Oral Questions

AIRPORTS

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK INITIATIVE—ROLE OF LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs in his capacity as Acting Prime Minister regarding government policy. The Minister of Transport announced yesterday policy regarding the transferring of Canadian airports to municipalities. The Minister will be aware that the only airports any municipality in its right mind would consider taking over are the ones making a profit.

In British Columbia the profit from Vancouver Airport in effect pays for the losses of all the other airports in B.C. Is it the intent of his Government's policy in getting rid of these profitable airports that the taxpayers will have to pick up the tab for the remainder?

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): There is no such intention at all, Mr. Speaker. The policy is a good policy that, on a voluntary basis, permits local municipalities, regions and commissions to take over the management or indeed possibly the ownership of an airport and apply the local energy and initiative from a region to make an airport profitable. Compare that to the NDP philosophy which would be to keep control in Ottawa, guaranteeing a drain on the taxpayer.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, someone called that a national airport system.

If the Government is not going to pass on the 10 per cent airport transportation tax to any airports that municipalities take over, how does the Government expect those airports to make money? By taking up a silver collection perhaps?

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): No, quite the opposite, Mr. Speaker. For example, at the airport with which I am familiar in Lethbridge, an enormous number of hangars are sitting there. They could be used. With local initiative and enterprise that airport could be turned around and could be making income tax money for us here in Parliament to redistribute to the people in the country who really need it.

CRIMINAL CODE

MANDATORY IMPRISONMENT FOR SECOND DRUNK DRIVING CONVICTIONS—EFFECT OF SUPREME COURT DECISION

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. It has to do with the Supreme Court of Canada's decision not to hear an appeal which, in effect, has invalidated mandatory incarceration for a second

facilities". They acknowledged, however, that considerable investments would be required to bring the company up to Boeing standards and indicated that Boeing was prepared to make those investments. In the light of the testimony of the Chairman of Boeing Canada to the parliamentary committee, how can Boeing make these demands today?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the original question had to do with whether or not demands were made and whether or not those are consistent with the original undertaking. I indicated to the Hon. Member that since that was a detailed question of which no notice had been received and the Minister is absent, I will have to take it as notice. His second question was contingent upon the first. I cannot make reference to representations that have not been confirmed.

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

REFUSAL OF INFORMATION CONCERNING FORMER AMBASSADOR TO EGYPT

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs. It concerns one of his former employees of that Department, Herbert Norman, who was Ambassador to Cairo and who committed suicide in 1956. The federal Information Commissioner is taking the Canadian Security Intelligence Agency to court because the Government does not want to reveal information in the spirit of freedom of information. Could the Secretary of State reveal what is behind the cover-up? Why is Canada still protecting a former mole of the Soviet KGB? Could the Secretary of State for External Affairs answer that question please?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we are talking here about the case of a man who died more than 30 years ago and about allegations that trace back at least five decades. The question is about information that might have been made available.

Speaking for my Department, which is the Department which employed Mr. Norman and which he served, all of the information that is allowed to be permitted under the Privacy and Freedom of Information legislation was made available to various authors who were conducting investigations. There are no skeletons left in that closet. I would suggest that the Hon. Member not pursue skeletons that do not exist. I would also suggest that he repeat his own observation in the prelude to his question that there are legal remedies that can be pursued by the Privacy Commissioner or by the Access to Information Commissioner. If those are being pursued, they will be respected and honoured. Otherwise I think it would be unnecessary and unworthy to raise 30 year-old questions here in this House.