

*Government Orders*

House of Commons, *Fourth Edition*, which says that the Speaker may subsequently recognize the mover if the latter so desires, and otherwise any other member. However, the mover must speak first, if he wishes to speak, because by the very fact of presenting the motion, he is deemed to have spoken—this is important, he is deemed to have spoken—and the Chair will not be able to recognize him again later on. So even if last night the mover did not speak, according to the Standing Orders he is nevertheless deemed to have spoken because he presented the motion. Technically, the hon. member for Labrador became the third speaker. I just wanted to add this clarification to the ruling I gave this morning.

[*English*]

**Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary Northeast):** Mr. Speaker, since I was interrupted I will take this occasion to continue my thought process on the water issue. Bill C-51 deals with water in the Northwest Territories. Water is one of the main resources of Canada and, as a nation, if we want to survive, we have to be careful what we do with it.

• (1200)

As members know, at the present time Canada has a resource-based economy. We have water and we have natural resources. I would like to quote from "Canada West Fact Finder". In 1990, Alberta exported \$15.6 billion of goods. Of those goods, energy was 58 per cent; forest products, 4 per cent; agriculture, 16 per cent; and manufacturing only 6 per cent. The same thing applies to British Columbia where forestry was 56 per cent and the manufacturing sector only 6 per cent.

As members can see, all of our economy is based on resources. This is why the United States and Mexico are interested in having a free trade agreement with Canada. They want our resources. We have no manufacturing base, or very little. The one that exists is being destroyed in Ontario and Quebec. So water is one of the other elements that the United States and Mexico want.

The question is, are we going to have a bill, Bill C-51? Is it going to deal with the control of our water resources or not? I believe that the government has failed because it has sold out to North American business interests, especially in the United States with the signing of a free trade agreement that includes water as well. Even so, in

their promises on water policy before the last election, the government was very explicit in stating that water was not included.

We are facing a dilemma as a nation. Do we want to be simply the suppliers of the raw materials for the world or do we want a nation that respects itself and develops a manufacturing base? I think this government has fooled not only me, because I did support the free trade agreement, and this is one of the votes that I do regret. The promises that were made to us were somewhat different than what the reality is.

I hope Bill C-51 goes to the legislative committee, where appropriate witnesses will be called and amendments will be put forward.

Mr. Speaker, this is the only thing I wanted to say as I was interrupted in my comments by another member here.

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)):** Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to interrupt the hon. member. What I was seeking to do earlier on, as you so wisely observed, sir, was to get some pertinence to the debate. I value this opportunity to strive to bring us back to that.

The hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood was quite correct when he underlined the fact that this pair of bills, C-51 and C-52, have absolutely nothing to do with any alleged export of water to the United States. He was quite correct in pointing out that they do relate to water matters in the two territories.

But I would draw to the attention of the member for Calgary Northeast that the Canada-U.S. International Boundary Waters Treaty, which I think has stood for some 70 years now, forbids the diversion of water to the United States or to any other country. So the protection exists.

I am somewhat amazed that the hon. member, as a member from Alberta, rather than throwing up his hands and suggesting that we are being raped or we are about to be raped, would not work for value-added industries in our province. He should be working for diversification of our economy, rather than cry, as Chicken Little did, that the sky is falling in some way or another.