

*Supply*

the deputy ministers to take over and run the departments. There are many examples of this.

What is a first rate senior civil servant? Chances are he is an academic with many years of university. Chances are he has been trained in public administration, grown up and developed in the civil service. If you look at all these pooh-bah civil servants who really run this country you will find very few who have had much experience out in the real world of the marketplace. They do not know what happens to the 50-year old vice-president of a company when it starts to go down the drain and he has to either produce or go. There are an awful lot of those vice-presidents unemployed today—good men, but business has changed. That does not happen to civil servants.

I do not want to deal with all the things wrong with the National Energy Program, but I do want to deal with how it was put together in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Let me give you an example of how the bureaucracy has run the country. They sat there in that department and said; well, there are 480 drilling rigs operating in western Canada. How much profit should we allow them to have? They worked at the figures and did all the academic things, and said; all right, we will allow a rig to make "X" amount of dollars. That is good enough. That became part of the NEP. What they forgot was that the operators had options. They forgot that if the operator did not like the profit he was allowed to make, he could pack up and head south to the Colorado play, or the Montana and Louisiana play. That is exactly what they did, by the hundreds. It never dawned on anyone in the department that that would happen when they tried to almost socialize and cut back on these operators. That is a mere example of the kind of thinking which goes on in the bureaucracy.

Does anyone really believe that the National Harbours Board in Ottawa, 4,280 miles from the west coast, has any concept of the competitive nature of port usage on the west coast? Do they really have any knowledge of what we are trying to do out there, or what are the competitive factors? I doubt it. All we have to do is look at what has happened out there to realize that. I think you could go through many government departments and find the same type of thinking.

When did all this start to happen? I did a little investigation and found that basically it started around the Pearson years. That is when politics became such a big game that ministers spent their time flying about the country making speeches, sitting in cabinet and in this House doing what we can almost call 99 per cent political work.

• (1750)

Prior to that time, in the C. D. Howe era, back in the days of Mackenzie King, when a minister of the Crown was given a department to run, he ran the ruddy department. Most of a minister's time was spent in his office running that department, riding herd over the civil service and making sure the decisions were right and that the department ran properly. If a minister did not do that, he would have caused so much embarrassment he would have been replaced.

However, the amount of time an individual minister of the Crown now spends on departmental activities within his department is not what it once was, and neither is the country. This is the result of allowing senior bureaucrats to take over and totally run departments.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) is a wily old fox. I will say that as a compliment, and I mean it. He is perhaps one of the shrewdest, most intelligent people who has ever sat in this chamber. If anyone can honestly say to me that he really contemplated and considered the budget of November 12 and knowingly brought it in that way, then we obviously have a difference of opinion. He did not know what was in this budget. He has changed the budget 22 times since then, and he will make more changes. If he had studied the budget, and it had been his budget rather than that of a group of finance civil servants who had no understanding of what it meant in terms of the business world, it would have been a totally different document. It was not.

Let us talk about the future. Hugh MacLennan talked about two solitudes. We do not have two solitudes in this country now. We have the solitude of Newfoundland, we have one in western Canada and we have one in Quebec. I do not believe this particular Liberal government can excuse itself or deny that it must take a tremendous amount of blame for what I would call the solitudes which exists in this country. We have the matter of confrontation and a question of fighting for power, one against the other. I believe that a different attitude on the part of this particular government could bring this country together much more rapidly than can be attained by the type of activities and statements of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) these days regarding the west, Quebec and Newfoundland. This country can only stay together by consensus. It can only stay together if there are good feelings on all sides. It can only stay together if everyone feels they are being relatively fairly treated. That is not what exists in the country today. I lay the entire blame on the Prime Minister of this country and his excessive statements in all parts of it.

That is really enough of what I would call negative thinking. I do have a dream for this country. Someone said that the twentieth century belongs to Canada. The twentieth century obviously will not belong to Canada. One can go through the litany of sad statistics we have heard today. This motion is one of the most important subjects that has come up in this House for some time. I hope people will start considering what is involved in the motion and will understand why so many of us can speak so vehemently on the issue.

The real answer to our problems lies in a little word called "productivity", much of which we have lost. We are not competitive in this country in a world sense. Our workers are not sufficiently productive. Is that the fault of the labour unions? I do not think it is. Is it the fault of management? I do not think so. I think it is quite properly the fault of the third member of that triangle which operates the country—it is the fault of government.

There have been no incentives, they do not exist now, and I do not see them coming. I do not see why this government