

● (1650)

The stewardess also said: "I wouldn't be working this four hour shift if it wasn't for that bloody Mazankowski." She can say that because it is freedom of speech. What damn nonsense, you idiots.

The girl went on to say, as these four ladies were leaving the plane: "Don't tell anybody that you're bloody Conservatives when you get off the plane in Toronto." This has absolutely nothing to do with freedom of speech. These people are perfectly justified and did the right thing by registering a complaint. The Minister did the right thing by forwarding the letter. This is a lot of damn nonsense and it has nothing to do with freedom of speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) wish to reply?

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, I have been watching the antics and it is quite interesting to listen to an hon. Member give his views and watch the antics of the Member from the New Democratic Party, the little blow-hard who sits in another spot, and the other Member, the Member for Hamilton East. I wish the people of Canada could see their antics so they could understand why this motion was brought forward today. It was introduced to waste the time of the Government and to try very hard to impugn the motives of the Minister of Transport and to try to smear him and the Government. It is absolutely ridiculous and should have been ruled out of order.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I will remain calm, notwithstanding the aggravation by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields), who really is too much. However, I hope you will recognize that this is about the fifth or sixth time he has talked about smearing the reputation of the Minister. I think you will recognize that that is unparliamentary because it is impugning the motives on the Opposition. I wish he would strike that particular spurious comment from his vocabulary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Member was in fact impugning the motives of a particular Member, be it the Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) who presented the motion, or the Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps), it is clearly unparliamentary.

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I said that if the Member was impugning the motives, it is unparliamentary. I do not know if the Hon. Member was doing that, it is up to him to say so. I am sure that if the Member was impugning the motives, he will withdraw.

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, I was suggesting that the whole exercise today was an attempt to discredit the Minister of Transport and the Government and an attempt to smear the reputation of the Minister of Transport. That is my view. I am not impugning the motives of individuals. I am not attempting

Supply

to say that of the Member for Hamilton Mountain. However, that is how this whole debate is coming across to this side of the House. That is how the debate seems, even if one reads the motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is satisfied. Resuming debate.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by quoting the masthead on the editorial page of *The Globe and Mail*, which one can hardly call a hotbed of socialism. It states:

The subject who is truly loyal to the Chief Magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures.

I believe that was said by the Roman philosopher, Junius. Let me also quote Mr. Justice Smith of the Ontario Supreme Court who said:

There should be no presumption that the State is reasonable and curtails freedoms and rights only in cases of virtually absolute necessity.

Mr. Oberle: That was Caesar.

Mr. Benjamin: That was stated by a Justice of the Ontario Supreme Court.

Mr. Oberle: He must have been quoting Caesar.

Mr. Benjamin: Let me quote the Associate Chief Justice of that province who stated that:

—a constitutional document should be given a large and liberal construction. The spirit of the living tree should be adhered to.

This motion makes no mention of the Minister or the Department of Transport, but refers to the recent action by Air Canada. To be more direct, we believe that Air Canada has made a bad error in judgment and has over-reacted and resorted to what can now only amount to small-minded vindictiveness.

I will not get into the details of the case because that is not the purpose of our motion. Our motion concerns a person who broke no laws, violated no policy about expressing a political opinion when asked for it, and violated no part of the collective agreement.

An Hon. Member: How do you know that?

Mr. Benjamin: The Minister said himself that Air Canada has no policy in this area. I can find nothing in their collective agreement. When expressing her political views while on duty, when questioned—whether or not in a joking manner—she violated no rule and no company policy. She was handed a 30-day suspension, which means about \$2,200.

Mr. Forrestall: She has not been suspended yet. You know it.

Mr. Benjamin: Disciplinary action awarded a 30-day suspension. It is now going through the second and third stages of the grievance procedure. I know that as well or better than the Parliamentary Secretary.