

separate budgets, and giving orders. That is what our motion is all about.

The federal government is making the plan of our house, with our money and without consulting us, when we already have a plan in Quebec. We do not have all the money we need, because part of it was coming to us from transfers originating in our own pockets. In our confederation, the constitution gives the federal government the power to collect money to spend in areas that are outside its jurisdiction.

So, the federal government uses our own money to draw the plan of our house without consulting us, while, on our side, we try as best we can, with whatever means left to us, to prevent the worst, in a situation where we have 803,000 welfare recipients and more than 327,000 unemployed, not to mention people who have given up, and the young who have no hope.

It is hard to keep calm when we hear the federal government bragging that it brought its deficit under control. How did it manage to do it? By transferring cuts instead of money to provinces, and more particularly Quebec. I stressed how, more than ever, Quebec's economy needs only one architect and only one team of engineers working under the control of that architect, in co-operation with others when information is needed. However, we just cannot continue with this madhouse being built at the people's expense, in spite of the 130 members elected by Quebecers out of a total of 200 at both levels of government.

Quebecers elect, at both the federal and provincial levels, 200 parliamentarians, 130 of whom are sovereignists. They are fed up with the central government using taxpayers' money to try to build a house they do not want, with blueprints they do not want, and for whose satisfaction? To satisfy those who, since confederation, think they are the only ones who know what kind of house should be built, and how.

Now, we happen to be a nation. We are not only a distinct society, but a nation. We are a nation according to every existing international criterion, the main one being the collective will to live. This collective will to live is our main mandate to see to it that our house is built following our blueprints and, moreover, with our money.

• (1600)

I want to read, if I may, a motion that I have just this instant received, and that has just been tabled in the National Assembly: "That the Quebec National Assembly call upon the federal government to review its Bill C-91, which will have the effect of sanctioning the federal government's interference and increasing duplication in regional development".

This comes just at the right moment in my speech. Yes, we will do our utmost to explain that to Quebecers, who have had about as much as they can take of the problems of everyday

Supply

life—and we can understand that sometimes they do not know which way to turn. We will try to explain to them that it is absurd, with our limited resources, to have two teams of architects contradicting each other, whereas there is only one team they can control democratically. The only one they can control democratically is the one they elect.

Some could say: "Oh! but why is it not Ottawa that looks after all of Canada's economy?" We could have a group of economists who would disagree on many things, but who would agree on one thing, that is as culture goes, so goes the economy. The Japanese do not think like the French, the Germans or the Americans when it comes to the economy and money. What is working for Toyota in Japan is not necessarily working in Mississauga.

The same is true for Boisbriand versus Mississauga. Why? Because culture has a profound influence on how we work, on how we create, on how we organize, on how we sell, on what we decide to work on. It is in the name of this culture, in a broad sense, and in the name of this nation that we are saying in this House, and I understand that it can be annoying, that the movement will not stop. As René Lévesque, who was to become the founder of the Parti Québécois, said in 1965, once a movement has started, nothing can stop it.

It would be better to start realizing that we will have to negotiate together, but let no one think that they are going to sneak one past us, that they are going to ignore us and create a Canada in which we will not feel perfectly at home, with our money and against our interests. I spoke mostly of Quebec, but I would like to conclude by saying that if the bills in question allow for a better development of Canada, I would say great, if that is what you want. I respect your culture and I respect the fact that that is how you want to develop, but for Quebec, and I am speaking in the name of the majority of members elected by Quebecers, it will not do.

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. In her speech, the hon. member said that there was anger among Quebecers. She said that she felt that anger, and I agree with her, it is true that there is anger among Quebecers, but I would simply like to point out to the hon. member that that anger, and it does exist, comes from a great disappointment vis-à-vis the present Quebec government. The other way to govern of that government, which is a branch of the Bloc Québécois, scares Quebecers.

• (1605)

We even saw sovereignist central labour bodies question their allegiance to sovereignty. Just consider the cuts in health care, which is a provincial jurisdiction. So, yes, there is anger. Since you also talked about your plan, about the architects, I will ask you a very simple question: Since you have a plan—