

Canada Oil and Gas Act

control of the resources in our province, so too we fight on behalf of those coastal provinces which had those rights when they came into confederation.

This motion brings us directly to the heart of the bill and the philosophy of the government. The rights of the provinces, whether obtained at their entry into confederation or provided to them by amendments to the Constitution in 1930, are at the very heart of the continuation of the development of this country, which is based on regional strengths. This is a confederation, and I have to say with great sincerity that I believe the government is operating from a unitary philosophy. It is not the provinces and the rights of those provinces which are uppermost in the minds of hon. members opposite, but it is their desire to control from the centre of this country all aspects of its development. That has led to the unfortunate National Energy Program and the Canadianization concepts therein.

Before I leave the speech made by the hon. member for St. John's East on the motion now before the House, I would like to underline a very important phrase the hon. member offered for our consideration. The hon. member defended the case of Newfoundland regarding the right to offshore mineral development out 200 miles and in the seabed beyond as far as the coastal lines prevail. He said to us that what Newfoundland wants is the right to control the development of that heritage which is Newfoundland's and the right to control the economic and social ramifications that development brings the indigenous community around it so that it would be developed with the best interests of the community involved in mind. So too in Nova Scotia. The hon. member for St. John's East said it is important that we have that rate of development controlled so that Newfoundland can then proceed, in the spirit of sharing, to share with the rest of Canada. I believe it is not the intention of Newfoundland, any more than it is the intention of Alberta, in exercising control of the development of resources, to hold the benefits of those resources for themselves. It is abundantly clear that Alberta has shared the benefits of its heritage. Indeed, we can make the case, and have made it very strongly, that by accepting a price far below the world price for our energy, we have made a significant contribution to the wellbeing of Canada. If you go back to the beginning of OPEC and the rise in oil prices, this contribution amounts to some \$30 billion. While we are not looking in particular for a great amount of credit for that because we have done it in a spirit of developing Canada as best we can from all regional points of view, at the same time I think it ill behoves the government, particularly the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) to keep insisting that these problems with respect to Alberta could be solved if we had a better sense of sharing.

● (2130)

The same is true of Newfoundland. When the benefits of high technology become operative in securing the development of mineral resources in our coastal provinces, whether it be the Atlantic coast or the Pacific coast, I believe these provinces will operate in the same mode as Alberta, which is in a spirit

of sharing with the rest of Canada. However, they cannot do that, any more than we can, if they roll over and allow an excessively centralist government to dominate the ownership, control and development of those resources.

I have a number of things that I wish to say about Bill C-48, Mr. Speaker, as we proceed. I am not going to go into them all tonight. I would draw your attention only to the importance of the motion put before us by the hon. member for St. John's East concerning the protection of the rights of coastal provinces with respect to ownership of their resources.

Mrs. Erola: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to ask the hon. member to tell me who negotiated the 200-mile limit and more, the provinces or the Government of Canada?

Mr. Roche: Well, I do not know that that is a point of order, but I am glad to proceed into the question of the negotiation of the 200-mile limit and the whole aspect of the Law of the Sea. I do not know whether Mr. Speaker is going to welcome a lengthy intervention, and I will be glad to return to that, but let me just tell the minister that of course it was the Canadian government that negotiated the law of the sea. However, I would say the Canadian government's intervention would only carry as much weight as the province's agreement to participate in a national policy on the law of the sea. I believe the provinces have made a distinctive contribution to the formulation of the policy which was advanced. I hope the minister is not trying to suggest the government's policies on the Law of the Sea have been all that wonderful, because I would draw to her attention the briefing published by the North-South institute in March, 1981, entitled "Canada: The Third World and the Law of the Sea" in which the fundamental point is made that there has been an acquisitiveness underlying the policies of the Canadian government and a reluctance for revenue-sharing.

The hon. member for St. John's East made the case this afternoon, which has been referred to by others in the course of this debate, that revenue sharing in Canada can only be done if there is a proper understanding of ownership and a proper exercise of the rights of ownership. So, too, revenue sharing internationally can only be done if there is a proper understanding of the rights of ownership of other countries. I believe that what the provinces have done so far is to help in the formulation of a realistic Canadian policy which respects ownership and then goes on to the larger question of revenue sharing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I was hoping perhaps the hon. member for Edmonton South (Mr. Roche) might wish to indicate if he was prepared to accept a question, but I do not have that choice before I know whether or not the minister wished to ask a question or make a point of order. So I have to recognize the Minister of State for Mines (Mrs. Erola) on a—

Mrs. Erola: I have another question, Mr. Speaker.