

*Private Members' Business*

help feeling frustrated or resigned when dealing with this kind of government!

[English]

In the minister's perfunctory conclusion to her remarks this morning she mentioned a few aspects of the legislation, such as how this was going to respond to the Charter of Rights provisions which, as you know, Mr. Speaker, were required, and that was going to create training. I wish I had more time to explain the way in which these training funds are being reacted to in the rural parts of this country. It is a joke. Parts of the country where the private sector is limited at best cannot respond to the provisions of training that are in this bill. What is going to happen is that we are going to be denied benefits, on top of the fact that our entrance requirements are going to increase. The unemployed are going to be shut out of benefits, out of training in the very regions where they need them.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The member will be allowed to complete his speech on Monday if he wishes.

[Translation]

I have received from the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) written notice advising me that he will be unable to introduce his motion during private members' hour on Friday, November 3, 1989. Since we could not, pursuant to Standing Order 94, arrange for an exchange of positions in the order of precedence, I am ordering the Clerk to drop this item to the bottom of the order of precedence.

Private members' hour will then be cancelled and, pursuant to Standing Order 94, the House will continue with the business at hand prior to that hour.

[English]

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

[English]

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS****JOB OPPORTUNITIES**

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

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of encouraging and building community-based investment and job initiatives through community and worker co-operatives, community development corporations, regional councils, small businesses and farms and municipal governments.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the opportunity that is given to us as private members to bring a motion before our peers and to get their judgment on whether what we are proposing has merit and if it is something that we should all develop a consensus around and make our voices heard.

I would like to begin by outlining some of the remarks I made when this particular motion was being considered by the committee which decides whether or not it will be a votable motion and have five hours of debate. We had very good discussions at that committee and I appreciated the discussion. I can also appreciate that another member's motion won the day, but nevertheless I would like to inform members that the members of that committee were very interested in the proposal I was making.

The five reasons why I thought this should be votable and should have a five hour debate are the following. First, I find that often economic debate in this House is very sterile, is often very polarized, it pits a vision usually imputed from one side to the other, with big government on the one side versus unfettered free enterprise on the other. There are an awful lot of nuances and an awful lot of things we all actually might agree on that are lost in that kind of a polarized debate.

Second, what I am describing in this motion is national in scope. There are co-operative and community development organizations actively involved in virtually every community in this country. Every member of this House,