

new position as the Conservative party critic on housing. One might have hoped that in her first speech she would not only have thrown cream-puffs but would have added a few bricks. Probably in the next speech she will do so.

The motion condemns the government in three areas, that of housing, that of urban transportation and that of energy conservation. The Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) is in charge of housing, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) is in charge of transportation, and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) is in charge of energy conservation. I say without any hesitation that the policies and attitudes of these three ministers are cruel, crass and cocky. Those are the three adjectives that best describe them.

The housing policies of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs are the result of bowing and begging and giving land speculators, developers, builders and financial institutions almost complete control over the number and types of housing, the interest rates, the land costs and the financing of housing in Canada, with the result that 80 per cent of Canadians cannot afford housing today. This situation is imposing hardship on young married couples and elderly people who wish to obtain reasonable housing accommodation. Mr. Speaker, this really amounts to criminal cruelty. I read the speech the Minister of State for Urban Affairs delivered in Toronto on November 2 before the Property Forum and this is what he said as the commitment of the government:

● (1452)

We, as a government, have a commitment to the people of Canada. We have undertaken to ensure that all Canadians—wherever they may live—have access to good housing, at an affordable cost, and in a safe and satisfying community environment.

That commitment, or statement, really amounts to fraudulent advertising.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Gilbert:** When we take into account the three components of housing, which are land costs, building costs and interest rates, what is the picture of this government and, specifically, the job this particular minister has done and is responsible for? Let me quote from a study of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which contains 2,000 pages with regard to housing conditions in Canada. These are some of the highlights of the housing picture today in Canada. I am quoting from the *Montreal Star* of March 29, 1977, which is commenting on the report.

About 7 per cent of city households have serious problems, says a Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. study . . .

The corporation yesterday released a summary of a bulky 23-volume, 2,000-page report on housing conditions in the country's 23 metropolitan areas in 1974.

It goes on to say:

But 40 per cent of households face at least one of the major housing problems of overcrowding, poor housing conditions and housing cost, the report said. Of these, 7 per cent or 225,000 households are burdened with at least two of these problems and are in serious difficulty.

### Housing

The CMHC report concludes that "renters appeared to be worse off than home owners—they constituted about three-quarters of the 225,000 households with serious difficulties."

The survey report says the largest single housing problem is cost.

About 547,000 households are paying more than 25 per cent of total household income in rental or mortgage payments.

About 298,000 households are overcrowded and 198,000 are living in sub-standard housing.

Then the CMHC report draws this biased view and says by almost any measure Canadians in the urban part of the country are well housed. It just indicates, from the attitude of the minister—and he displayed it this afternoon—that Canadians should be mighty thankful to the Liberal government.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gilbert:** When he criticized the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton for her remarks concerning housing conditions, he said that in her particular riding she should be very proud because of the actions of the two previous Liberal members. The only inference to be drawn from that is that unless you are a Liberal member you do not get any money for housing or anything. Mr. Speaker, this just indicates the crassness and cockiness of this particular minister.

I would like to point out to the minister just what housing costs in Canada. These figures are from the *Globe and Mail* of November 19, 1977, showing the cost of a three-bedroom bungalow with one garage. These are the costs across the country: Cornerbrook, Newfoundland, \$55,000 this year compared to \$54,000 in 1976. In a province with roughly 25 per cent unemployment, can you imagine a worker paying \$55,000 in Corner Brook, Newfoundland? In Montreal, in one area, \$47,500; another area, \$43,000; and yet another area, \$39,000. In Toronto, in the Thornhill area, \$83,000 this year compared to \$76,000 last year; Scarborough, \$67,400 compared to \$65,000 last year; Richmond Hill, \$65,000 compared to \$60,000 last year; Ottawa, \$62,400 compared to \$60,300 last year; Calgary, \$78,000, compared to \$72,000 last year; Vancouver, in one area, \$94,000 compared to \$93,000.

These are examples of what it costs for houses across the nation, knowledge of which the minister should have. I say to the minister, "How can young people afford to pay those prices—

**An hon. Member:** They have other types of houses they can buy.

**Mr. Gilbert:**—so they can establish themselves?" I can appreciate that the truth really hurts this particular minister.

**An hon. Member:** That is why they lost the November 15 election.

**Mr. Gilbert:** All these homes have an average mortgage of \$50,000 to \$60,000 and an interest rate from 10 per cent to 12 per cent. You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, just what the payments are for the particular house they purchase.

The second component is land costs. For an NHA single, detached lot in 1977 the cost is \$9,918. The Malvern Project—