

Supply

GOVERNMENT FUNDS ALLOCATED FOR LABORATORIES

***Question No. 236—Mr. Saint-Julien:**

For each year since the Canadian Centre for Mineral and Energy Technology (CANMET) was created, for each province, has the government allocated funds for laboratories in (a) Ottawa (b) Edmonton (c) Calgary (d) Elliot Lake (e) Cape Breton (f) Quebec City (g) Montreal (h) Val d'Or and, if so, what amounts?

Hon. Arthur Jacob Epp (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Due to archival constraints, the requested information, since the founding of the Canadian Centre for Mineral and Energy Technology (CANMET) in 1975, is not readily available. However, for the fiscal years 1986-87 to 1988-89, the following distribution of CANMET's operating costs can be provided:

Average Operating Costs, 1986-87-1988-89			
		\$/Year	%Distribution
(a)	National Capital Region	51,244,000	88.4
(b) & (c)	Alberta	4,233,000	7.3
(d)	Elliot Lake	1,421,000	2.4
(e)	Nova Scotia	1,076,000	1.9
(f)	Quebec *	-	-
(g) & (h)	CANMET does not have any laboratories in Montreal or in Val d'or.		

NOTE : The indicated operating costs, which have comprised about 82 per cent of CAMNET's total costs in the past, will decline to about 76 per cent of the total during the next few years as a growing share of CAMNET's R&D program is contracted out to industry and universities. This will result from a change in the nature of CAMNET's R&D program as well as from a desire to diversify CAMNET's R&D effort. Moreover, the regional distribution will change to reflect the presence of the new energy laboratory at Varennes, Québec.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The questions as enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary have been answered.

Mr. Cooper: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S. O. 81—FUNDING FOR WOMEN'S CENTRES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Ms. Hunter:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should reinstate core funding for women's centres, to enable those centres to continue to provide essential information, referral and support services to women.

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Madam Speaker, I rise today in sorrow that I have to support this motion, although pleased that the motion was brought forward by my colleague from Saanich—Gulf Islands, but in sorrow that the need for a motion like this arises in Canada.

I might also say that I am devastated to see that the Secretary of State is no longer with us.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order. The hon. member does know that referring to the presence or absence of a member or a minister is just not done in this House. I know she will be careful.

Ms. Clancy: Madam Speaker, I am devastated that we have to speak on this issue yet again in the House.

We are looking at the Secretary of State cut of \$23 million in total. We are looking specifically at the cut to women's programs of \$1.6 million. We are also looking at the difference between core funding and project funding.

The hon. minister told us this morning that some women did not understand the difference, and I assure you that women understand all too well the difference between core funding and project funding.

First, the number of programs affected by cuts in core funding is 76, and I will discuss those programs further along in my remarks.

Second, core funding is a long-term kind of funding. It allows for long-term planning and for autonomy, an arm's length relationship to government policy. Project funding, on the other hand, is short term and limited to a particular purpose. If the government is changing the rules *vis-à-vis* the titles of these funding programs, all that is happening is something similar to a geometry