

*Supply*

**Mr. Valcourt:** The Hon. Member would have liked the Minister of Transport to get personally involved and to investigate, which was not his job. He had to report this to the proper authorities, as he did. Is the Hon. Member suggesting that this is not a proper course to follow, that he should instead judge?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has failed to listen to my speech, because I said: Had I been in his place, I should have thrown this letter in the wastebasket. Because one does not have the right to complain about a person because he or she has exercised the right to freedom of speech. That is what this lady, Donna Ford, has truly complained about—

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Government is trying to speak from both sides of his mouth: on the one hand, as suggested by the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen), we have no right to intervene in this case. On the other hand, the Government will not recognize that it is this same Progressive Conservative Government which has started the whole business in the first place.

If the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski), as I had suggested to him, had thrown this cranky letter into the waste basket, there would be no problem.

That woman, Donna Ford, did not complain to Air Canada but to her great friend the Minister whose name is Don. "Dear Don", I should like to lodge a complaint. If, instead of accepting her judgement, he had thrown this letter in the wastebasket, this would have been the end of the matter.

Now, the Government is trying to use Air Canada as a scapegoat, because it is the Conservative Government which lodged a complaint in the first place.

[*English*]

As we say in English, Mr. Speaker, you cannot have it both ways. You cannot say on the one hand that it is up to Air Canada, that it is their complaint, then on the other hand that it was the Minister's rather faulty intervention which set the process in motion in the first place. He should have exercised some judgment and thrown the complaint in the garbage can, which is where it should have been properly filed in the first place.

**Mr. Forrestall:** This is not really a question of freedom of speech. It is a question of whether or not there are standards to which people must adhere. There are standards which are, in fact, objectionable. When you deal with the public you cannot hide behind freedom of speech. The resolution of the problem, which is an internal matter of Air Canada, has nothing to do with freedom of speech as the Hon. Member and others would have Canadians believe. The question is whether her actions on that flight were objectionable.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I may be missing something, but I do not think anyone was complaining about the way she

positioned the pillow. I do not think anyone was complaining about the fact that she did not deliver the drinks on time. I do not think anyone was complaining about the fact that the breakfast was over-microwaved. The only complaint was that she spoke out about the Progressive Conservative Party. It seems ridiculous to me that the Government should now suggest that it is not a question of what she said, but what she did.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, this is a fundamental question of what she did. In the complaint from the delegate to the Minister of Transport, which set the whole process in motion, there was no mention of the positioning of the pillows. It was a complaint about what she said about the Conservative Party and the Conservative Government's dealings with a specific issue. It was in fact a question of freedom of speech. If the Member can bring to my attention the fact that she did not turn the lights off at the right time, did not show the film properly, or did not hit the proper—

**Mr. Forrestall:** You are among the first to hit the roof in this Chamber when somebody even looks at you sideways.

**Ms. Copps:** The Member says that I am the first to hit the roof when somebody even looks at me sideways. Mr. Speaker, I have had insults far more grievous than the insult which was purported to have been made by Miss Corrado to the Conservative Party, and I have taken it all in absolute good faith and good humour, as is my usual custom.

**Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate. I would like to begin by making a few remarks in response to the Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps). She is trying to say that there is constant harrassment which has manifested itself in a number of ways, and she used the example of Mr. Fraser and the metric situation. I have noticed that this Member does not worry too much about facts as long as she opens her mouth and abuse streams out. Mr. Fraser was an employee of Revenue Canada who on his own time joined an anti-metric campaign and spoke out on his own time at meetings about his opposition to metric and his reasons for it. He did not do this at work. It did not interfere with his job with Revenue Canada. We believe that as a member of the civil service he had a right to speak out on that.

I will now turn to the "Buffalo Jump program" or the Price situation. The Member failed to mention that Mr. Price was fired because he broke his oath of secrecy. That man, a Minister of the cloth, took an oath that he would not reveal secret Cabinet documents which he would gain access to by taking the oath. He was a member of the clergy. He broke the oath which he took to gain the right to see discussion documents which belonged only in Cabinet. It is my view that he should have been put in jail. If any other citizen of this country broke a sworn oath he would be put in jail. That oath had the same weight as the Canada Evidence Act. The Member did not mention that. She said that that is harrassment. She said that poor old Price did not like the discussion paper which