

*Oral Questions*

agreement with the government of Manitoba. I can tell him that yes, a few hours ago I did sign, in the name of the government of Canada, an agreement with the government of Manitoba relating to new arrangements between the two governments in the field of cable. Let me tell him what it is all about if you will bear with me, Mr. Speaker. This arrangement provides for guaranteed access for cable operators to the cable. It provides for priority of the broadcasting signal over other services on the cable, and it provides a guarantee that only CRTC licensees will have access to that cable. It also provides a possibility for cable operators to rent some of their hardware from the telephone companies, thus facilitating certain problems we have had with the condition of hardware ownership set out by the CRTC. I think this whole agreement shows the desire of this government to accommodate the provinces and its desire to establish an efficient and economical system of telecommunications, provided that the unquestionable jurisdiction of the federal government over broadcasting is recognized.

**Mr. Nowlan:** I thank the minister for her full answer on this complicated subject and unique arrangement. I should like to ask the minister very seriously, since this agreement appears to be in fundamental conflict with CRTC decisions on cable on September 15 awarding cable licenses in Manitoba, whether the minister can tell the House if this unilateral *de facto* reversal of CRTC policy means that the commission for all practical purposes is presently "defunctus"—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Nowlan:** —until the minister brings in new legislation setting herself up as the czar of communications.

**Some hon. Members:** Czarina.

**Mrs. Sauvé:** Mr. Speaker, section 23 of the Broadcasting Act gives the governor in council authority to either set aside or refer back a decision of CRTC. Two of the decisions of CRTC have been set aside, and I am sure that the existence of this new agreement will allow the CRTC to take all the new facts into account when they call for new applications for those licences.

\* \* \*

**CUSTOMS****ARRANGEMENTS FOR IN-TRANSIT PASSENGERS AT GANDER AIRPORT—REQUEST FOR REPORT**

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue and also, in part, for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration following the questions I put to the Minister of Transport the other day regarding the situation at the airport in Gander. Would the minister advise the House what arrangements have been made, in conjunction with the department of her colleague, to handle in-transit passengers on the basis that they shall not be released at the airport or into the surrounding territory, and

[Mrs. Sauvé.]

also whether the customs and immigration controls may be applied to incoming passengers to Mirabel or to Malton?

**Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, for the time being the Gander airport facilities are still what is called in the jargon, a sterile airport—I mean, a fertile airport.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Miss Bégin:** There was never a woman minister of national revenue. I would like to tell the hon. member that there is no sterile area where passengers can be helped in transit. With the development of other airports in Canada I understand the Minister of Transport is proposing to locate an in-transit lounge at the mezzanine level which will accommodate up to 250 passengers.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** I wonder if the minister or her colleague could indicate to the House how it is that their administration has tolerated conditions over possibly the last ten years whereby in-transit passengers were allowed to wander in and about Gander airport and into the town of Gander contrary to the regulations of IATA and our other international air obligations?

**Mr. Speaker:** May I point out with respect that that information should perhaps be sought in another way.

\* \* \*

**EXTERNAL AFFAIRS****REASON FOR ABSTENTION FROM VOTE ON UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION CONCERNING ARMS EMBARGO AND ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION WITH SOUTH AFRICA**

**Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Could he explain why at the United Nations General Assembly yesterday Canada abstained from voting on a resolution calling for an arms embargo against South Africa, considering that Canada has imposed an embargo since 1963 and an embargo on spare military parts since 1970?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I can give the hon. member a brief answer, but I would also be glad to provide him with a more detailed written explanation.

**An hon. Member:** Try one here.

**Mr. Jamieson:** I certainly will try one here if the hon. member would give me the opportunity. The resolution has many different component parts in it. In the case of the one to which the hon. member referred, there were certain portions which were not acceptable to Canada. However, it did not change the policy, as the hon. member has said, that we have been following for quite some time. I might point out to him that on at least four aspects of the resolution we did in fact continue to vote against apartheid and its effects in South