

Supply

creation programs in the short term as a bridge to the point where we have other jobs flowing from a revitalized private sector, thanks to the policies of this particular Government. That is why I am delighted to be able to vote against this motion.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a comment. It is not often that I would say I feel slandered in the House, but I want it to appear on the record that I do not consider my time as a Cabinet Minister to be comparable or compared in any way with the period of time of the Hon. Member who has just spoken when he was a member of Cabinet. I make a very real distinction between the two and I want the record to show that.

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the lady from Kingston and the Islands made that point. The only point I was making in reference to my brief period in Cabinet, which discussion she initiated, not I, was that when I was there I did no damage at all.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Oberle: That will make the quote of the week.

Mr. Nystrom: He did not have any time; he was only there for two weeks.

My question deals with the so-called slush fund, Mr. Speaker. In Saskatchewan we do not have any Liberal ridings to spend it on, so the money is spent differently. The program I want to ask about is the Immediate Employment Stimulation Program looked after by Senator Hazen Argue. It involves \$4 million, and the only access to it is through Senator Hazen Argue. I approached officials in the Department of Employment and Immigration for capital funds and they told me that there is no such funding available. They say that under Canada Works and so on we can fund the labour component of some project but we have no money for capital expenses. We get quite a few projects like that, Mr. Speaker, and we keep on being told there is no such program. We find out later on, through contacts which have to remain confidential, that indeed Senator Argue is administering a \$4 million fund. They do give out moneys for capital costs. Does the Hon. Member think it is proper that that kind of thing be kept from Members of Parliament and from municipalities?

The other question deals with the fact that public servants are not involved in screening these applications. Project officers are not involved in looking at and analysing the applications. Departmental officials do not make any recommendations. A decision is made in Senator Hazen Argue's office, and that is it. It goes to Ottawa where it is rubber stamped, and after that the Public Service become involved. Is this proper? Do we not have public servants who are supposed to do a job such as they do for Canada Works and all the other programs? Why in this case is a Minister of the Crown making these unilateral decisions rather than going through the Public Service, which is the right, proper and decent way?

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Senator from Saskatchewan has another responsibility. He is a Member of Government. In that capacity he has some decision-making authority. I do not know beyond that what the system is in Saskatchewan. However, I can tell the Hon. Member that in so far as any job creation projects I have been involved in are concerned, all have been subject to very close scrutiny, screening and examination by Manpower officials. I can only assume that the same process happens elsewhere.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Hon. Member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) to look at the "blues", because he may have a question of privilege to raise arising out of comments made by the previous speaker. I would also like to point out that the Schefferville settlement from Iron Ore Company of Canada has been judged by impartial observers as the largest, fairest, most generous settlement in Canadian corporate history.

Mr. Gimaiel: Come on!

Mr. Hawkes: That tells us about the attitude of the Leader of this Party toward working people in this country. If that had been paralleled by Members opposite, we would have expected major government initiatives, but none of us in the House have ever seen that. But we have seen a response from a corporation president who is now our Leader, and it speaks well for the future of working people in this country under what we hope will soon be a new Government.

The question I have for the Member is the following. In the last 19 years his Party has been, with the exception of nine months, the Government of this country. Throughout most of that period, and certainly today, the Province of Newfoundland which he represents has had an extremely high unemployment rate. Can the Member tell us what he thinks is so marvellous about the policies of the Party he supports when, in a period of 19 years, nothing but unemployed people have been created in the Province of Newfoundland? Why have these marvellous policies not solved the unemployment problem in Newfoundland in 19 years?

● (1710)

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Calgary West is completely right when he says that the Schefferville settlement was a good one. It was not the settlement that I was criticizing. It is the set of circumstances that triggered the need for a settlement.

The settlement was good because my colleague from Manicouagan (Mr. Maltais) made representations. The then President of Iron Ore was publicly on record at that time as paying tribute to the gentleman who did what we on this side are good at doing, that is, getting after the Government to address some of the real problems in the country.

Yes, the Government addressed the problem but no, the Government did not create the problem. The Hon. Member who is now the temporary Member for Central Nova created the problem passively by taking his cues from Cleveland