

### Housing

mitted to—"committed to removing the 12 per cent sales tax". If that was a commitment I would hate to see a promise. Then he went on to say that the Liberal government "will offer" the best use of existing railway rights of way and that the Liberal government "will rapidly implement" the railway relocation act.

Those were Liberal promises—commitments—the clear, unadulterated policy that the Prime Minister promised the Canadian people in Vancouver on June 17, 1974. What has happened since? The \$270 million promised for this program has been withdrawn. A former minister of finance, no longer a member of this House, withdrew those funds and renege on the promise. We have nothing, and we do not see the prospect of any action.

There is a matter of more grievous concern, Mr. Speaker, and that is in the area of housing. I should like to quote something for the record and give hon. members opposite five seconds to guess the source. If the Minister of State for Urban Affairs were here he might help hon. members opposite, but he has left them to hold the fort so they will have to fend for themselves. I would ask hon. members to listen to the following statement:

When 280,000 families in Canada pay more than 50 per cent of their family income for housing and 500,000 families in Canada pay more than 35 per cent, and 820,000 families pay more than 25 per cent, and when two-thirds of those Canadians in need of housing cannot afford to buy or rent a home without a government subsidy, we have a problem of fundamental proportions. We must take decisive action now or face unparalleled problems later.

The five seconds are up and hon. members opposite have not guessed that statement was made by the deputy minister of urban affairs, William Teron, chairman of CMHC, only one year and two months ago in the city of Calgary. I was there and I heard him. He talks about taking "decisive action now or face unparalleled problems" in the future. Since then the Minister of State for Urban Affairs has been going about his political activities in the province of Quebec—and not too successfully. He has been alienating the municipalities and provinces.

The Postmaster General (Mr. Blais) interjects with some figures pertaining to our representation in this House from certain parts of Canada. If he is as bold and confident as he appears from his seat, why does he not call an election now? Then we will see who comes back with the corporal's guard.

The Prime Minister is also in Quebec politicking for the next election, whenever it comes. There is a critical problem in Canada which is being intensified by the attitude the minister expressed in the House today. We have a conflict between the provinces, the municipalities which are the creatures of the provinces, and the federal government. We have to determine who has the constitutional right to act in the various areas relating to housing and urban affairs. Some provinces take block funding, unconditional grants, non-designated equalization payments, and then there is the federal government taking the federalist attitude.

Today in committee I quoted from the *Financial Post*, but the minister objected that it was not an accurate recollection

[Mr. Whiteway.]

of what he said. I have the paper here and should like to quote from the *Financial Post* of October 8 where the minister is reported as saying "I am not prepared to see federal funds used in Quebec without making the population aware that it's thanks to their Canadian government."

The attitude of the minister is clearly that he wants to get credit for federal moneys spent in the provinces. The minister wants his name up in lights for everyone to see his wondrous works. I am not a shorthand writer, but I believe this afternoon the hon. minister indicated that the intervention of federal government into urban affairs is natural, that his department helps to co-ordinate activities, and that their role is complementary. He went on to explain that this complementary role makes for a better general plan. Approximately five times the minister used the word "consultation", and that nothing was done without consultation with the provinces.

● (1542)

**Mr. Andres:** That is right.

**Mr. Whiteway:** I will prove to the hon. member how wrong that is. I should like to tell him not to get excited. I realize the little fish bite even before the hook is baited.

Particularly in Quebec there is a new developing hostility between the provincial government and the federal minister. Let it not be said, or thought even for a fleeting moment, that members on this side of the House take the position of the Parti Québécois on any issue. Members on this side are clear federalists. The minister violates the constitutional authority of all provinces and the Parliament of Canada.

The situation in Quebec has developed to the point where a document called the black book or the black file is being compiled. It contains all the instances where the Minister of State for Urban Affairs has lied. That is not my language. It is the language of Mr. Jean Foisey, who is the special adviser to the minister of municipal affairs in Quebec City. This black book will be made public. I hope the minister will refer it to an appropriate committee of the House in order for us to see if there is any substance to the allegation that the minister has somehow wrongfully misled the province of Quebec.

The fight among the provinces, the municipalities, and the federal government is not restricted to Quebec. I should like to refer to a report entitled "Report of the Western Premiers Task Force on Constitutional Trends". The minister had that document with him today in the House. Referring to page 31 of that report, I read as follows:

As a rule, consultation by the federal government has never preceded major changes in legislation or regulations. Consultations at the officials' level are usually in the vague context of "policy research." In the broad areas of housing and urban affairs, consultation has been virtually nonexistent.

How can the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Andres) defend the Minister of State for Urban Affairs who told this House that nothing took place among the provinces, the municipalities and the federal government without full consultation with the provinces? Clearly that is not so; clearly it is wrong.

**Mr. Andres:** You are misguided.