

*The Constitution*

in 38 of the last 50 years on the rights of Canadians, we have now reached a point in our history when we have to reassure people in order to keep them from revolt. Because the people are disgruntled. People may wonder about what happened in the United States. I have heard comments about the choice of President Reagan. People are fed up. Why did people vote against some services and for tax cuts? They did so for the simple reason that they are fed up with big governments. That is exactly what we have had here.

It is regrettable that my time is almost up because I would dearly have liked to cover many other points.

**Some hon. Members:** More!

**Mr. Korchinski:** I would like to talk about the Vancouver consensus, for example. Let me touch briefly on that. They say it is going to be a checkerboard. Well, Mr. Speaker, do you know where the Prime Minister gets his information? He was in China, he has spent a lot of time in Russia, and everybody there behaves as if they were in the army. When they say "Attention", everybody stands up; when they say "About turn", everybody turns; and when they say "Forward march", everybody marches forward. He wants everyone to be regimented. He wants a society which, if you plug it in, it turns yellow; if you tell it to move forward, it moves forward; and if you tell it to stand at attention, that is what it does.

● (1540)

The next step will be that everyone will have to wear a uniform as in red China. I have never travelled to red China and I have not seen it first hand, but on television you can see that everyone there is dressed in the same uniform. He wants a stereotype society, and never mind the fact that Quebec wanted a language of its own, that Saskatchewan wanted a medicare plan, which it would never have had if unanimity had been required. It was a Liberal provision which required the approval of six provinces before a grant could be made toward medicare. It was the Diefenbaker government which said, "We will provide assistance even if only one province wants it." That is accommodation of the provinces. With its kind of attitude, the Liberal government cannot have accommodation.

I do not want to impose on the time of this House, Mr. Speaker, or on that of any member, but I will say this. What the Prime Minister has done is rejected British Columbia on the gas issue, infuriated Manitoba, mesmerized Ontario, inflamed separation in Quebec, scorned Newfoundland, ignored Prince Edward Island, antagonized Nova Scotia, manipulated Saskatchewan, tranquilized New Brunswick, despised Alberta, and, above all, reached a point where one hon. member has had to rise in his place and say that the Prime Minister has lied to Canadians.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I think that in determining who is for and who is against this resolution, we will have to mark the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) as being doubtful.

I am extremely pleased to have the opportunity to participate at this stage of this very important debate. Actually, I had not intended to do so; I was content to have my views recorded in the remarks which I delivered at the initial stage of consideration of this resolution. My speech in the House today is prompted solely by certain remarks the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) made in the debate last week. But before I turn to those remarks, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the right hon. gentleman on the endorsement he received from his party on the weekend. I believe that his hard work deserved a better endorsement, but, as I will be saying in the course of my remarks, unanimity is hard to achieve, whether on the Constitution or on other types of endorsement.

In relation to the remarks which the right hon. gentleman made in this debate last week, his views, his premises and his conclusions are so in error, so mischievous, so harmful to our national existence as to cry out for correction. I feel fervently about our country and its future. I have devoted two decades of my life to public service and I have been involved constantly in the serious examination, consideration and negotiation of matters affecting the welfare, unity and survival of Canada. From that experience I have developed a profound belief in the kind of Canada which can best persevere and best serve the interests of our different regions and varied cultures.

My understanding of Canada, however, is so different from that set forth by the right hon. gentleman as to require me to enter this debate to put forth our contrasting views. The Leader of the Opposition has said that the purpose of parliamentary debate is to draw attention to alternative views of our country. I agree that this is one purpose of debate, one justification of our party system, one manifestation of our parliamentary government. As he said, there are two visions of Canada. Ours is very different from his. I would happily place the choice of those two visions before the Canadian people, for the two visions are very different. His is a vision similar to Mr. Peckford's and Mr. Lougheed's. He has spoken of Canada's relationship to the provinces as a community of communities. Mr. Peckford has expressed the same principle of total decentralization of authority in different words. He has said the Canadian government is the "agent of provincial governments."

**An hon. Member:** Be honest.

**Mr. Regan:** If they see the Canadian government as being the agent of the provinces, then surely the Leader of the Opposition has shown himself to be the agent general of the premiers.

**An hon. Member:** That is right.

**Mr. Regan:** There are two visions of Canada. Ours is of a Canada of strong provinces and a strong central government. Ours is of a Canadian government able to provide leadership, to spread opportunities, to equalize opportunities throughout our country, and able to speak for all Canada in international matters.