

manage, then the only thing you can negotiate is joint management. Newfoundland has been told, for example, that the federal government is willing to enter into a joint management agreement over those lands and that revenue sharing would be the same, from 12 miles to the continental shelf which Canada has the right to exploit, as it is for the province of Alberta.

The hon. member opposite asks why Newfoundland cannot own the offshore, meaning beyond 12 miles, I presume. If I have to go through that again, then I think there is a serious question of their listening or understanding.

The hon. member for St. John's East dealt with the question of ownership in his speech. After listening to him yesterday, I am quite confident that he was not talking only about the first 12 miles but was talking about the entire continental shelf, out to 200 miles and in some cases beyond, where the continental shelf goes beyond the coast of Newfoundland. That is the basic flaw, the basic fallacy; it cannot be owned.

The other point is that Canada has negotiated this treaty with other nations and Canada has the right to exploit, and also the responsibility for any occurrences which happen within that area under which Canada has been given jurisdiction. Therefore, if there are obstructions to navigation, the Government of Canada is responsible; if there is pollution, the Government of Canada is responsible according to international law, and the Government of Canada is responsible for the management of the fishery.

The question then arises, how can the Government of Canada be asked to be responsible for anything that occurs in that region which happens to violate international law and then be told that all developments and all management of the resources in that area must be under the exclusive control of the province? That is asking the federal government to take responsibility for something over which it is being asked to give away all authority. By any rational calculation, that is simply unacceptable. At the most, it should be precisely what the Prime Minister has offered to the province of Newfoundland: a jointly managed arrangement where the federal government can protect itself against those claims which arise in international law as the result of its negotiated treaty obligations over that territory.

Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker. That is the reality of the situation. The questions that have been brought out by the other side indicate that they have not read the bill and that they do not understand what this particular clause does and does not do. Hon. members opposite do not understand the reality of the 12-mile and 200-mile limits.

Let me go on now to indicate that this lack of understanding not only relates to hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, but also to the province of Newfoundland. The hon. member for St. John's East referred to a letter from the Prime Minister to the premier of Newfoundland outlining four principles. The first is as follows:

That the province of Newfoundland should own mineral resources of the continental margin in so far as Canada should own them.

Canada Oil and Gas Act

Canada does not own them, Mr. Speaker. It owns them out to 12 miles. There is a statement saying that as far as Canada should own them, the province of Newfoundland should own them.

The letter continues:

That the Government of Canada should continue to have legislative jurisdiction in certain areas such as the environment, shipping and so on.

They must have this because under international law, they have responsibility for those areas and therefore must have the legislative jurisdiction to protect the people of Canada.

Earlier the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) spoke about the same basic issue, and effectively said that there should be concurrent power in the federal government and the provinces in a number of areas such as environment, fishing, shipping, and so on and that, finally, there should be revenue sharing as a result, and that is the way Canada can work and be fair to all.

We could not agree more, Mr. Speaker. That is what has been offered, not only to Newfoundland but to New Brunswick, to British Columbia, to Nova Scotia.

I become more than a bit concerned when time after time, day after day, on bills such as this, with regard to an amendment that is improperly drafted and misconstrued, we hear the opposition harangue the government for doing something that the government is not trying to do. If hon. members opposite would read that definition carefully, they would see that it is not the intent of the federal government to strip away provincially-owned resources or to rape the provinces. The intent is to ensure that Canada protects its international claim under treaty to those areas off its coasts for which we fought so hard to obtain the international treaty. There will be sharing, there will be equity, but let us keep the question of equity and ownership and those realities in proper perspective. I hope, in the speeches that follow, hon. members opposite will keep these things in mind as they go on with their discussion of this amendment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether there is time to permit a question or two of the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans). In his comments, the hon. member suggested, first of all, that the law of the sea convention has been concluded and ratified and is now universal law. He should know, of course that it is not even concluded.

The other point he suggested in his speech—and I wonder if he has it clearly in his mind—is whether the federal authorities, when negotiating international agreements, negotiate only in those areas and for federal purposes only and do they negotiate on behalf of all of Canada, including provinces—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is really making a speech. If the hon. parliamentary secretary wishes to reply, he may.