

*Housing*

serious housing problem. It is not a simple matter. But it cannot be something that defies solution in a country with all kinds of land, materials, resources and a labour force which is at least 10 per cent unemployed.

**Mr. Cosgrove:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member indicated that if there was time he would entertain a question. My question arises out of news reports of an opinion of his colleague, the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood (Mr. Rae) who has a seat quite close to him in the House. That hon. member indicated that if elected premier of an NDP government in the province of Ontario, he would move to augment the federal non-profit program with a commitment of \$100 million to the non-profit co-op program. Can the hon. member explain why the NDP governments of the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan have not adopted a similar policy?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Mission-Port Moody has about one minute remaining.

**Mr. Rose:** I do not know the figures. I did not see the news release. All I know is the excess profits of the banks in 1981 over 1980 amounted to something like \$700 million. The new leader of our party in Ontario is not more than 31. I know he is over 21. If the minister would like to ask why this mature individual put forward this program, the best place to direct that kind of question would be to the new leader of our party in Ontario.

**Mr. Al MacBain (Niagara Falls):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to become involved in this debate on Bill C-89. I would like to point out that I really cannot understand the rationale of members opposite tying up the valuable time of this legislative body with such a ridiculous debate as we have heard over the past few days. I say this knowing full well that by now most Canadians fully understand the many options available under the budget put forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen). As a matter of fact, we spent about three weeks debating and discussing some of these endeavours in this very House, with a proposal by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cosgrove) for the amendments to the National Housing Act and other matters.

It is obvious that members opposite still do not have a real perception of what is being done and what will be done. At the same time, while they are not fully cognizant of the many fine features contained in the housing and rental measures of the budget, they are telling us to spend more and more money. This is particularly true of the party of which the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. Rose) is a member.

In these times, that is surely the advice of fools and followers. That is the basic difference between this government and the other parties and that is surely why we are the government and they are not.

Our policies are based on sound reasoning and judgment. Our policies are for the times. With this in mind, let me just remind the House and refresh the memories of my colleagues that the measures contained in the budget were specifically designed to help those Canadians who need help the most.

What kind of nonsense would it be if we were to write a blank cheque? No, these measures were responsive to the needs of Canadians at this particular time.

● (2130)

**Mr. Taylor:** That is the kind you got from Mexico and Russia.

**Mr. MacBain:** We had to use Standing Order 75c to get this bill to conclusion. Yet, you see the response, Mr. Speaker. They do not want to let me speak. There is no one in the House to vote. They will try to get clear of voting.

**Mr. Taylor:** You introduced the closure, not us.

**Mr. Deans:** Don't threaten or we will have a vote. I promise.

**Mr. MacBain:** Specifically, I would like hon. members to recall the Canadian mortgage renewal plan which was proposed to help borrowers who are renewing mortgages at admittedly high interest rates.

Basically, there are two major components to the program. The first component involves the government's guarantee of interest deferral by lenders to home owners experiencing a cash flow problem upon renewal of their mortgages. As defined under the program, these are home owners who have to spend more than 30 per cent of gross household income on principle, interest and taxes, but who otherwise have substantial equity in their homes and therefore cannot be described as hardship cases. The interest deferral component of the plan is therefore intended to ease the cash flow problems of those home owners by allowing them to borrow against the equity in their homes.

However, the CMRP recognizes that interest deferral is not an appropriate solution where there is not sufficient equity in the property against which to borrow. Therefore, the program provides that in those cases where people have little or no equity in their homes, the government will offer guarantees.

I would like to talk for a moment about the guarantees. The government will undertake to compensate lenders in amounts of up to \$3,000, plus accrued interest during the deferral period, for any losses incurred for deferral of mortgage interest payments provided that the borrower's mortgage payments, including principal, interest and municipal taxes and 50 per cent of any condominium fees exceed 30 per cent of household income at the time of renewal. Household income, in this case, is family income from all sources.

The guarantee will apply only to one mortgage period, the first, second or another encumbrance, according to the borrower's choice, provided it was assumed or arranged at the time the property was purchased, and will apply to only one renewal period. Payments on these encumbrances may be taken into account in calculating the proportion of monthly payments to income.

The guarantee will apply to properties occupied by the owner, including duplexes and triplexes. In the case of duplexes and triplexes, gross rent from the space not occupied