

the sea is defined as the territorial sea of Canada; the internal waters of Canada other than inland waters; any fishing zones prescribed pursuant to the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act; the Arctic waters within the meaning of the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, all of which are perfectly clear, and then any area of the sea adjacent to the areas referred to in paragraphs (a) to (d) as may be prescribed. I am particularly concerned about that when it is read in conjunction with Clause 19 which provides in part:

Where an offence against this act is committed by a person, whether or not he is a Canadian citizen, in any area of the sea referred to in paragraphs 2(2)(a) to (e)—

Could the parliamentary secretary, who I am sure has given a great deal of thought to this bill, indicate to the House what the government has in mind when it says in paragraph 2(2)(e) "any area of the sea adjacent to the areas referred to" in those paragraphs? How far away from the territorial sea of Canada would that area adjacent extend—would it be up to 10 miles, 15 miles or 20 miles?

I am worried about the question of jurisdiction when charges are laid, particularly in light of some of the decisions of the World Court, with which the hon. member and I are particularly acquainted. I am wondering about this area of Canadian jurisdiction when charges are to be laid against persons who are alleged to have committed offences in these areas adjacent to the sea. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary could elaborate on that for a few minutes.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) would repeat that question?

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, any member, other than a member from the inland province of Saskatchewan, would know very well what I mean.

**Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo):** Mr. Speaker, I am not certain I can answer all the questions the hon. member has raised. Many of them are highly technical and are the kinds of questions that should be answered in committee. If I thought the hon. member were serious in making this speech in the form of a question I would take him seriously, but I do not think I should take him seriously now. I would be happy to assure the hon. member that the minister will appear at some stage before the committee, along with the appropriate officials who will be able to answer any of these technical questions the hon. member might like to raise. I should like the hon. member to attend the committee hearings.

● (2020)

**Mr. Baldwin:** I am sure the committee proceedings will be in order.

**Mr. Roche:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to pose a question to the parliamentary secretary, if I can get his attention. I should like to ask him how he possibly could have made a speech on ocean dumping tonight without one single word or reference to the Law of the Sea Conference that is now going on in Geneva, which is considering ocean dumping as well as many other subjects related to the common

heritage of the sea. Is this not an indication of the government's—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I think the hon. member is taking advantage of a question to make his own speech. This is not according to the rules. If the parliamentary secretary wishes to answer I shall allow him to do so, but personally I feel this is not a proper procedure at this stage.

**Mr. Roche:** I will repeat my question for him in a shorter form. I simply want to know why, in the speech he made tonight, he made no reference to the Law of the Sea Conference in Geneva, which is very important to Canada.

**Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo):** I suppose the hon. member could mention many things that could have been contained in the speech. The hon. member might refer to the statements which have been made about the Law of the Sea Conference by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc), the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Sauvé) and others.

I do not believe it is a valid point at this stage to suggest I should discuss everything that is being dealt with by the Law of the Sea Conference. It is dealing with many important questions, one of which is the 200-mile zone. We are all concerned about this. I think we all hope we will achieve the 200-mile economic zone at the Law of the Sea Conference. Really, however, I think this is a question which has been very adequately debated. The position of the Government of Canada is very clear relating to what it hopes to achieve at the Law of the Sea Conference.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the parliamentary secretary would permit one further short question.

**Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo):** Yes.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Thank you very much. My question relates to the matter referred to by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), that is, the definition of the sea as it appears on page 3 of the bill. There is a reference to the territorial sea and various other seas. There is also mention of areas under foreign jurisdiction, and other areas. Would the parliamentary secretary assure us that when the matter goes to the committee there will be someone present from the department to tell us what part of the sea the bill does not refer to, in view of the broad definition that has been placed in the clause? Would he undertake to do that?

**Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo):** Yes, I would be happy to give the undertaking that at the hearings of the committee on this bill we will answer all technical questions any hon. member would like to raise.

**Mr. Joe Clark (Rocky Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised to be debating this matter tonight, but I am pleased that the government has at last found the time to devote to this matter in the House of Commons.

This is a matter which all parties in the House have agreed is of some substantial importance to Canada, to the longer range development of programs and agreements of the type being discussed at the current conference in