

start with the Canadian businessman or the private sector. Canadian business must be involved and encouraged to invest. It is not overstating our case to say that we must retool our economy for the tough world which is coming. The Japanese and the Germans did it following World War II, and we can all see the results. To start us on the road will take some very smart businessmen and planning. It calls for confidence in our economy and nerve to take the risks but that, after all, is what private industry and private business are all about.

Next, we urgently need more research and development. The world of the 1980s and the 1990s will clearly be one in which economic and industrial gains, from which stem social gains, can only result from productivity gains. Among the most likely sources of these gains is improved technology. As Canadians we have become very comfortable in accepting the hand-me-down technologies of other countries. Our research and development expenditures, once 1.4 per cent of our GNP, have declined to a pitiful .9 per cent when the competition level is at least over 2 per cent.

If we wish to become technologically independent and competitive in the scientific seed-bed of economic progress we will have to do better. The alternative is that we pay the full price of being shut out of the growth industries of the future. I am not saying that investing more in research and development is the sole responsibility of the federal government. The federal government can help and encourage, but I believe the private individual and the private businessman must actually be the major contributor.

Another requirement of Canadian business is that it take an international approach to opportunities for growth. With our balance of payments situation and our limited domestic opportunities for economies of scale, our whole approach to doing business and expanding it must be built on a global perspective. The simple truth is that the future belongs to the world, and in this area, the federal government with its world-wide chain of high commissioners and trade commissioners can be most helpful.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock.

● (1700)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie)—Pension Act—Inquiry respecting delegation of authority under Section 33; the hon. member for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke (Mr. Hopkins)—Customs tariff—Request for removal of duty on body armour; the hon. member for Selkirk-

Garrison Diversion

Interlake (Mr. Sargeant)—Canadian Armed Forces—Reported testing of chemical defoliants.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, notices of motions and public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

Items Nos. 25 and 27 allowed to stand by unanimous consent.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

GARRISON DIVERSION—SUGGESTED MEASURES TO PROTECT ENVIRONMENT OF MANITOBA

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of taking those measures necessary to ensure that there is no damage caused to the Manitoba environment by the completion of the Garrison diversion unit in the State of North Dakota and, that such measures to be considered could include:

1. the convening of a joint meeting between provincial, state and federal authorities affected by the Garrison project;
2. the offer of legal and technical assistance to those citizen's groups in Canada now attempting to halt the progress of the Garrison diversion; and
3. the bringing to trial in the World Court, the government of the United States, should Canada be unsuccessful in its efforts to receive satisfactory assurances regarding the future safety of her environment.

He said: Mr. Speaker, getting up to speak on this matter in the House is a little like the "good news—bad news" syndrome. The good news is that I always enjoy speaking in the House on matters of concern to my constituents. The bad news is that it is rather sad, after so many years, that very little has been done to solve or end this problem.

To understand the issue of the Garrison diversion unit fully, one must consider its history, particularly its history in North Dakota. The desire to use the waters of the Missouri River to irrigate the drylands of northern North Dakota is older than the state of North Dakota itself. The first documentation that shows an interest in using this water and in constructing such a diversion is dated 1887. At much the same time a constitutional convention which preceded North Dakota entering statehood took place, and a request was made of the United States Congress that such a diversion be built. Nothing was done. However, in the 1930s, when the dust bowl that ravaged much of the prairies, including North Dakota, occurred, the desire and the dream for an irrigation system using the Missouri River waters grew again. It became quite strong, and in 1935 appeals were made to the United States Congress for the construction of this diversion unit.