## Government Orders

subject matter which I think might enjoy the support of all members of the House.

I do not wish to prejudge the House in any way but I am wondering if the parliamentary secretary could take that under advisement and perhaps either later this day or early on Monday indicate whether we could have a consensus on proceeding to an emergency debate on that important matter.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Speaker, I think what my hon. friend is asking for is a two-track process and I would be quite prepared to agree with the first track that he proposed and that is that discussions take place among the House leaders. That is the appropriate way to do it rather than making commitments here on the floor of the House.

Mr. Murphy: On the same point, Madam Speaker. If this action is undertaken by Canada it would be a significant departure from some of our previous activities on the world scene.

Many Canadians would be concerned to have a full debate, to understand exactly what the parameters of the commitment are. I would encourage the House leaders to meet either today or early Monday to ensure there is some vehicle for a public discussion on this issue.

## **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

## BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION (GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS) ACT, 1992

## MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-93, an act to implement certain government organization provisions of the budget tabled in the House of Commons on February 25, 1992, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee in the Economics envelope.

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, I thought we might get unanimous consent to give me more time if necessary. I am sure the House would want to hear my remarks.

I want to thank members for their consent so that I may complete my remarks.

• (1230)

Earlier today, I raised questions with regard to the procedural acceptability of Bill C-93. I hope that before the day is out we will have a decision from the Chair in terms of the points I raised.

In my remarks I made reference to the fact that the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, now in place, with great fanfare some time ago was announced with a budget of \$1.05 billion over five years. Individuals on the government side rejoiced that this was going to be the panacea for creating economic development in Atlantic Canada. In point of fact they have pointed to it as the lead tool for economic development.

The budgetary provisions of that particular day require careful examination. The money has roughly been \$200 million a year for four provinces equalling approximately \$86.96 per resident of Atlantic Canada. At the same time, the Government of Canada was providing \$1.2 billion for a space station, not to suggest that we are against that.

When one looks at the need for economic development in Atlantic Canada, however, that certainly has not been a sizeable expenditure for the needs of those particular residents.

I attempted in my remarks to lay out the history of the Cape Breton Development Corporation with its two divisions, its mandate, its own president, its own board of directors. I talked about Bill C-103, namely the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, part I and part II which was Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation. For all practical purposes it was to usurp the role of the industrial development division of Devco and thereby be rolled into a separate and distinct Crown corporation.

My colleague in the upper house raised a number of questions with regard to the efficacy of that particular Crown corporation. I would like to repeat what my colleague, the Hon. Allan J. MacEachen, at that time leader of the opposition in the other House said on June 14, 1988. He was questioning the government House leader, Senator Murray. He said:

Would I be correct in concluding that, while ACOA, as a whole, will not be involved in infrastructure, for example, or not involved directly in assistance to farmers, the new Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation will still be enabled to fund projects in the field of infrastructure, in the