

years the west has assumed that central Canada had treated them as second-class citizens and as second-class provinces. The formula here, the 25 per cent rule so called, means that no matter how much the west grows, no matter how much the province of British Columbia grows—I use British Columbia as an example—and how much Ontario or Quebec does not grow, British Columbia or the west will still not be able to stand four square with the two central Canadian provinces. That is the fact of the matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crombie: There is no other way one can describe it. I can tell you that in Toronto there is not one person I know who says you ought to have an amending formula which says there are two kinds of provinces. There is one kind of province.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crombie: To add insult to injury, to then argue that if you cannot get your way you are going to go behind governments to create a referendum means an even bigger problem. What we are saying to the west by this resolution is that not only will it be imposed, not only will the west be second class no matter how much it grows in population, but third, that if they do not like what we do we will conduct a referendum on our terms with our money—probably the Minister of State for Multiculturalism will be funding the advertising.

With respect to the principle governing security of the powers of the provinces we have the equalization formula. It is astounding to hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) talk as though he invented it. In fact, the equalization principle in this country was something on which we all agreed. Certainly the province I come from had an opportunity to give for years. I might add there are a lot of other provinces, I will come to them in a moment, which would like an opportunity to give rather than to receive. The hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) touched on the matter of equalization. A principle which was meant to bring provinces together is now being used by the government in this resolution as a club to divide them. That is the irony in all of this. I know when it comes to the Premier of Saskatchewan with whom I gather the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is having discussions, that the Premier of Saskatchewan will not be bought off by any concession affecting natural resources only however great a concern they are to Saskatchewan and, indeed, every other province. The Premier of Saskatchewan and all other premiers from the west know they cannot accept a bargain and trade natural resources for second-class citizenship.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crombie: The second principle this offends is the principle of the protection of rights. I am sorry the Minister of State for Multiculturalism is not here because I had an opportunity last week to read in the *Toronto Star* and other newspapers his reasons for supporting entrenched rights. He said in this House:

The Constitution

The end of such democracies as Chile and Greece began, as in Hitler's Germany, with violations of human rights no worse than we have known here in Canada.

That is terrific, Mr. Speaker. I want all hon. members to think about that; Hitler's Germany is no worse than we have known here in Canada. This is an argument for having entrenched rights, by the way. I happened to look up the constitution of Chile and the constitution of Greece. They both have entrenched rights, and so did Nazi Germany.

An hon. Member: And so does Russia.

Mr. Crombie: That is bad enough, but I thought "that is part of the politics of it all." Then the minister made a speech in Toronto. He said this:

We need an entrenched bill of rights because we have had attacks on East Asians in Toronto, and in one western province alone we have had recently four crosses burned on the lawns of West Indians and Asians who have come to Canada. We need it so all Canadians in this country will know that we all weigh the same on the moral scale.

The evening this was reported I watched on television the reactions of a number of people following the slaying of six citizens in the city of Buffalo. I listened to Jesse Jackson talking about the problems of black people there. Not once did he mention that entrenched rights would help them. He talked about a great number of other things that would help them. If the Minister of State for Multiculturalism is really interested in racism in Toronto, he might want to find out what Jesse Jackson had to say. To use racism as an argument for entrenched rights is sick. It is sick, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crombie: Those of us who have dealt with the problem for a long time, like the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Stollery)—I know how he must feel—

Mr. Stollery: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Crombie: I would be happy to answer at the end of my remarks.

In dealing with the principle of the protection of rights, one has also to look at language rights. It seems to me language rights are part of the whole dialogue between French Canada and English Canada and what the referendum in Quebec was all about. So I wonder whether or not we still have a long way to go in paying the debt for the confederation bargain. It seems to me that some of the ancient inequities have not been dealt with. I am impressed by the fact that not only does Premier Lévesque have no interest in saving federalism—indeed he has an interest in making sure it does not work—but Claude Ryan, the leader of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec, who fought very hard to make sure that federalism worked, is also opposed. That is another worry.

● (1650)

With regard to native peoples, if you read sections 24, 15 and 6 together and you happen to be an Indian in this country,