

government gets its priorities straight and until this government is certain that its unilateral actions are backed by international law. For all these reasons, I am opposed to this legislation in its present form and wording.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member who last spoke would permit a question since, I think, he has some time left.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): No. I am sorry to inform the hon. member that the time allotted to the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) has expired. However, with the unanimous consent of the House I can permit a question to be put to him. Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Rompkey: Mr. Speaker, I was wanting to intervene on a point of order to ask if I might have some minutes to speak. However, I understand we have until six o'clock this evening. In view of that perhaps we could agree to that.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I have just a short question for the hon. member. I followed the Nova Scotia election. The hon. member made reference to Nova Scotia and to the position of the government. As I understand it, the Premier of Nova Scotia has now said that he has a deal with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and that he agrees to what the Prime Minister offered him in a letter which was sent this summer. I have read the letter, and it appears to me that the Prime Minister has offered revenue sharing and 100 per cent of revenue for a period, but in fact he has retained federal control.

I wonder if the hon. member, who made reference to the position of the government in Nova Scotia, could explain to me why the Government of Nova Scotia has given up its claim to offshore control and why its policy differs with the policy of the Conservative Party here in the House. Perhaps he could clear that up for me because I think there is plainly a conflict.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, this explains why the NDP now has only one member in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Waddell: A smart answer, but it does not answer the question.

Mr. Crouse: The simple fact is that we have not given up our claim to offshore resources. What we want to have is a stronger voice in administrative arrangements and in the revenue sharing which will accrue to our province when the offshore oil and gas developments take place. We want to have a say as to where the drilling equipment will be built, where the oil pumping platforms will be constructed, and who will man them. There is a host of ancillary industries which are allied with this enormous type of development. When we look at the figures I have put on the record as taken from the minister responsible for DREE and see the potential, we want to know precisely the areas in which our province will share. That is why I raise these issues and place them on the record today.

Canada Oil and Gas Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Before I recognize the next hon. member to speak, I want to make my apologies to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), who earlier approached the Chair and indicated that one of the members of his party would like to speak. Subsequent to that I see that the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Rompkey) is rising to be recognized, and I have to remind hon. members to my left that the Chair is obligated to move from left to right in that order. So I will recognize next the Minister of National Revenue and thereafter, if he rises, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Alberni (Mr. Miller).

Hon. William Rompkey (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak this afternoon, but both the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson) and the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) have referred to me, and I feel, moreover, that it is important to put the facts on the record, in view of the allegations and positions put forward by the opposition.

The main case the opposition is putting forward is ownership. Ownership is completely irrelevant in this issue. Hon. members opposite are arguing on the grounds put forward by the Premier of Newfoundland. When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) was head of the administration, he wrote a letter to the Premier of Newfoundland. If the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre had gone on to quote the letter at greater length than he did, I think he would have shown that that letter was so full of holes as to be meaningless. The then prime minister granted ownership on certain conditions, and those conditions certainly depended on federal jurisdiction. In my opinion, that letter from the then prime minister was really not worth the paper on which it was written and, indeed, did not address in a legitimate way the question of ownership because that issue cannot be addressed.

Ownership is not the relevant issue, and I think we should put that to rest. Let me give an example. The province of Newfoundland owns the forests of Newfoundland, it owns every tree in Newfoundland, yet we have signed three DREE agreements with that province to improve the forest industry there and to build up the provincial forest service. There is no way it could have been done without federal participation. That resource is completely and utterly owned by the province, but I submit it would have been impossible to develop the forests of Newfoundland without federal participation. The question of ownership in that case is completely and utterly irrelevant.

Let me give a second example. A mine in my riding is being closed down. It is not a question of ownership. The province owns that mine. It owns all the minerals under the earth, yet where is the province coming for help? It is coming to the federal government.

I submit again that ownership is not the relevant issue. Just because you own something that does not mean you have jurisdiction over it or you control it because the important concept here is not ownership at all but, indeed, jurisdiction and control, and that is what we have been trying to point out to the Government of Newfoundland for the last two years.