As I say, we made the north the place it is, a great place for the people of this country. This government is doing everything in its power, despite our protestations, to undo the progress made by the previous government in northern development.

Mr. Chrétien: May I ask the hon. member another question?

Mr. Baldwin: Delighted.

Mr. Chrétien: Is he aware that when the Conservatives were in power, mining production in the north was about \$26 million a year? This year mining production will be over \$200 million.

Mr. Baldwin: Of course I am aware of that. For ten years prior to 1957 the people of the Northwest Territories implored the then Liberal government to do something about building a railroad to provide access to the north. Who was responsible for building the Mackenzie highway? Who was responsible for constructing the Pine Point railway? A large part of the mining production of which the minister speaks is the result of the construction of the Pine Point railway. This mine was put into production because this railway was built by the previous Conservative government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: Let the minister answer that.

Mr. Greene: What did Sir John A. do? Nothing.

Mr. Baldwin: That is the trouble with too many members of this government: they have their minds back even before the time of Sir John A. Let them bring their minds up to date. Let them realize that in the 20th century the Northwest Territories is a living, viable part of this country.

Mr. Ricard: Give them a mind first.

Mr. Baldwin: My hon. friend says there is some question about whether they have a mind, and I agree with him on that.

I did not intend to make a long speech, but I was provoked by the inaccurate questions and remarks made by both ministers. If the minister is of the opinion that it is not the intention of the government to leave any loophole with regard to the export of water, then he should have no difficulty in accepting my amendment. In order to ensure there is no doubt about the matter, I would move,

Northern Inland Waters Bill

seconded by the hon, member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt):

"This House declares that the bill fails to enunciate the principle that the inland water resources of northern Canada and the Yukon territory and the Northwest Territories ought not to be exported from Canada by licence or otherwise and the bill should not be proceeded with.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I should raise a point of order or a point of procedure, but I do not think the motion is acceptable. We are not discussing exportation here; we are talking about the management of water resources in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon territory. It is not a bill relating to international markets or exportation. There is some legislation that provides for Canadians in such circumstances. This bill deals only with management of the water within the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. I should like to point out to the Chair that this amendment in my view is not acceptable.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: On this particular issue-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has raised an interesting point. The Chair would be pleased to hear the views of all hon. members who can contribute to the enlightenment of the Chair on the point of order.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, on this particularly limited aspect, I would point out that in view of the clauses I have already read, this bill refers to the uses of water, and the uses of water are defined to include diversion of water. By any simple understanding of one of the languages that this House has adopted, a diversion of waters falls within that definition. Obviously, export would be a diversion of waters from the territories.

What I am saying is there is no limitation of the right to use water for diversion to places outside of the territories. A glance at the definition section, and those clauses which deal with rights and powers, would indicate beyond any shadow of doubt that the power is authorized to grant to applicants for licences the right to make use of these waters and to divert them for this particular purpose. How can the minister or any person stand in this House and say that those provisions are not wide enough to include any use at all? We are saying there is a gap; let's close it. If the minister is sincere, then I hope he will accept the amendment.