

because of its involvement with provincial and municipal governments in many aspects of policy, could be doing something. The mayor of Montreal has proudly suggested that his administration is going to spend some hundreds of thousands of dollars to build 3,000 new low income homes which will be made available to people with lower incomes after the Olympics. What he has not pointed out or emphasized is that the same city is going to lose 3,400 units now in existence during the preparation of that great extravaganza. This represents a net loss of some 400 housing units to the poor people of Montreal. What the federal government could do if it were really serious about involving itself with the concerns of the poor people, particularly those in the province of Quebec, is say to the mayor of Montreal he will not get one cent of federal money to put into that extravaganza unless this policy is changed and unless he begins to do something now about the welfare of these poor people.

The politics of grandeur are popular not only with the mayor of Montreal but, unfortunately, with many other people in that city. This approach must be abandoned if the real needs and interests of the average citizen in that city are to be met. The federal government has an important responsibility to not encourage the politics of grandeur by participating in this Olympic project of Mr. Drapeau. That is one act, symbolic if you like, of a number of similar practical moves the federal government could make in respect of municipal politics, not only in Montreal but elsewhere in this country. I will conclude with that suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and, although he delivered his speech in a very commendable way, I think it might be well to point out to the hon. member for York South that he spent 28 minutes out of his 30-minute speech bewailing unemployment, stressing its disastrous and unfortunate consequences. I feel that on that score, except for a few allusions he may have made, all hon. members agree.

And as time went by, I became very anxious to know what constructive suggestions he might make to the government to change the situation he so intelligently and learnedly put before the House.

For another minute, he spoke about the effectiveness of the measures and towards the end of his speech, he talked about the establishment of special programs of a general nature following a federal-provincial conference with the co-operation of municipalities, about changes of attitudes in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and about an increase in old age pensions.

Mr. Speaker, the disastrous effects of unemployment cannot be denied. The hon. member for York South talked about the unemployment conditions in Quebec. I agree with him on that subject, but more so with the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) who just sat down and who said that something must be done to fight unemployment in Quebec.

Employment Programs

In 1969, the hon. member for York South said, if those figures are accurate, that 45,000 new jobs had been created in Ontario. On the other hand, the federal government is blamed in certain areas of the country for overdoing it in Quebec, where only 3,000 new jobs have been created. Yet, the same federal legislation, the same measures of assistance are involved.

Mr. Lewis: It was not in 1969, but in 1970.

Mr. Laflamme: I thank the hon. member for his correction, but whether it is in 1969 or in 1970, the argument is basically the same, to wit under the same federal legislation, 45,000 new jobs are created in Ontario and only 3,000 in Quebec.

Why this anomaly? I do not agree with the reasons given by the hon. member. The real cause of the shortage of investments reported by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and one which has yet consequences for which the federal government is required to take emergency action, so to speak, is the lack of stability and action which, for too long a time, have been a characteristic of politics in Quebec.

While nowhere else in our country was any disagreement possible on the basic structure of our society, in Quebec, this matter was challenged and the news was splashed all over the front page of all Canadian newspapers.

And while unfortunate events were taking place in Quebec, investors were being frightened away so that, as the Minister of Finance has just stated, capital investments in Quebec in 1969 only reached 62 per cent of the national average.

The hon. member for York South should understand that basically this terrorist action is not linked to unemployment. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby has just said that activists and terrorists are generally found among the unemployed who have lost hope. This is true. However, the agitators in Quebec who are mainly responsible for a drop in investments, and, consequently, more unemployment, have been led on by the political climate which prevailed for too many years. This state of affairs has been gradually disappearing, so we hope at least, since April 29, 1970.

I have no intention of singing the praises of Mr. Robert Bourassa, premier of Québec. The people of Quebec, in the last election, had no other choice but to vote for a party that was the only one, in the last ten years, to advocate keeping Quebec in the Confederation and putting an end to the sterile debates on constitutional reform and the carpet wars. The Liberal party wants to solve the economic problem and to take action in that area.

Almost all the people would have wished to cast their vote for it, except those who, cleverly stressing the problems obtaining in Quebec, tried to make the people believe that the Ottawa government is against the adoption of any legislation that may be helpful to the poor. This climate seems to be lifting and since Quebec has a government able to really understand the situation, it is