

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): The Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) on a point of order.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am in this House under the same set of circumstances as any other Member here. It has been very difficult for me, as a Member of Parliament, to listen to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of the country refuse to accord me the same title as any other Member of this Parliament day after day and year after year. Sir, I protest that I am entitled to be addressed as a Member of Parliament. It is on that basis that I was sworn into this Parliament. I insist that that is how we should all be addressed.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I am sure that the hon. lady would not want us not to respect past practice. Very often it has been accepted in the House that we call a colleague the hon. gentleman from a certain riding. I am pretty sure that the hon. lady is not suggesting that we should not call her a lady. I respect her very much. There is nothing wrong and nothing contrary to parliamentary practice in calling an Hon. Member either an hon. gentleman, if I am addressing Mr. Dick, for example, or an hon. lady, if I am addressing my good colleague, the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald).

● (1720)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): I did not personally sense any intention to show any lack of respect. It might simplify matters if Hon. Members could restrict themselves to the use of the terminology "Hon. Member".

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, as always, an excellent ruling. I hope the Opposition will keep that in mind when they sometimes refer to Ministers during Question Period as other than Minister.

The point raised by the lady from Kingston and the Islands—

Miss MacDonald: He just ruled.

Mr. Simmons: The Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands. You interpret me correctly, Mr. Speaker. Of course, I intended no disrespect. I used it in the same vein that she had, moments earlier, when referring to the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate as the gentleman from Gander Twillingate. It is quite common practice. It is far from me to suggest that she is not a lady.

I thought it was touching that the gentleman, the Hon. Member for Elgin came to her rescue so magnificently a few moments ago. At that point she needed rescue because she was impugning the performance of a Trojan in this House, the Member for Gander-Twillingate.

I happen to agree with the Member for Elgin thoroughly when he says that the Tories, during their nine months in office, created 40,000 jobs. I believe, and let the record show that, that they did create 40,000 jobs. Nobody would deny them that. Nobody on this side of the House would deny them

Supply

that because we know that the reason the programs were in place to create those jobs was that a Liberal government had preceded that Tory government for the preceding 16 years, from 1963 to 1979. Despite the fact that they wiped out every fisheries project in Atlantic Canada during their nine months in office, and despite their stated policy to do away with job creation programs, they were unable to wipe out all the jobs. Therefore, 40,000 jobs were created as a heritage, a leftover from a Liberal government. They were jobs that they could not destroy despite their most destructive efforts.

The gentleman from Elgin is absolutely right, the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands—

Miss MacDonald: You are learning.

Mr. Simmons: I agree with the lady from Kingston and the Islands when she says that the attitude of some politicians toward Newfoundland and Labrador is absolutely despicable. She is absolutely right. Again, I remind you and her, Mr. Speaker, that among those politicians who manifest such attitudes are the two gentlemen from Newfoundland who are in the Tory Cabinet and who had such a despicable attitude toward Newfoundland that they were party to wiping out every single fisheries project in all of Newfoundland and Labrador. All of them had been approved, had gone through the Cabinet process during the Liberal years, had gone through the parliamentary process and were on track until the two gentlemen from St. John's got a hold of them. They put them off track very fast. She is right, that is despicable.

Speaking of other politicians, watching the performance these days of the Premier of Newfoundland, a man I know very well, makes one a little unhappy about what some politicians will dare to do. The economy of Newfoundland is not on track to the degree it could be if we had an agreement on the offshore. The reason there is not an agreement on the offshore has nothing to do with a lack of willingness on the part of the Government of Canada. It has nothing to do with a lack of willingness or desire on the part of the Newfoundland community at large. It has very little to do with any lack of willingness in the Government of Newfoundland as a whole. It does concern the attitude of the Premier of the province who fights not to win, but who fights to fight. His objective is to fight some more today and some more tomorrow. Until that attitude changes, I agree with the Member for Kingston and the Islands that we will continually have to lament the approach of some politicians who would put base, partisan politics before the good of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I thank her for raising that particular issue because it is an important issue to the gentleman from Gander-Twillingate, and an important one to me.

I also agree with her that the Tories were in power at a time when the unemployment rate was decidedly lower than it is today. Is she suggesting that because a government of whatever political stripe took office that somehow the unemployment rate suddenly shot downwards? Is that what she wants us to believe? The truth is that that unemployment rate was low