

Supply

Mr. Taylor: Read it again. You've probably read it all wrong.

Mr. Simmons: What I have said thus far, of course, has been straight from the heart. I did not need any glasses to see the inconsistency on the part of the Hon. Member for Simcoe North, because that is obvious to many people. I did not really need glasses to be reminded of what I heard from the Hon. Member for St. John's East during my period in the Newfoundland House. I heard him here in Ottawa as a very strong advocate, for example, of consumer matters, that kind of thing which is shown on television. He and I share exactly the same concern. What disillusioned me was that when his Party formed the Government, albeit briefly, there was no initiative from him or his Government to address the matter which he so much decried during his period in Opposition.

Mr. McGrath: You didn't give us a chance, Roger.

Mr. Simmons: The argument is always that they never had a chance. They will not say it in this House, but they say privately when speaking of their good friend, Mrs. Pigott that they never had a chance to do many other things. She had the patronage list all ready.

Miss MacDonald: That didn't stop Arthur Erickson or Donald Macdonald or—

Mr. Simmons: However, it did not proceed as far as they had hoped. Therefore, they must now officially be against patronage, because they were a little slow in getting on with the job at hand.

The record is clear that they are fairly slow at most things. I agree with the Hon. Member for St. John's East that they never had a chance, not the kind of chance they would need, because they would need years and years to do some of those things.

Mr. McGrath: How do you explain 30 per cent in the polls, Roger?

Mr. Simmons: With regard to the particular issue of consumer matters upon which I touched in relation to the Hon. Member for St. John's East, I would have hoped that they might have seen as being the kind of priority that which he had seen in Opposition.

It is a well known game, an easy thing to say what could be done, what should be done or what would be done. However, it is a far different matter to put one's money where one's mouth is. That requires a bit of courage. In that particular respect, the courage was lacking or the priority was not there, because we still have the same kind of thing which the Hon. Member for St. John's East so long decried in Opposition. It could have been changed had he followed through with his stated convictions on the matter.

It is really mind-boggling to hear the Hon. Member for Simcoe North speaking of our failures, as he puts them, to live up to commitments. Has he not done the very simple exercise that I have done or have had done on my behalf? Has he not

done the very simple exercise of taking, statement by statement, the commitments and the undertakings in the Throne Speech of 1980, and comparing or relating them to Government actions since then?

I hold in my hand a document comprising about 28 or 30 pages. Very concisely and without a lot of verbage, it says, "Here was the promise, the commitment. Here is the action which flows from it". I could take the House, were there the time, through literally dozens of quotations from the Throne Speech of 1980, quotations relating to home mortgages and housing. I could remind the House of the program whereby the Government undertook to guarantee repayment of the amount of interest deferred in the case of homeowners whose gross debt service ratio exceeded 30 per cent. I could do likewise for commitments related to additional rental units. I could do likewise for other initiatives in the housing area, the home renovation plan, for example, the new initiative which flowed from our commitment in 1980. I could do likewise concerning initiatives in farming and small business and, particularly, the amendments to the Farm Improvement Loans Act which renews that program for another three years and increases the loan maximums available to farmers from \$75,000 to \$100,000.

● (1550)

However, by doing so I would make a very elementary mistake, the mistake of assuming that Tories would ever be confused by the facts, the simple mistake of believing that they would want to hear anything that would rebut the charge. They want to carry on in their own merry way stating the big lie over and over again to Canadians.

I invite them instead, to get their facts straight before making those charges, and realize for example that the commitment this Government made in the Throne Speech to raise the Guaranteed Income Supplement to the Old Age Security Pension by \$35 a month as of July 1, 1980 was met on June 5, 1980 when we put legislation through the House to keep that commitment.

Have we heard in today's speeches any acknowledgement that perhaps some commitments have been kept? Are they so naive as to think that the public, from whatever segment, believes what they say about this Government?

Miss MacDonald: Thirty per cent of them.

Mr. Simmons: Are they so naive as to think that everybody out there believes everything they say?

Miss MacDonald: Only 50 per cent.

Mr. Simmons: She talks, Mr. Speaker, and she talks. She does not say anything but she talks. I say to my good friend from Kingston and the Islands that we have a system—

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): You should have.

Mr. Simmons: —for electing governments in this country. It is not a government by polls. Her own erstwhile leader said the