

The industries, the head offices, the individuals, who have moved, especially capital which has gone elsewhere, or never come in the first place. You know this better than I do. Capital is more mobile than anything else in the world. People and families cannot move easily. We've lost many in the last 100 years to New England. But capital is lost from one day to another or it does not come in overnight. It only takes a difference of one point in interest rates or rate of return for capital to go where returns are a bit more attractive. I even met some people here who told me they are hesitating to make investments. They aren't submitting as many tenders as before. Why? Because the rules of the game aren't established.

This is why I say to you, that the choice must come relatively soon.... But you have to have the courage to ask yourself the question, if you will. We must not be afraid of winning or losing the battle. I am a Canadian. That's always been my choice. I think we are going to win. But I have to accept the rules of the game. And I can't say, we might lose, we might lose the referendum, so let's put it off for ten years.

At some point, we shall have to realize that we must become adults. And this is not only a matter for you, for businessmen, for the politicians; we have to get on with it for the populations of Quebec, for whom work, investments, are real requirements, real needs, and for whom unemployment is real misfortune. So we must know fairly soon what framework we are going to operate in. I know that businessmen don't only make short-term investments, but in the medium term, it is important that we know where we are going.

...I said that the choice must be final and definitive. By this I do not mean that it is for eternity. Let's say a generation of two.... I'm not saying that we couldn't make one in two years, another in 25 years. But I tell you that we cannot accept rules of the game which would invite us to make a choice, a conscious well thought out choice, and then we play heads I win or tails you lose. If I win the referendum, I've won; if I lose it, I'll have another. That won't solve the problem.

In other words, I have to stick my neck out. It's obvious that if Quebec opts for independence, I wouldn't stay

long in federal politics. I'd have lost my bet....

* * * *

A question of proof

...It is not a matter of proving that federalism causes problems or difficulties. We know family life causes problems, and difficulties, and that doesn't mean that we are going to abolish families. Democracy raises problems and difficulties. Freedom itself causes some funny problems and difficulties, starting with sin and crime. If there were no freedom, we wouldn't be bothered by sin and crime. Just the same, it's not worth abolishing freedom. In another way, it's not a question of saying that federalism causes problems. Rather, you have to prove that some other system would be better. That it would cause fewer problems and would be a better response to the problems that federalism poses. This is the first rule of the game.

...If federalism never worked, or less than half the time, then you could say it wasn't worth it. Well, for the moment, you must not add up only the disadvantages, you must say what are the advantages of the other system. And it is this kind of question that we have to ask ourselves. In other words, the burden of proof is not on those who want to defend the existence of a country that has belonged to us for 300 years. That has brought Canadians of all origins to one of the highest levels of prosperity in the world. That has given us almost the highest level of political, social, and cultural freedom that can be found anywhere in the world. There are not many countries that would give democratic freedom to a party whose goal is to destroy that same country.... I tell you that it's up to those who want to destroy this reality to make their case. What case - well, in every field, in economics, for instance. In what way would Quebecers be better off economically? I don't have time to develop that idea of course. But, the moment that those who want to make Quebec independent start talking right away about association, common market, monetary union, customs unions, I can only assume that they are not just doing that to please the English.... They have to say that, because it would be an advantage for an independent Quebec to be associat-

ed with that common market. Otherwise we wouldn't hear about it right away. It seems they have already accepted that if they want to construct independence it will cost something from the economic point of view.

* * * *

Improvements possible under present Constitution

...Read attentively, as I have, what the Premier of Quebec said in New York, when he spoke of his program for the province.... Apart from independence itself, everything that he proposes to do, he can do within the present constitution. Because what did he talk about? He said that he would provide good government, which would have better labour-management relations, which would respect the freedom of companies, which would perhaps nationalize asbestos, which would concern itself with the forests and better business management. Read that, I don't remember the words of it, but, apart from one phrase that he said about screening foreign industries, foreign investments, the whole of his program can be achieved within the present Constitution. So much the better. But, let's not talk about independence, let's get down to business, gentlemen, let's get on with it. Now, I don't want to take an undue advantage in saying that we who believe in Canada, of course, will not also have to provide evidence and demonstration. And of course, this is what every federal government endeavours to do....

* * * *

Human rights the crux

The important thing is how will the people be happier, better governed? Not how we can give more or less power to different levels of government. Of course, all the provincial premiers generally agree with the Premier of Quebec that more power should be given to the provinces.... But I want to be flexible. In the Constitution, I think there is only one principle, that is to respect the rights of men and women, the respect of human rights, and probably the respect of the collective aspect of these human rights. I'm thinking of language, the right of regions to exist. And from this prerequisite you can start from the beginning: write a new Constitution. We haven't had one in 110 years, we