

*Oral Questions*

We have incorporated many of the concerns of the panel, on the environmental aspects and impact. I would like to quote from the report: "The impact of the proposal on the natural environment would be at most marginal and mainly temporary". The longer term effect in fact proved to be less harmful than the present situation.

We had to reject the recommendations of the north-south runway for safety reasons and will not be proceeding with the east-west parallel runways until capacity requires it.

\* \* \*

**NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT**

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister for International Trade said yesterday that the three accords proposed by the United States "will not change the substance of the North American free trade agreement in any way".

President Clinton has refused to introduce NAFTA legislation until the accords have been negotiated. Clearly the accords which the Canadian government regards as unimportant are being treated as very important by the United States. They are being treated as so important in fact that the United States will not implement NAFTA until it has its three accords.

Could the minister explain why the government is rushing ahead today with an agreement whose operation will be profoundly affected by the demands of the new U.S. administration for parallel accords?

**Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)):** Mr. Speaker, when we talk about rushing, in fact what is happening is that President Clinton and the U.S. administration is catching up to Canada.

We proposed changes to the environmental framework and the labour framework over a year ago. The United States is just catching up to requests that we have made.

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, the minister answers in that fashion today whereas yesterday the minister of trade said: "I do not know what the Americans have in mind by their proposals". Which is it?

Does the minister know what the Americans are proposing? Did the minister for trade yesterday have a

different impression and now does not know what the Americans are proposing? If the government does not know what the Americans are proposing, as the minister said yesterday, can this minister at least tell Canadians what this government wants?

I want to know from the minister, is the government simply prepared to accept whatever the United States puts forward in the parallel accords or will it now tell Canadians what its own objectives are in the parallel accords?

• (1455)

**Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)):** Mr. Speaker, the government is not going to just accept what the Americans want to do in a parallel accord. That is for further discussion.

I am glad that we have finally got them to talk about things such as environmental protection, where we have taken the lead. I am glad that we finally got them to talk about certain labour standards, where we took the lead over a year ago.

The hon. member wants to know our objectives in NAFTA. Our objectives in NAFTA are as follows: We want to increase our access to the Mexican market; to improve still further our access to the U.S. market; and we want to make sure that the provisions of the FTA which have been so effective for Canada are extended to all of North America.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**FRANCOPHONE COLLEGES**

**Mr. Réginald Bélair (Cochrane—Superior):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. Last June, the Ontario Minister of Colleges and Universities confirmed that his government would pay part of the cost of establishing a francophone college in northern Ontario. Nearly three years ago, the federal government made a similar commitment, but francophones are still waiting.

Could the minister explain the reasons for this delay, which by now has become unacceptable, and tell people in northern Ontario what the government's intentions are in this respect?