

The Budget

Mr. Edmonston: Mr. Speaker, I seek clarification because I do not know whether or not it is a question of not being here long enough. I know my colleague has been here far longer than I have and we both came to our feet on the same point of order.

I do not think, with all the respect I have for the House, that we should get involved in union bashing in as budget debate. I think it is really unseemly of this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will just listen to the hon. member. I am sure he is going to be relevant as far as the budget is concerned.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Della Noce: Mr. Speaker, I asked if I could say these things and my chief Whip assured me that I could talk about a case involving 2,200 jobs in my riding. If it upsets the Liberal and NDP members to hear me talk about my riding, let them leave the Chamber and go have a coffee, because where I come from 2,200 jobs are important, especially when certain NDP members frighten people by telling them not to take the plane because it is dangerous.

I am quite sure my colleague will go out for coffee. Mr. Speaker, 2,200 jobs. It is very important for us. It is appropriate to talk about it within the discussion on the budget.

[*English*]

Mr. Edmonston: Mr. Speaker, I rose earlier on a point of order and I appreciate the fact that you ruled against it. I believe now there is a definite point of order in the sense that we are not to make reference in this House at any time to the presence or absence of one of the members of this House. Am I right or am I wrong?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I never heard the hon. member make any reference to anybody in the House or outside the House. If he has, that is right. We are not allowed to do that but I have not heard that.

Mr. Edmonston: Yes, I am sorry you did not hear that but as I was leaving to make a phone call there was such a reference.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Members do that quite regularly. I regret that the hon. member should not do it. Get on with the debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Della Noce: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my hon. colleague could stop interrupting me. I will certainly not talk about him. I have more important subjects to discuss concerning my riding than to talk about the member for Chambly. I have things to say in this House. In the speeches on the budget we demand jobs, jobs, jobs, and those who have jobs want to destroy them. My job is to try to make people understand that each time we speak outside this House we displease the unions. Instead of dealing with the issue, instead of making offers to the unemployed, to the workers who are locked out, they say: "If Della Noce, the member, speaks too much, we will sue him." Well let them do so. I will go to jail simply because I want to save 2,000 jobs in my riding. If I must go to jail, I will do so and gladly.

We also have a problem in Quebec every time a company is successful. Take Nationair for example. I mention this one because it is in my region and it is of great interest to me. We keep looking for means to tear it down. Every time a company decides to move to Toronto we cry for a year before it leaves. I for one do care. There are 450 young men between the ages of 22 and 24 who work there. I certainly would not want them to lose their jobs because those are darned good jobs. When young people come to us looking for a job we tell them: "Try that place; they hire a lot of people." Now a union leader is saying: "So what if it shuts down".

I am not blaming all union leaders, mind you, Mr. Speaker. Two members of the shop committee resigned. This means that six union members caught the drift of their leaders and resigned. They did so because they did not like the idea of a union destroying jobs instead of preserving them. That is happening here and now. There are still very down to earth, mature union people who have chosen to resign rather than stay on and chitchat with an airline accused—of what—of not being safe. Apparently the staff would not be adequately trained. If there is one airline today which is safe it is Nationair. With all its safety inspections, it is quite impressive. There is no Canadian airline safer than Nationair.

The ad also reads that they are paid welfare wages at \$17,000 or \$15,000 per year. I agree that \$17,000 is not great, but what the union failed to mention in the ad was that it was for 53 hours of work, not per week but per