

encies. Ontario is only losing \$2 million. The Minister, to the question I asked him, and the President of the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation had this to answer on that matter, to a reporter from *La Presse*: We had to make up under the RRAP because Ontario needed it and had less funds than previously. Then, Mr. Speaker, I said to the Minister: This is untrue because under the Liberal government we know quite well that Quebec and the Maritimes needed more funds under RRAP, because they had more units to repair while Ontario and the Western provinces received more funds under the program for the construction of rental units, because their rate of vacancy was lower than in Quebec. The Minister beat around the bush as usual but I am fortunate today, because I have learned what the amounts are. I was shocked to learn that Quebec was penalized. It should be emphasized that such a decision was taken before the Ontario elections to help a good friend, one Mr. Miller. But that was done to no avail and it cost Quebecers \$17 million to help Mr. Miller who was almost defeated. If he was not this time, he will be the next time. Not only are we penalized under the RRAP, but I received today from the Minister's office budget figures for the construction of rental units. For Ontario, a first instalment of \$15 million, a second one of \$6.7 million and another one of \$415,000 for a hefty total of \$22,115,000. Quebec, you will be pleased to learn, will get nothing. It is as simple as that. Quebec gets nothing under that program, period. I hope that the Progressive Conservative members of Quebec who are here—they would normally have a caucus this evening—will ask the Minister some explanations and the list for their constituencies as well as their losses under the RRAP.

The Chicoutimi area received \$268,000 in 1984 but only \$97,000 this year, Mr. Speaker. In the Hull area, it is too bad that the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly) is not here. She is often too eager to rise on points of order to prevent opposition members from stating the truth and defending the interests of the Canadians, but I will say to her, Mr. Speaker, that she should shout this evening in caucus; Gatineau received \$480,000 in 1984, but that amount has been reduced to \$209,000 this year. In the Laval-Deux-Montagnes area, \$225,000 was spent in 1984 but only \$30,000 will be spent this year Mr. Speaker. I could go on and on and I am now trying to find the constituencies in the Beauce area.

● (1700)

**Mr. Blais:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

**Mr. Blais:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Montreal-Sainte-Marie should know that it is not considered parliamentary to refer to members' absence from or presence in the House. He often calls his colleagues' attention to this rule. Because of his many years experience, he should practise what

### Supply

he preaches, especially after his colleague lectured us this afternoon on the need to live up to our Standing Orders.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** I recognize the Hon. Member for Montreal-Sainte-Marie.

**Mr. Malépart:** I shall continue because I was precisely coming to this Hon. Member who is present. Something interesting in the Vaudreuil-Soulange riding, Mr. Speaker: \$739,000 in 1984; \$362,000 in 1985. Near Quebec City, in the Beauce riding—it sounds vaguely familiar to you, does it not?—\$417,000 in 1984; \$200,000 this year. Bellechasse, there we are! In the Bellechasse riding, \$445,000 in 1984, \$240,000 this year.

Mr. Speaker, I could continue with the list of all Quebec communities, both rural and urban, and indicate just how much this Conservative government has taken away from Quebecers: \$17 million under the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program, which is very important for the population as a whole, not only because it improves the quality of housing, but also because it creates a great many jobs.

Mr. Speaker, here is the heading of a newspaper article: "Demonstration at the office of the MP for Verdun-Saint-Paul (Mr. Chartrand) against the cancellation of the RRAP in connection with housing co-ops". The mayors of the municipalities in Rimouski County—they are not Liberals, Mr. Speaker—are very disappointed with the cuts made by this Conservative government.

There are cuts also to RRAP in the Arthabaska riding. According to this article, the funds made available by the Conservative government will make it possible to rehabilitate only one house or housing unit in each municipality. That is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker.

Same thing in the Rouyn-Noranda area: the constituents are anxious to meet their Member of Parliament.

Let us turn to the Sherbrooke area now, Mr. Speaker. All the mayors in the Eastern Townships and the members of the Quebec Construction Association strongly object to the Conservative government's decision to make cuts to RRAP in their region, in view of the great many applications received and of the expectations of the people in these communities.

Mr. Speaker, the prefects in Eastern Quebec have formed a common front, in Matane and Bellechasse. According to a regional newspaper, their member of Parliament met them and said: "Ladies and gentlemen, be patient because you are not going to get a cent. I have decided it was better to change the colours of our military uniforms than to help you." That was his reply, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Bellechasse (Mr. Blais) on a point of order.