am talking about the British North America Act, the charter of James I or William Alexander's charter which set out the definition of Nova Scotia. I am talking about Nova Scotia; the hon. member for St. John's East talked about Newfoundland. Nevertheless, the general principle applies in terms of maritime offshore resources.

I would like to speak specifically in terms of Nova Scotia. Hon. members opposite can ask rhetorical questions. The bill we are debating says that for the first time the federal government will own these Canada lands which are set out in the interpretation section of the bill. This raises a philosophical question with regard to the words "in right of Canada". We are all Canadians, let us share and share alike. The federal government has tax policies to help the sharing. I ask the hon. member opposite, who must appreciate this fact: why should we in Atlantic Canada, and in Nova Scotia, be the only provinces which do not own their natural resources in adjacent areas of the sea? Does he not appreciate the history of this land? Let us take James Bay for an example. When this country was formed in 1867, Canada lands of the day included one half or one third of Quebec. I do not plan to just pick on Quebec. I will talk about the tar sands development and the mineral wealth of northern Ontario. These, too, were parts of the country which formed Canada lands of the day. The term

Canada Oil and Gas Act

Canada lands seems to be something new from the heavens, an open sesame to the new world and a new distribution service wherein everyone will be treated equally. We will share the bubbles from gas and the slickness of oil. We will share. I want to share, but that is not the topic of debate this evening.

As far as I am concerned, when we are speaking about motion No. 3, why should we in Nova Scotia sit quietly back and allow the federal government to come in and say, "The history of Nova Scotia since 1621 is wrong. We own it. You must come to us on bended knee and find out how we will administer it?" Why should we in Nova Scotia who, prior to confederation, had control of our offshore mineral resources, allow the government to come in and take Sable Island where a great deal of the action is today in terms of oil and gas, especially gas? As my hon. friend said this afternoon, a provincial government fell on the issue of ownership in 1978. The present Minister of Labour (Mr. Regan) tried to defend the federal position of a 75-25 share to administer the wealth and to try and reach a practical sharing formula. As we all know, the trouble with that principle is that he who owns the resources calls the tune. There is no doubt that if you own a resource, you can direct its development. We do not feel that confident when there are competing interests in a country such as Canada with a federal government away in Ottawa which perhaps gives priority to the development of a resource which we thought we had owned since 1621. I say to the hon. member opposite, partly in answer to his question, that he would be just as aggrieved if the situation were reversed historically.

I am all for the Canada lands which were created in 1867. At that time they became trump cards. There was James Bay, which I am all for. It is one of the great creations of our engineering skills in Canada. As we all know, Hydro Quebec is a fantastic colossus which has economic clout in terms of the dollars which it produces for Canada and Quebec. The mineral wealth being ceded to Ontario and the development of the tar sands in Alberta were not part of the original confederation agreement. That is when Canada gave Canada lands to those parts of the country, and since then they have become very valuable.

Let us not kid ourselves about this bill in terms of distribution. This bill does not affect those ex-Canada lands. It affects and directs the development of the present Canada lands, the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories, and then it adds to Canada lands parts of Canada which were not defined in the term before.

● (2040)

That is the whole point. Your Honour and I could go back to section 109 of the BNA Act which makes it very clear as to who has jurisdiction of the mineral resources and the seabed of Nova Scotia. I am not going to confuse everyone by reading a lot of historic definitions; but, in effect, the definition of section 109, as most hon. members are aware, is:

All lands, mines, minerals, and royalties belonging to the several provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick at the Union—