

Supply

Let us get to the core funding applications and project funding applications about which my colleague has spoken. The core funding applications have been annual applications, not long term applications. They must be applied for every year. Every project needs to have an application.

In the last few weeks the minister has reiterated the importance of flexibility in the program. These moneys are to be used for such things as rent, light and heat. The minister has asked the women's groups to forward applications. The staff has been available to assist in filling out the applications. We are prepared to expedite those applications in order that the funding is available. I think the hon. member, instead of inciting a situation, needs to see how we can work together to make this a very substantial program so we can attain what we are all looking for and that is equality and social justice for women.

Ms. Clancy: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her comments, but I am afraid I must correct a misconception on her part. It is difficult to understand the difference between core funding and project funding. It may have been a slip of the tongue, but what she said was that each project must be approved separately. That is quite true for project funding, but core funding is different.

Core funding is done usually every year, I agree. There are different lengths of time, but a year is the average. Core funding is considered to be renewable and it covers certain things that project funding does not. I further tell the hon. member, with the greatest of respect, that I asked the minister today in Question Period, whether or not he could assure the women of Canada that all those groups which lost their core funding would get comparable funding under project funding. I am afraid I received no such assurance and neither did the women of Canada.

Core funding pays for things like rent, heat, lights, and co-ordinator's salaries. Project funding relates to a specific project and, thus far, it is not within the project funding terms of reference—so far as we know and so far as we have been told by consultations today with the minister's department—whether or not a project can be keeping open the centre. It does not appear that can be the case, that you must have a specific project.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, I would like to make a comment and ask a question. I would like to comment on a comment, if I may.

The Conservative member across the way has just said that the government wants to see equality and social justice for women. Well, why not just restore the funding? Why not just admit it was a mistake, or it has gone wrong, or it is not working, and just restore the funding? That would be the simple way of doing it. Governments have done that in the past.

We had a provincial government in B.C. that I never voted for and never liked, but sometimes the old Premier, W.A.C. Bennett, would say: "Well, we're taking another look at it" and something would change when there was a public outcry. Why the gobbledegook about core funding and project funding? That is just putting poor women who are overworked and underpaid through more bureaucratic hassle. Just restore the funding.

I have a question for the hon. member from the Liberal Party who just spoke. Is there another agenda here from the government? She mentioned more money for propaganda and advertising the GST. There is more money for the secret police. Are we, in fact, seeing the government trying to punish what they think are political opponents in the women's movement or, for example, native people? The government cut back native communications programming and so on. It is a paranoid government that considers that somehow these groups are not on its team. They are not the big business boys so it is punishing them. They are the groups in society which can least afford to be punished.

I wonder if the hon. member is hinting that there is another agenda there on the government's part and that it is not just an oversight. Is it a real agenda to kill these kinds of groups and to put them down, perceived in the paranoid way of the government that somehow these groups are in opposition to what it stands for?

Ms. Clancy: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from British Columbia for his comments and his question. Indeed, if I was hinting, I apologize. I agree, absolutely, that there is another agenda here. I am not absolutely certain that it is a political reaction in the manner suggested by him in that political opponents within the women's movement or native Canadians who have become politically active are being punished. I do not think that the level of reaction here is quite that