

erty in Canada. Further it agreed to a process of ensuring that we would be heard and our problems would be taken into account when works which would potentially affect us were under consideration.

The next major step forward was to refer the question to the IJC for an impartial study. The results of that study have already been detailed by the hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake. In summary, the commission concluded that Canada had every right to be concerned.

Following the IJC study, both Canada and Manitoba have continued to keep the pressure on. The next major development was the proposal by the United States administration, or more properly the Department of the Interior, to Congress, of a plan which would irrigate some 96,000 acres instead of the originally proposed 250,000 acres. In 1979, by means of diplomatic notes and in meetings, Canadian concerns focusing on the problem of biota transfer were expressed concerning those features of the 96,000-acre plan which were common to the original plan, namely, the substantial interbasin transfer of water involved.

During the period from the release of the IJC report until the Canada-United States discussions on the revised plan in 1979, the United States Congress also took note of Canadian concerns. Until after the release of the IJC report, the United States Congress had not specifically indicated that funds for the project were not to be spent on project features directly inimical to Canadian interest unless and until we have been consulted. While we regret that Congress had not earlier taken our concerns into account, the conditions applied after the release of the IJC report have continued.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock this evening.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1981-82

##### SUPPLEMENTARY BORROWING AUTHORITY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Bussières (for the Minister of Finance) that Bill C-59, to provide supplementary borrowing authority, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

#### *Borrowing Authority*

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, when the House went into private members' hour at five o'clock I was speaking on Bill C-59, an act to provide supplementary borrowing authority. At that time I pointed out that the role business and government can play in strengthening our economy is an important one. I stressed that one of the requirements of Canadian business is that it takes an internationalist approach to opportunities for growth in this country. I also stressed that more research and development is required, not necessarily by the federal government alone but also by the business community.

Of course, there is a special role for the federal government. In my opinion the government's attention should be focused on economic policy rather than on disputes over power and jurisdiction. What is needed today is a farsighted and responsible framework of economic policy, including appropriate fiscal and monetary approaches. To bring this about I believe leadership is required, and that leadership must realize the three most important objectives of this government should be the stimulation of private investment, the lowering of the inflationary spiral and the development of petroleum self-sufficiency, all of which could be the springboard for future growth.

Just as I believe that the Canadian businessman has to learn how to work with governments, and in particular the federal government, I also believe that it has to improve its approach to the private sector. If business is to do its job for Canada it needs respect from the government, not confrontation. It needs recognition of its role. It needs room to breathe. It must not be muzzled and smothered by bureaucratic red tape. This has happened under the government's national energy program. The results have been chaotic. Surely it is not too much to ask that the energy antagonists sit down, consult and mediate, for we desperately need an end to the present unnerving uncertainty which the present situation is producing.

Another recurring need for all Canadians is a marked improvement in the efficiency and speed of government decision-making. As I stated earlier, the development of an entire community, namely, the town of Lockeport in Nova Scotia is at a standstill as a result of this government's inability to reach a decision concerning the cost and size of the fisheries processing plant to be replaced. I say to the government, through you, sir, we can and must do better.

Unfortunately, today this government is placing great emphasis on state control. Yet state management of the Canadian National Railways in Nova Scotia leaves much to be desired. For example, on November 5, 1980, we in Nova Scotia were informed by the Canadian Transport Commission that it planned to remove 11 agency positions in our province, eight station buildings and 12 contract on hand representative positions. Of the 11 agency positions to be removed, seven are in my constituency at Chester, Mahone Bay, Lunenburg, Liverpool, Lockeport, Shelburne and Barrington Passage. Of the eight railway stations to be removed seven are in my riding at Chester, Mahone Bay, Lunenburg, Liverpool, Lockeport, Shelburne and Barrington Passage.