

Adjournment Debate

the legislative committee that there were major flaws within the legislation. I congratulate him on his speech today and on the position which he has taken in the House.

I still would like to clarify exactly what this means with respect to the Liberal Party's position on third reading of this legislation. My colleague from the legislative committee talks about his position of standing up for the taxpayers in the country and therefore that he has many concerns with this piece of legislation. My friend from Essex—Kent talked about how he was in favour of the legislation on behalf of the taxpayers of this country.

I have to ask for an unequivocal answer from the member for Saint Henri—Westmount. Would he be prepared to tell this House whether he is in favour of this legislation as it now stands or against it? Will he vote for it on third reading, yes or no?

Mr. Berger: Madam Speaker, I think it should be fairly evident from my comments and even from the comments of my colleague from Essex—Kent that we have serious reservations about many aspects of this legislation. I chose to emphasize certain aspects in my speech and my colleague from Essex—Kent pointed out some of the problems that he has with the bill in his speech. I am sure that our position on third reading will be the same as his party's. I believe that there is a—

[*Translation*]

— a feeling for passing this bill on division, of course, and I suppose the opposition parties are against it. I believe our party is against the passage of this bill as it is before us now.

[*English*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Langdon: I have another question, Madam Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: As it is six o'clock, I am prepared to put the question if the House was ready. Obviously, the House is not ready if the hon. member for Essex—Windsor is rising again on questions and com-

ments. I will have to go to the adjournment motion. The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Cooper: Madam Speaker, I have had conversations with the two parties on the other side as well as my own party and it was my understanding that we had come to an agreement to complete this bill this afternoon. If the hon. member just wants a minute or two to pose another question, could we agree not to see the clock? Certainly, we on this side have no problem with the member posing his question and the hon. member responding. We could then have the question put and complete our business for the day.

Mr. Langdon: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. My House leader and myself have had discussions about this. It is our understanding that there was absolutely no such agreement that this legislation would come to a vote this afternoon. We certainly did not intend to permit it to come to a vote. We think it deserves important consideration.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member for the clarification.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

CHILD CARE

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, on October 18, 1989, I posed a question to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. It was concerning the subject matter of child care and particularly it had to do with the conditions which child care givers find themselves in across this country.

At that time I alluded to the fact that child care workers in this country earn 30 per cent less than the average industrial wage, 50 per cent less than a teacher at the elementary school level and 30 per cent less than animal care workers on government farms.

I raised this issue in the broad context of a national child care program. For quite some time the Govern-