

sit down with the regional governments to work out a compromise. This situation is particularly evident in Newfoundland, on the West Coast, in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Nearly two million people across the country are unemployed, again as a result of confrontational politics. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, that we live in a country endowed with resources, with energetic and willing people with the drive to work and to get the economy going, but because of a government with its confrontational policy which attacked, through the misguided National Energy Program, an industry that was leading the country, creating employment throughout the land, under the guise of fairness and with the false promise of "We will give it back to Canadians", which the Government knew full well it could not do, it destroyed the engine that was keeping the economy of Canada moving ahead. Again, the Government did this through confrontation. We did not see reasonable men and women sitting down trying to work out an energy policy that would be equitable to the industry, equitable to the ownership of the resources, the provinces, and to all the people in Canada. We saw a government that determined a policy sitting in its ivory towers in Ottawa and imposed that policy on the provinces and the industry in a confrontational way. This was done with disastrous results, and that is why we have two million unemployed.

Let us look at the native unemployment, Mr. Speaker. Talk about confrontation. The native people, as the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner) so eloquently expressed it this morning, want to participate on an equal basis with all other Canadians. What have we had? We have had nothing but confrontation.

Let me give you one brief example, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development funds the bands at the band level and says, "Okay, fellows. You are going to run your own show". The Department decided to fund the bands but it thought, "We cannot trust them sufficiently to fund them on a yearly basis, so we will fund them quarterly." The Department tightened down the budget for those bands and restricted the ways in which the money could be moved around within the budget.

Funding comes quarterly but at the same time the budget is very tight. Each band that is funded quarterly is forced to go to the bank for interim financing. This interim financing over the year costs bands something like \$15,000 and sometimes \$20,000 in unanticipated expense. Then the Department comes back, in a confrontational way, and says, "You have exceeded your budget". Again, this is confrontational politics.

I could not help but listen to the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) this morning. He talked about his Province of Newfoundland. He said that the people of Newfoundland would probably be watching the proceedings of the House of Commons on television because many are unemployed and drawing unemployment insurance or welfare. Newfoundlanders want to work. I can attest to that. Those people do want to work. They have moved from Newfoundland to all parts of Canada. More particularly, they have moved into my riding and into the City of Fort MacMurray. They are prized

workers and prized employees because they know how to work. The shame of it is they could be working in their own province where in many cases they would be more happy. They would not have to leave families and friends. They could be working in Newfoundland, except for the confrontational politics that we have.

There are reasonable men in the federal Government, yet the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) cannot sit down with the First Minister of the Province of Newfoundland and work out a solution to the ownership of resources in Newfoundland. That is a shame. The same situation existed with Alberta and Saskatchewan. The bottom line is that the federal Government does not accept the fact that the provinces own the resources. That is the shame of it. It is confrontation politics. Canada needs new and credible leadership, one that will inspire the Government to work in co-operation and not confrontation so that all Canadians can work toward a common national goal.

• (1650)

What is the record? The present Government did not have a mandate to destroy the energy industry, but it brought in the national energy policy under the guise of a budget in 1980. This Government did not have a mandate to force Canagrex on the agricultural industry, which it did in a confrontational way. It did not sit down to discuss what was best for all sectors of the industry. It engaged in confrontation politics. It did not have the mandate to nationalize the East Coast fishing industry. It did not have the mandate to make massive changes to the tax system, resulting in the activities we see in the tax department today, changes brought in in the 1981 Budget.

This Government did not have the mandate to destroy the Crow rate benefit to western prairie producers, which it did in a confrontational way. Confrontation politics does not work in a country as vast as Canada. It cannot work unless reasonable men and women are prepared to sit down and work out a compromise. That is the challenge we face today.

This Government did not have the mandate to change the very nature of our parliamentary system, which it did. Members on the Government side must go home periodically. When they speak to their constituents, they must hear the same questions that I do. Our constituents want to know what in God's name has happened to our country when we are blessed with such an abundance of resources.

I want to give an example of something that happened in my riding. A man approached me with a \$385 cheque that he had received in unemployment insurance. He used that money to start his own business. He rented a small place, hired two people and began to repair cars. The first roadblock was the income tax department. He was told that because he did not make his last month's remittance, his business would be closed and his bank account seized. He explained that he had too much out in receivables and could not meet the payment at the time, but that he would give priority to it the next month. With a \$385 unemployment insurance cheque, that man creat-