

AIRPORTS

THE NAMING OF AIRPORTS—DEPARTMENTAL POLICY

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. I should like the Minister to tell us when the change in policy took place in his Department to name airports in Canada after politicians and not after Canadian aviation pioneers, such as the McCall field and Stevenson field that exist today.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the Government, representing the people as it does—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: Twenty-six per cent.

Mr. Axworthy:—always looks for opportunities to give proper honour to distinguished Canadians who have served their country well, and who have served the world well by winning a Nobel prize. I am surprised that the Hon. Member would take umbrage at what I think has been a universally popular and accepted notion, that we should pay proper respect to Canadians who have served the public well, unlike the Hon. Member.

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, I thought the External Affairs building in Ottawa was named the Pearson Building after the distinguished gentleman who served this country so very well.

REQUEST THAT MIRABEL BE RENAMED PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU AIRPORT

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. If the Minister is changing that policy within the ministry, then would he rename Mirabel Airport the Pierre Elliott Trudeau Airport, because both have been a disaster economically?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not asking a supplementary question. The Hon. Member for Durham-Northumberland.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

ALBERTA COURT FINDING AGAINST SURREPTITIOUS ENTRIES BY POLICE

Hon. Allan Lawrence (Durham-Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. It relates to the clear opinion expressed by the Alberta Court of Appeal yesterday that there is no statutory authority for any type of police surreptitious entry. In light of the abrupt, unnecessary, and now illegal change of the policy of his predecessor by the Solicitor General, in signing warrants for

Business of the House

intrusive entries, which contain no restriction whatsoever on surreptitious entry, and in light of the very clear recommendation against this type of practice by the McDonald Commission, has the Minister of Justice issued any instructions whatsoever to the Solicitor General regarding surreptitious entry in relation to the planting of intrusive devices?

● (1500)

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, according to the usual practice our law enforcement in Alberta would, of course, under this decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal, now be inhibited in the manner indicated by my hon. friend. However, the Attorney General of Alberta has indicated he is appealing the judgment to the Supreme Court of Canada. Since the hon. gentleman is quoting other sources, such as the McDonald Commission, I might mention that a unanimous report of a task force appointed by the federal Attorney General and the provincial Attorneys General last summer, came to exactly the opposite conclusion with respect to the law in Canada. In fact this is a matter on which there is considerable dispute.

I feel we will have to await a final determination by the Supreme Court of Canada, now that the Attorney General of Alberta has announced he is taking that appeal, before any such action is taken.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DISPOSITION OF BILL C-2

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order because we have just concluded an agreement among the House Leaders. I would like to spell it out so that you can make the agreement an order of the House. It is in relation to Bill C-2 which is now under debate.

First, we are debating second reading and on Monday, at 3 p.m., the question will be put on second reading of Bill C-2.

The second element of the agreement is that after the vote on second reading we will, of course, go into Committee of the Whole, and on Tuesday, at 6 p.m., the motion to concur in the report of the Committee of the Whole will be put.

The third element of the agreement is that on Wednesday of next week, rather than dealing with Private Members' Business we will be dealing with the third reading stage of Bill C-2. We will have one speaker per Party. Once the three speakers have spoken on third reading, the question will be put, and if the Bill is carried we will agree to suspend the sitting while awaiting Royal Assent.

Essentially, Mr. Speaker, I have summarized the agreement which we would like you to make an order of the House. It is understood among ourselves that each Party will use the time available to it as it likes. If the Conservative Party or the New Democratic Party wishes to use two speakers in 20 minutes as opposed to one, that is fine with everyone. This is also part of the understanding.