

*Supply*

Therefore, and I am quoting part of that published declaration: "The unity of Canada must transcend the identification Canadians have with provinces, regions and linguistic or other differences. —Each must feel that Canada, and the federal Parliament and government acting on his or her behalf, are the best guarantors of the security".

As member of the Bloc Québécois, the official opposition, I say to my fellow Quebecers that such a declaration, such a statement of intent, threatens considerably the existence of the Quebec state and the Quebec nation and threatens also the economic development tools we want to give ourselves.

The referendum failure of May 20, 1980, the failure of the PQ government's proposal, changed the circumstances. The federal government now enters into negotiations by taking the offensive; it starts by reminding us that decentralization is not a solution to Canada's problems and states that the Canadian federation sorely needs the federal government to ensure a strong economic management.

The Canada Act, or Constitution Act of 1982, includes in the famous Charter of Rights and Freedoms, a formal amendment limiting the capacity of provincial governments to obstruct economic mobility and therefore extending federal jurisdictions to all essential matters necessary to preserve the economic union. The goal is to put an end to the many provincial initiatives which impede the mobility of production factors; in other words, Ottawa is trying to marginalise the provincial level.

• (1025)

We find the same objective in the federal position on all the important questions relating to areas of shared jurisdiction.

For example, Bill C-88, an act to implement the agreement on internal trade, signed by the provinces last summer and denounced by the official opposition, is a direct result of this highly centralizing outlook of the Canadian government, started by the federal Liberals. Bill C-88 gives the federal government powers which were never considered at the time the agreement was negotiated or signed, and embodies the extremely centralizing position of the federal Liberal government.

Indeed, clause 9 of the bill goes way beyond the spirit of the agreement signed last summer. It reads as follows: "For the purpose of suspending benefits or imposing retaliatory measures of equivalent effect against the province pursuant to Article 1710 of the Agreement, the Governor in Council may, by order, do any one or more of the following—" What we are talking about, here, is an order in council. This is no laughing matter. Orders in council, or decrees, are generally the means used by totalitarian governments. What this clause says is that the Liberal government wants to govern by decree. Are we faced with the prospect of a Liberal dictatorship?

Similarly, the text of clause 9 means that, if ever a party is recognized at fault pursuant to article 1710 of the agreement—and I would like to remind you, Madam Speaker, that article 1710 deals with retaliatory measures—the aggrieved party can take retaliatory measures against the other party which does not conform to the agreement.

Now, the federal government, no matter whether it is part of the dispute or not, is taking it upon itself to impose retaliatory measures on all provinces, without distinction. As regards this bill, the federal government shows its intention of setting itself up, in the area of interprovincial trade, as both judge and party, of establishing, within this agreement, an enforcement power that would take the form of an order in council, which it alone can invoke, and of extending the application of federal laws to the provinces, as is mentioned in paragraph (c) of clause 9.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, the fact that the government intends to govern by order in council and act as if it were in charge of interprovincial trade goes far beyond the spirit of the agreement that was reached by the provinces, last summer.

The government is assuming too much retaliatory power through this clause. Indeed, it is assuming excessive power to take measures against all the residents of a province. Obviously, clause 9 of Bill C-88 does not go in the same direction as the current tendencies in international trade. This is all the more relevant since economic development is based on competitive development, which seeks to take advantage of the quality of the workforce, the infrastructure, and the savings associated with conglomeration and urbanization.

It must be remembered that those levers come under provincial jurisdiction, since health, education, and land use planning come under provincial jurisdiction. By setting itself up as an arbitrator in international trade, under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and therefore Bill C-88, the federal government is impeding the development and the autonomy of provinces.

The spirit of the unitary state, of centralizing federalism opposed to provincial identity, thus directly impeding directly the development of the people of Quebec, can also be found in Bill C-46. This enabling bill for the Department of Industry adds to duplication and overlap in Quebec, and deprives the state of Quebec of exclusive authority over regional economic development.

Along these very centralizing lines, clause 8 of the bill specifies that the Minister of Industry of Canada, a minister from Ontario, is responsible for regional development in Ontario and in Quebec. This bill confirms the existence of overlap in regional development, by confirming the interventionism of the federal department of industry in an area over which Quebec has long claimed jurisdiction.

Quebecers have a very different way of looking at their regional economic development needs. Decentralization of budgetary envelopes and powers proposed by the Parti Québécois is the answer that outlying regions in Quebec have long