

*Supply*

position than before with the various departments he will have to deal with.

This is the third bill which, under the guise of simple name change, is used to discreetly introduce provisions that would have gone unnoticed if it were not for the watchful eye of the opposition. But this is serious business and it speaks volumes about how this government operates, always trying to go over the heads of the provinces.

If we were certain that this approach was effective, we would have to recognize that, as unconstitutional as it may be, it is efficient, but experience shows that it is not effective and never has been. A region like Eastern Quebec is a perfect example, having been a proving ground for every federal-provincial action for the past 25 years. And the end result was a significant drop in population. All the young people have moved away, and we are struggling in our communities to get out of this situation, but were it not for the goodwill and sweat of local stakeholders, we would get nowhere. But we also get tired of trying to work with that system and finding ways to implement programs locally.

There is another clause in the Business Development Bank of Canada bill which is indicative of duplication, as it set out two different goals for a development policy. I am referring to the fact that the bank is to support Canadian entrepreneurship. This is a very general statement. It means that, if some provinces implement projects on their territory to make up for the seasonality of their economy, for example in the Maritimes or in certain regions of Quebec, a federal intervention aimed at providing programs which support Canadian entrepreneurship could easily trigger a centralization of businesses in the large centres, and thus result in an even greater population decrease in the outlying regions.

The provinces, and particularly Quebec, will have to spend energy and money to fight that approach. The federal government will do just the same, with the result that public servants will be very busy and will work really hard, but not toward the stated goal, which is to develop the economy.

If only one bill or another was involved, we could talk about a blip on the screen, or say that the federal government wants to interfere in social programs because it feels that some provinces are not adequately assuming their responsibilities. However, this is a planned approach. It is a systematic approach designed to make Canada a unitary state.

The predominantly English-speaking provinces probably have no problem with that approach, since they are pretty comfortable with a system where the federal government assumes all the responsibilities. A university chancellor in the Maritimes told me that we were now at a stage where we need a federal department of education and that it will have to come to that. I told him that I appreciated his being so clear about the issue. Such will be the choice for Quebecers. They will have to decide whether to keep the steamroller which, in 1982, unilaterally erased the reference to two founding nations in Canada's constitution.

• (1245)

Now we are left with the Canadian people. Since 1982, all the federal structures have favoured this approach, which is at odds with how Quebec wishes to develop.

Take health, as an example. The official opposition is said to continually criticize the federal government's interference in areas of provincial jurisdiction, but, of course, they are sovereignists. The members opposite will even say we are separatists. But if we take an event like the health forum, there could have been two different approaches.

The federal government could have made sure that the provinces were represented. The discussions might have taken a little longer, but it would have been possible to reach a consensus and find a logical solution. Instead, it was decided to hold the health forum without the provinces. Not to worry, we will bring in experts to define Canada's needs. The result was inevitable.

We find ourselves in the situation where the recommendations resulting from this forum will have no credibility with the provinces, who already have jurisdiction in this area and are aware of the problems created by the reduced federal budgets. And more problems are expected in the future. The provinces must take on increasing responsibilities, with no consultation by the federal government, accepting the news and making short term adjustments.

Here we are at the beginning of June 1995. Quebecers are three weeks away from their national holiday and a few months away from a referendum in which they must decide if they want the future of the people of Quebec to be governed entirely by Quebecers or whether they can risk seeing the people of Quebec become just a minority among Canadians within the Canadian constitutional context.

We have the choice of accepting the model proposed by the federal government or fighting it within the existing Canadian system. But that has been the nightmare of the last 30 years. There is no longer anyone in Quebec who dares to say that we should keep trying to change the federal system. No one in a position of political responsibility would say it because it no longer has any credibility, there is no longer any likelihood that it can be done.

The third choice available to Quebecers is to leave the existing federal system, eliminate duplications and overlap, all the reasons to do with how it operates. But why, when it comes right down to it, should we leave? Why must we make sure that these unsuccessful efforts are not repeated? Why cease these futile struggles? Because, fundamentally, we are a nation. We have long sought to work out an agreement with Canada's other founding nation. Now is the time to make a choice. As Maurice Duplessis said: "Donnez-nous notre butin". Faced with a choice between what this government is offering us and taking