

Will the minister take a tough stand similar to that of the Americans on this issue at the negotiations and demand environmental protection for both the Canadian environment and Canadian workers who will lose their jobs because of this deal?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend had been in the House yesterday he would have heard the Prime Minister refute that statement and elaborate on exactly what was said. If he would read *Hansard* from yesterday he would see that.

Let me make it very clear that we believe the NAFTA as it stands is in the interest of Canada. In addition we have the two side agreements on the environment and on labour which is consistent with the agenda we have been following since February of last year when we proposed similar side agreements.

The outgoing administration did not want to pursue those side agreements. The incoming administration does. We are prepared to sit down with them and negotiate them together with the Mexicans.

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, this government is putting at risk the jobs of Canadian workers and the livelihoods of Canadian farmers because it will not deal with these issues.

The government refuses to negotiate a set of subsidy and anti-dumping rules as promised under the free trade deal. Why will Canada not demand a parallel accord on subsidies and anti-dumping which will give Canadian workers the tools they need to compete in a North American market?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I wish my hon. friend would elaborate on why he said we are putting at risk the livelihood of Canadian farmers. He comes from a farm community. If he asked the farmers in that community they would tell him that the supply managed sectors are specifically exempted from the NAFTA.

**An hon. member:** You're selling them out.

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** My hon. friend has to have a comeback on everything. He will not face the facts of the agreement because he knows the facts support what I have just said.

### Oral Questions

#### PUBLIC WORKS

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works. On the very day the government introduced conflict of interest legislation I want to ask him about the sale of properties at the airport in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu.

There are serious allegations that the properties were not sold by public tender, that the land was not even offered to the previous owners, and that the land was sold to a supporter and friend of the Conservative Party for a fraction of what it was worth.

What will the minister do to restore the integrity of tendering process of this government?

**Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my colleague opposite for whom I have a lot of respect that perhaps he should not be jumping to too many conclusions too fast.

The newspaper report from which I believe he is quoting is somewhat misleading. In fact it mixes up to some extent two separate parcels of property at the Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu airport. This property was expropriated in 1963 for runway extension at the time. When it was not proceeded with it was decided in 1988 to sell a portion of the property on the western end. It was in fact sold and the remaining portion at the other end of the runway was recently cleared for disposal by Transport Canada, late last year.

• (1450)

I know my colleague will have a supplementary question so I will respond to that.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I know very well what the minister is saying, but he has not at all addressed the issue about the properties that were disposed of without public tender.

[Translation]

How can the minister justify not giving the neighbouring owners who wanted to buy back their former land the opportunity to do so? How can he justify going beyond the whole public tendering process and selling to an individual without informing the public? How can he justify that?