

Government Orders

all the relevant factors such as resources, industrial structures, domestic market, social climate, etc.

More specifically, Mr. Lévesque argued that provinces have the sole right of ownership over their natural resources, adding that "as regards minerals and other resources located outside the immediate provincial territory but within the 200-mile economic zone, Quebec favours a joint jurisdiction whereby a province's legislative authority would prevail".

Mr. Lévesque also pointed out that since mineral resources and their management come under provincial jurisdiction, it is up to the provinces to find the best way to ensure the survival and growth of their mining industry.

Even in the days when federalism was perceived as a *beau risque*, and those days are certainly gone, Mr. Lévesque suggested that each province should have exclusive legislative power over its natural resources and interprovincial trade. In that latter sector, provincial laws would have superseded federal legislation so that the federal government would not have been able to use its general power to oppose a provincial law.

As you can see, the bill before us does not comply with the wishes expressed by the numerous premiers who have represented Quebec over the last few decades. That is why I support the amendment proposed by my colleague from Matapédia—Matane, because that is the only way of ensuring that this government respects the will of the provinces, especially of Quebec, as it should under the relevant provisions of Canada's Constitution.

The Government of Quebec has always been opposed to the federal government's spending power, that is, its power to use Quebecers' taxes. Canada is not doing us any favours. What it gives us comes mainly from our own pockets. What we object to in this bill is this ability to spend, to take our money and manage our economy in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction according to all the laws of Canada and to Canada's Constitution.

[English]

Once again the federal government is going to extremes in its willingness to centralize everything in Ottawa.

[Translation]

That is what Mr. Bourassa used to call domineering federalism.

[English]

In its willingness to centralize everything in Ottawa, in attacking the exploitation, concentration and management of natural resources, a sector which is exclusively in provincial jurisdiction, we cannot endorse a federal process to which Quebec in particular does not entirely subscribe.

For us federal intervention in natural resources is totally illegitimate if the provinces are opposed to the project. Quebec, of course, and we have said it before, has always opposed the creation of a ministry of forests, for example, rightly viewing this as an intrusion into one of its exclusive jurisdictions.

As well, Quebec is not a signatory to the national forest strategy and no Quebec minister has participated in the work of the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers since the Meech failure. It is Quebec that must exercise its full jurisdiction to determine its own policies, programs and priorities in the area of natural resources.

• (1655)

[Translation]

To convince this House of the challenge facing us, I would like to close my remarks by repeating a statement made by a former Quebec premier, Adélard Godbout—this goes way back; we did not start fighting for our causes yesterday—who expressed this somewhat prescient or prophetic opinion at the time: "Full respect for provincial rights is essential to Canada's unity and progress. Any infringement on provincial rights would inevitably weaken Confederation". That is obviously a reality which this government and its predecessors have always refused to understand.

Mr. Réginald Bélair (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, I have a simple question. When the forest management plan for Indian lands expires in 1995, when the Canada-Quebec agreement on the development of forestry resources expires in 1996 and the plan for Eastern Quebec expires in 1996 as well, will the hon. member for Anjou—Rivières-des-Prairies recommend to his caucus and their colleagues in Quebec City that they should not renegotiate and should turn down all potential funding?

Mr. Pomerleau: Mr. Speaker, the question is very apt, and I hope the answer will be as well. As long as we are part of Canada, as long as we pay our taxes and provide 25 per cent of Canada's income, we will insist that 25 per cent of any funding that is made available should go to Quebec.

[English]

Most Canadians actually believe in two assumptions concerning Quebec. We see it every day in the House. Most Canadians believe that we are a bunch of troublemakers who are never happy with what we get.

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pomerleau: Well, you can see it is quite true.

The second assumption is that Quebec receives much more money from Canada than it puts in. Most Canadians believe that assumption. If it is really the truth, then what is the problem? Let us go. You are going to make money and you are going to solve the problem. That is what we want. But until that time, demo-