

*Points of Order*

I might add that the facility in Montreal will not be built by the government. It will be built by the private sector and arranged on a lease back basis to the government. Subsequently we will still continue to have the savings of \$35 million per year.

**Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton):** Jeffrey Simpson just recently said in an article on defence: "When it comes to budget cutting political requirements invariably come first".

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder, given the time, if the hon. member could put his question.

**Mr. Rideout:** Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that the government would respond on the basis that the supply depot in Downsview should be consolidated with the one in Montreal, when all the internal reports indicate that it should have gone to Kingston. The same information is available for Moncton.

Why is the government playing politics with national defence and with the lives of employees at the Moncton supply depot?

• (1500)

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister Responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I can assure my hon. colleague that I know all these decisions are difficult. Indeed many people indicate that we should do further rationalization of our infrastructure. We recognize that changes have to be made to meet the realities of today.

I would like to advise the member, though, that when we looked at the total Canadian scene, the rationalization of depots throughout the country, it made more sense to establish them and maintain them in Edmonton and to work with the existing facilities in Longue Pointe, Montreal, rather than to establish any new Greenfield operations, which I think the hon. member would agree would not have made any logical sense.

\* \* \*

**CORE AREA INITIATIVE**

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Yesterday the Core Area Initiative program in Winnipeg died. The pallbearers were the federal and provincial Tories. What a national disgrace.

Why did this government refuse to renew funding for this program which has helped some 3,000 inner city Winnipeggers find jobs? Why did this government again turn its back on Winnipeg, one of the poorest cities in Canada? Why did—

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has put his question.

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the hon. member that it had been agreed to end core two, which ended yesterday, at the end of the fiscal year. There was a lot of overhead. We want to have an agreement between the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba on funding that is now being used by the Government of Canada, for example, in training of especially aboriginal people in Winnipeg to give them the kind of training they need so that they can integrate into the job market.

It is better for us to spend the money for training and for those people than to maintain something that has now ended and which was agreed to end by all three levels of government.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**Mr. Speaker:** I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of Dr. Peter Tancig, Minister of Science and Technology of the Republic of Slovenia.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

\* \* \*

**POINTS OF ORDER****CLARIFICATION OF REMARKS**

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to clarify a point I made in response to the member for Skeena and pursuant to a matter that the leader of the NDP had raised.

Non-energy pipelines can include coking coal, other minerals, chemical feed stocks, and non-petroleum based gases as well as oil and natural gas. I wanted to make that clear so that there would be no misunderstanding whatsoever about the import of my answer.