illusory to confer rights on people, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, who do not have the means to enforce them.

That is what the Court Challenges Program did; it gave the wherewithal to those people who do not have the means to hire a high priced lawyer to do court challenges. She, of course, appreciates that governments are currently in a period of financial restraint, but she says that she has difficulty with a policy that places the burden of that restraint on those that can least afford it. That is what this government has done time and time again.

The final issue I want to point out is the environment. As an associate critic for the environment for my party, this is once again smoke and mirrors. What we have seen with the green plan, the big ticket item that was supposed to ensure the re-election of this government, is that the government added insult to injury once again by re-profiling another $150 million in this budget, $75 million in both 1992-93 and 1993-94.

I asked the Minister of the Environment today about a kind of business opportunities incentive regarding ozone depletion, CFCs, the extraction, the Vampire units. This is an opportunity not only to create jobs but to preserve the ozone layer of our country. There is no money for this.

When the minister meets with the environment ministers next week in Vancouver I do not know where he is going to find the money to be able to do that recycling program that he says is the responsibility of the provinces.

This is a shameful budget. It is a budget of despair. As New Democrats we do have alternatives. We have the vision. We have the commitment, not just to the rich but also to the unemployed and the low income families.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 5.45 p.m. it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 84(5), to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the amendment now before the House.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will be please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 111*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse	Anawak
Arseneault	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bélair	Bellemare
Berger	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Boudria
Brewin	Caccia
Callbeck	Catterall
Chrétien	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Dingwall	Dionne
Duhamel	Edmonston
Ferguson	Finestone
Fisher	Flis
Fontana	Foster
Fulton	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gardiner
Gauthier	Gérin
Gray (Windsor West)	Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hopkins	Hovdebo
Hunter	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kindy	Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)	LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	MacAulay
MacLaren	MacLellan
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
McGuire	Mifflin
Mills	Mitchell
Murphy	Nunziata
Pagtakhan	Peterson
Phinney	Proud
Prud'homme	Robinson
Rodriguez	Simmons
Speller	Stewart
Stupich	Taylor
Vanclief	Volpe
Walker	Wood—82