

Our party, the NDP, originally came to support the bill because we thought it was balanced. We thought that the bill would do something for workers. Essentially the government has let us down. The government has let workers down.

It is not just myself and the NDP who are saying this. Even members on the government side have expressed their discontent with what has happened here. They have wanted to see workers better protected, and they are not. That is very obvious when we take a look at the bill.

The major weakness with this bill is when it comes time for a worker to get some protection, to get some money owing. I am not talking about charity. I am not talking about UIC. I am not talking about welfare. I am talking about money that is owed to a worker for his or her time and effort put in on the job. That worker is not in this bill.

As much as we try to get the minister to say that he has forgotten the key element he was supposed to protect, all we get back from the government side is ideology. All we get back is that this is good for the country. It is not good for the country. If the people of our country, our citizens, lose confidence in our government being able to provide for them, it is not good for the country.

At this time we are having a constitutional crisis. People are looking to the federal government to show them where it is standing up for them and protecting them with a social contract. We give up certain liberties, our taxes, and a certain amount of freedom in order get a certain amount of protection. When the other side of the contract does not come down to our level we are actually creating a disrespect, a kind of annihilation, anarchy, where people do not believe that the federal government really cares about them.

At this time when we are dealing with the Constitution and trying to keep our country together, this kind of law is working against that end.

We are going to vote against this law. We think it is bad and wrong. We will not hold our noses, close our eyes, and say the government could have done better. It did not do better. There are some small things which are wrong with this law.

The protection of workers' wages is not a small addendum. It is the principal part of any protection and it is not in there. If we do not have a law that is fair,

Government Orders

equitable and applies to people who are most in need then we do not have a law that is acceptable to a political party or to members of Parliament.

As a member of Parliament who followed this bill through the committee stage, I believed in this government as far as this bill was concerned. I believed in you. I felt you were going to do a good thing. I felt you were going to do the right thing. I thought you really cared about the average Canadian worker. I was duped along with the other workers in this country. Unfortunately the only people who are going to benefit from this bill are those who need it the least, corporations and banks; not us, not the workers.

By betraying the people who believed in you, you are going to pay and that payment will come on election day.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say ye.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): It being 12 minutes past 10 p.m., pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, June 9, 1992, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 10.12 p.m.