

The Constitution

Mr. Korchinski: Why do you think we have had the CCF in Saskatchewan, and now the NDP? Why do you think we have a Union Nationale in Quebec? Why do you think we have the Parti Québécois? Why do you think we have Progressive Conservative governments in other provinces? Only occasionally did provinces resort to Liberals in order to turf out a government which got to be too smug. In places where they have only a two-party system, they resorted to electing a Liberal government. The simple reason is that they have had to turn to new political parties in order to provide some balance. The government is emasculating the powers of others. What is it doing to the provinces?

Anybody who knows something of the history of school boards knows the power which they had some 25 years ago. A new idea came in: centralize, as the government is doing now. Keep the power in the central unit. Do you know what happened? At one time you were able to hire, fire, and select the kind of education that the community wanted. Today, the only role which one sitting on a school board plays is to make sure that the sewers are not plugged. That is the kind of power that is left to the school boards today, and that is the kind of power the government wants the provinces to have, regardless of the fact that these same Canadians elected these governments to provide a balance. They say, "Well, that Ottawa government certainly doesn't do anything for us; we'll go to another political party. At least maybe we'll have some power then."

That is the kind of situation we are in. We are not only perpetuating this situation, but enshrining it. We are chiselling it in marble to ensure that it stays this way. Is this the kind of future we want for Canadians? Some of us will be gone, but this situation will continue. How do you amend it? You cannot amend it because you have made the formula so restrictive that it is impossible to move without the consent of two provinces. Only by their mercy shall the provincial governments survive. In this Parliament, an hon. member said, "Thank God for the Liberal government."

An hon. Member: Right on.

Mr. Korchinski: Where do you get your strength from? Fifty per cent comes from one province, Quebec; and with the province of Ontario you have 80 per cent of your strength. Adding one more province, New Brunswick, you have 91 per cent of your strength. Are you now speaking for all Canadians?

An hon. Member: No way.

Mr. Korchinski: I say that the government is enshrining this provision to make sure that the Liberal Party stays in office, and it is not speaking for Canadians. An hon. member said "Thank God." Why has the province of Quebec had to resort to the Parti Québécois? Is it because of the Liberal government? Do you think they were happy with it? There are 73 members from Quebec and 52 from Ontario. Adding the seven from New Brunswick accounts for 91 per cent of the members.

Perhaps for the benefit of the record I should indicate that during 38 years the province of Alberta has never had a Liberal government; in British Columbia, in 29 years, there has never been a Liberal government provincially; in Manitoba, in the last 32 years, there has never been a Liberal government; in New Brunswick, for ten out of 29 years there has been a Liberal government. They have a two-party system. Because our Constitution allowed a province to come into the federation in Canada, it also allowed Quebec the option of stepping out. Newfoundland resorted to a Liberal government temporarily for 23 of the last 32 years that they have been in confederation, but they stepped out, too. For eight out of 25 years, Nova Scotia had a Liberal government; again they have a two-party system. Ontario has not had a Liberal government in 32 years. P.E.I. has for 13 out of 22; they also have two-party system. Quebec for six out of 22 years has had a Liberal government. Saskatchewan has for seven out of 20 years.

Why are they doing this to Canadians? Only because of the self-interest of the Liberal government, their self-preservation in Ottawa. That is where the power is, and they want to continue in power.

● (1530)

The other day I asked the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Munro) a question because for the first time under the definition of "aboriginals" in this proposed resolution the word "Metis" was included. The words "Indian", "Inuit" and "Metis" are used. To anyone not familiar with the Metis situation it appears that we have made a breakthrough. I know that the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) says, "Look what we have done for Metis and Indians" and so forth. Only someone who does not know the situation and who is ignorant of the facts would be so bold, because the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan does not belong to the national association. In the province of Saskatchewan the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians does not belong to the national organization. A long time ago that federation decided it did not want any part of that organization. It therefore is alone. There are 85,000 Metis in the province of Saskatchewan. The Inuit have been recognized, and there are 25,000 of them. The Indians have been recognized, and there are 300,000 of them. However, the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan has not been recognized because it is not part of the national organization, nor does it want any part.

What is this government telling that association? "You must adhere to another organization or you will not be recognized." The Metis are saying it was a Friday night massacre. What rights are they being given? Hon. members opposite talk about rights. What kind of rights? They will have a discussion after the fact. The Metis are 85,000 strong in the province of Saskatchewan. They are saying this is a disservice, because up until now many organizations have been backing them up. Now those organizations are saying, "Why should you complain? You are mentioned in the charter." What good is it? It is a disservice to these people because up until now they had the right to negotiate. If the negotiations failed, they had the