

*Motions*

techniques, I suppose that for those of us in a democracy, it is never possible to say that it is adequate.

We want to use the security access program, but contrary to what my friend has said, his Party has taken a stand on the issue. Quite properly, his Party has raised the question of the invasion of privacy of the employees who will be inspected by CSIS. Members of the NDP on the one hand are objecting to that invasion of privacy, but on the other hand, it is those employees who, if taken over by a foreign Government or an agent of a foreign Government, would permit highly trained and sophisticated terrorists to get through.

There is a conflict here. In a democracy where we try to be open, there are always problems when it comes to security checks because they involve the invasion of the privacy of the employees as well as the flying public. The flying public wants to have quick access. They want to come to airports 20 minutes before their planes take off, and they become very annoyed when they find what they feel are overly zealous guards poking them and checking into every piece of baggage they carry. There is always a balance to be maintained and there always will be.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Mr. Speaker, I was not talking about terrorists, international terrorism or those aspects of airport security. I was asking the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary about the training that is provided to the people who do the screening.

By the way, the only objection I ever made to the airport security access program was made when airlines were getting passes for scabs to strike-break on a number of occasions. They were getting passes and escorts very quickly. It is hardly the way to have a good security system to give an advantage to airlines that are involved in strikes. That is certainly something about which I complained.

Again, this young woman who appeared on television the other night said that she would not feel secure if she was boarding an aircraft because she knows what is going on. These people get no training at all in crowd control. They have little or no training in first aid. They have little or no training in dealing with the massive numbers of people that can be at airports.

We all know what happens when there are a few obstreperous passengers in a lineup. It can cause a problem and quite often, the RCMP are 10 gates away. Some of these people are elderly and some of them are very young. They are not really capable of dealing with those situations. Even if they were capable, they do not get any training in dealing with them.

There is more to security than just watching an x-ray machine. Again, I ask the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary what he thinks about the adequacy of the actual training program given to the people who work for these security companies.

**Mr. Thacker:** Mr. Speaker, again I would not want to go on record as saying that it is adequate because if there were to be

a terrorist attack, I suppose that a 10-year course would not be adequate.

The fact is that when the tests first started some years ago, the training lasted about two and a half hours. It is now up to some three days for screeners. Over a period of three days, they can learn about a lot of different aspects of security. As well, on the job they should grow and mature into the job so it is a continuing process.

I think Canadians would like to know of the additional resources to enhance security at Canadian airports which the Government has put in. In May of 1986 Treasury Board approved \$33.6 million and 74 person-years for immediate enhancement of Transport Canada's Civil Aviation Security Program. Those resources are allocated as follows: Airport policing and security services, \$7.5 million; physical security, \$20.4 million; training, \$2.1 million; research and development, \$700,000; security organization, \$2.9 million; for a total in 1986-87 of \$33.6 million. Approval was also given for \$13 million to be spent on operating and maintenance in subsequent years, for a total of approximately \$60 million through 1988-89.

• (1310)

In June of last year Treasury Board again approved the following additional resources for the long-term enhancement of Transport Canada's Civil Aviation Security Program: Commissioners and security guards, \$4 million; physical security, \$800,000; emergency response, \$100,000; security organization, \$3 million; training, \$500,000; for a total in 1988-89 of \$8.4 million and an additional 37 person-years.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate.

[Translation]

**Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Westmorland—Kent):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of the motion put forward by my colleague for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin):

That the third report of the Standing Committee on Transport, presented to the House on Monday, December 14, 1987, be concurred in.

It is a real pleasure indeed, Mr. Speaker, because I was and still am a member of the standing Committee on Transport, and I had the opportunity to travel to Europe.

During that trip we met a number of people who were quite knowledgeable in the area of transportation. In a number of countries we visited airports, harbour facilities, rail facilities. I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, that most of the time I was very much impressed.

Of course, in some cases it would be difficult to compare European facilities with what we have in Canada for the simple reason of sheer size. The European geography of course and population centres in Europe are quite different from what we have here in Canada.