

Private Members' Business

legislation to end it. The Government of Canada should reinstate the subsidy and be true to its word.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The next time the bill comes up, the hon. member will have 10 minutes questions and comments. I hope that you will all be there when the debate is all over.

I have received written notice from the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Mr. Allmand, that he is unable to move his motion during private members' hour on Monday, June 10, 1991. It has not been possible to arrange an exchange of positions in order of precedence pursuant to Standing Order 94(2).

Accordingly, I am directing the table officers to drop the item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence.

Private members' hour will thus be cancelled. Pursuant to Standing Order 99(2) the House will meet to consider Government Orders at 11 o'clock a.m.

It being five o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 37, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

REQUEST FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of directing financial assistance to Co-operative Development Agencies, pilot co-op projects, and Community-based Economic Development Organizations.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is again a privilege to rise under private members' business to discuss an item of business which I think is very important to a great many Canadians, but which is not very easy to cover within the regular business of the House because co-operatives and community development organizations enjoy a very low priority with the present government.

When we are talking about co-operatives and community development organizations, I think we are talking about something that is part of a larger trend in our society.

Certainly when Canadians are discussing the political and constitutional future of their country, we hear a lot of talk about Canadians wanting to be directly involved in determining the future of the country.

They want to be directly involved in making the decisions that affect their political and economic future. It could well be said that the low standing which the government currently enjoys in public opinion polls is a direct result of its inability or unwillingness to involve Canadians directly in their political future.

I think this feeling on behalf of Canadians that the future is out of their control and their deep concerns about the future of their community, their children and themselves is also very evident when it comes to their economic future. People ought to be involved just as much in their economic future and ought to have just as much control over their economic future as they do over their political future.

If I could review just briefly the general trends when it comes to economic development in this country, I think it is fair to say that we have seen two major trends since the Second World War.

The general policy pursued by Liberal governments through the years relied very much on attracting branch plants to the country and developing an the economy that was very closely linked to that of the United States.

There was very little opportunity within that economic structuring for local control or development of local economies.

With the Progressive Conservative government which we have seen since 1984, those trends have become much more evident. The trend toward the loss of local control has become much more serious through two specific trends which the government has introduced, those being its reliance on megaprojects which are directly tied to its reliance on the major corporations, the large corporations in this country and in other countries.