

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, April 15, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### AIRPORTS

#### ALLEGED INADEQUACY OF X-RAY AND METAL DETECTING DEVICES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 43 to propose a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

It has come to my attention that people have carried weapons, such as holstered hand guns and long bladed knives onto commercial airliners, both on their person and in their hand luggage. While these were not people of bad intent, these occurrences do show that x-ray and metal detecting devices at Canadian airports are not completely thorough or effective, resulting in possible danger to innocent passengers.

I would move, seconded by the member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke):

That this House direct the Minister of Transport to launch an immediate investigation into this matter and conduct extensive tests on these apparatus at Canadian airports.

**Mr. Speaker:** The motion proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43 cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

### THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

#### INFLATION—METHOD OF MAINTAINING COMPLIANCE WITH GUIDELINES ON WHICH THERE IS CONSENSUS

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance who indicated yesterday in response to a question that he did not expect to achieve unanimity in any particular sector of the economy. I would like to ask, therefore, whether he expects to be able to maintain compliance with the targets about which there is to be consensus over a period of three or four years in the absence of unanimity within the particular sectors.

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is assuming that we are successful in achieving a consensus or mutual agreement. Obviously any mutual agreement would have to allow for a certain flexibility in those areas of the work force that have fallen behind in terms of their ability to maintain that pace of the rise in the cost of living over the last 18 months.

On the other side, certain businesses and even industries have been in a loss position over the last few months or in a position where the competitive forces have put them in exceptional circumstances. So that in envisaging the operation of any consensus program, one would have to allow not only for a lack of complete unanimity but for some flexibility in the appraisal of the success or failure of the program.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I am happy to have the information, but I would be happier if the minister would answer my question.

Is it the intention of the minister to rely entirely upon voluntary compliance with his targets, flexible or rigid as the case may be, or does he propose to resort to other sanctions such as taxation sanctions, having said yesterday that he does not intend the monitoring board to have any power to impose its will?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** One of the difficulties with sanctions is the rigidity they impose. What one has to try to achieve in mobilizing the program is a balance between moderation in the claims upon the economy in terms of prices on the one hand and costs on the other with the necessity to retain enough incentives in the system to provide for the expansion, both in agriculture and industry, necessary to provide the jobs we will need until the end of the decade and provide the production that will ensure stability in prices over the medium and long terms.

● (1410)

**Mr. Stanfield:** I have a supplementary question. I wish the minister would answer directly how he intends to achieve support for his program if he cannot achieve unanimity within each sector, and how he can expect to achieve compliance over a period of three or four years. In particular, since he indicated yesterday that with respect to mineral prices, for example, the world price would be the domestic price, and that we would not resort to a two price system, how can he expect manufacturers to accept that kind of standard for mining companies if they are going to be restricted to price increases based only upon increased costs?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The hon. gentleman of course still has in the back of his mind the feeling that the voluntary system will not work—