

*Government Orders*

ly have the right to join NAFTA, for instance, or other trade agreements such as the Canada-U.S. free trade agreement.

That is simply not true. Yesterday, Mr. Christopher said clearly that, if Quebec were to separate, things would not be necessarily the same at all.

• (1530)

Of course, the Deputy Premier of Quebec has attempted to give a different twist to all of this. Last night, on the news, we saw him try his best to put other words in Mr. Christopher's mouth. But it did not work, of course. Mr. Christopher's words are clear. Besides, a few days ago, we saw the Roh report, which was even tabled in this House and which indicated, once again, that agreements signed exclusively between Canada and the United States or Mexico are not automatically offered to other countries, including Quebec if it became a country. And I repeat that I hope that this will not happen. I hope we will remain a united country, the great country we live in.

However, that would not be automatic, and the Minister of Finance made it clear. The minister mentioned that one million jobs in Quebec depend on trade. He clearly said that those jobs are at risk. He did not say that they would all disappear. He did not say that. The member opposite knows that and so do his colleagues. But it is true that these jobs are threatened. Does that mean that some would have to take salary cuts, while others would lose their jobs, their benefits, or whatever else? I do not know, but there is no doubt that jobs are at stake. There is a potential loss for one million workers. This is not to say that they will all lose their jobs. Absolutely not. The member knows that too.

However, it also does not mean that everything will remain the same as it is, and the member is also aware of that. There are potential losses and there are great risks. As we saw, the referendum campaign went through various stages. For example, at the beginning, these separatist members told us about sovereignty, without elaborating. Then we saw one separatist leader give way to another and, at the same time, we started hearing about a new union, a unifying separation, if you can imagine.

According to the Leader of the Opposition, this unifying separation would lead to all sorts of agreements, imaginary or otherwise with the rest of Canada, in addition to ensuring that Quebecers would enjoy all the benefits resulting from Canada's international agreements and prestige, including the Canadian passport, if you can imagine that for one second.

Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition went so far as to admit it may not be quite that way. Trying another tack, he said that, maybe, the passport will not be a Canadian passport. It may turn out to be something else. We can see that he is starting to

sing another tune, once again. Separatists are shifting like that all the time. It is a case of moving targets.

What takes the cake, concerning agreements and privileges that some separatists envision, is that they used the Canadian dollar, the loonie with the word Canada on it, to replace the "o" of "oui". It is very hard for me, and probably for you too, to imagine they had the gall to do that, but it goes to show how low the separatists across the way have stooped during the referendum campaign.

Last weekend, I campaigned in the Saint-Janvier area, near Mirabel. Senior citizens told me and some of my colleagues that separatists had told them that voting yes meant voting for Canada. That is what they were told by separatists.

• (1535)

How awful. This shows how little conviction they have on the other side if they go around telling people the opposite of what they think in order to get their vote.

That is what I witnessed last week. This is the sort of thing going on. They tell senior citizens that voting yes means voting for Canada. That is what I have seen in that area. Members opposite must not be too sure of their arguments if they are willing to tell the opposite of the truth to win votes. It is even worse than the unifying separation the Leader of the Opposition was talking about last week. That is the kind of thing we have heard.

This morning, the hon. member tried to rewrite history when he said that the province of Ontario and Quebec have been together only since 1867, only for 130 years is what he said, when he knows full well that the Union Act of 1840 was signed—guess when, ladies and gentlemen—in 1840. That is why it is called what it is called. Being a teacher yourself, Mr. Speaker, you know that is so.

The pages here in the House of Commons are all students who have learned that the Union Act of 1840 was signed in 1840. It does not come as a great surprise to them, but it seems that the Bloc members have to revisit the past, because the rest of their arguments does not hold so good either.

Let me tell the hon. member opposite who spoke this morning that the agreements referred to in Bill C-105 are not side agreements nor are they similar to agreements made under the Canada-U.S. free trade agreement and NAFTA signed by Canada, the United States and Mexico.

U.S. trade representatives, whether it is Senator Dole, Mr. Roh, and even Mr. Christopher no later than yesterday, have all clearly stated that there will have to be concessions for a sovereign Quebec to keep the prerogatives it now enjoys within a unified Canada. That is why Canada must remain unified, if for no other reason than to serve the commercial interests of the