

federal-provincial land prices study. If the Liberal Party of Canada appointed this gentleman to do a land prices study, presumably he must have some expertise in the field of housing and land. That is what I conclude. Otherwise they would be saying they appointed to do this study a dumb-dumb, a ding-ding, a no-no, a know-nothing. Surely they are not going to suggest that. What did he say in *The Globe and Mail* of October 28, 1979? The whole article is worth reading. Here is how he starts:

To avoid being poor when they become old, working people—

The little clutch down in the corner who talk so much of the working people, I hope are listening.

—should spend their working lives building their own equity, not their landlords' equity.

That is just what this bill wants them to do.

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

**Mr. Crosbie:** He continues:

For two generations, ownership in housing has given working people what no government social security system can come close to giving: old age security, effective, non-eroding savings; and an economic stake in society.

That is home ownership.

Working class renters who ceased to be young continued to be poor. But working class home owners were not.

That is the point he starts off making.

It would be iniquitous for public policy to encourage working class tenants to spend working lives building landlords' equity at the expense of their own long-term security.

That is what the NDP wants. That is what they advocate—keep the working class poor in their rental accommodation, let them build up equity for the landlords.

He goes on to say:

The only result for many individuals will be poverty in old age; the only result for the public will be subsidized housing for senior citizens on a massive scale at prohibitive cost; the only result for the large landlords such as the city of Toronto who specialize in low and moderate income housing will be massive wealth in buildings free of mortgages paid off by the rents of generations of tenants.

That is the point Mr. Greenspan makes that I hope hon. gentlemen will consider. They are huddled together in their misery now as a result of the byelection in Burin-St. George's.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Tell us about Newfoundland.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Mr. Greenspan says in his article how this is a plan to help the tenants. That is the point he is making.

Three distinct groups of tenants exist and the fact that you don't want to help the first and can't help the second is no reason not to help the third.

The tenants by choice can afford to own houses but prefer not to. Those without choice are the real poor who can never afford to own housing which is not heavily subsidized. The third group of tenants in the middle could afford to own houses if carrying charges were lower.

That is what we are attempting to do here.

This is the prime target group for a mortgage-relief scheme.

This is good stuff so I can't resist quoting Mr. Greenspan. Referring to this government he says:

### *Mortgage Tax Credit*

One analysis indicates that if the government's current proposal had been in full operation in 1974, home ownership could have become accessible to as many as 230,000 tenant households across Canada.

Why don't the members of the official opposition listen to this? If they had adopted in 1974 what we are proposing, by the evidence of their own expert, Mr. Greenspan, 230,000 tenant households across Canada in the metropolitan areas of Toronto, Vancouver, Saskatoon, St. John's, Newfoundland and Halifax could have become home owners.

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

**Mr. Crosbie:** I will skip some.

But the important principle is to give tax relief in some form from the burden of home ownership. The important need is to begin, somewhere. The government's current proposal is a beginning.

That is what this is, a beginning. If we can straighten out the Canadian economy, get it vibrant and strong and throw off the years of deficits and decadence, neo-socialism, and get Canada going on a strong course again economically, in the next few years we can go on and improve this scheme. This is only the beginning.

What else does he say?

A mortgage relief scheme would help not only one large group of tenants to acquire new housing, but also home owners to carry their homes. They are struggling with the triple whammy of high interest rates, high house prices and high mortgage amounts made possible by low downpayment requirements.

He goes on with quite a bit more. He discusses other interesting issues I do not have time to go into tonight. He says this:

—if the working middle class—

That is the middle class that supports this country, pays the taxes, that is in the metropolitan areas, that is being put upon, that is fed up.

—perceives its social policy treatment by Ottawa is fundamentally unfair over a long period compared to the social policy treatment received by other classes, it will inevitably attack some programs which favour the poor.

In other words, it is time for the working middle class to receive some decent social policy treatment, and we are going to see they get it.

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

**Mr. Crosbie:** The author goes on to explain how the wealthy can deduct their interest anyway, and the ways they can do it. We are not helping the wealthy here. They have been deducting it for years in every way you can imagine. He goes on to say:

Giving home owners of the working middle class the right to claim mortgage interest would permit them an advantage already taken by the wealthy.

Are hon. members going to vote against that? Are they going to vote to continue this for the wealthy and not extend it to the working and middle class? He then says this, and this is so right on, so completely accurate, so completely true, and so describes what we hear from the other side, that it is marvellous. He says, and I quote: