

*Supply*

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member ignored the case of Mr. and Mrs. Dawson, in such a cavalier fashion, a case that was raised with the office of the Minister responsible for national housing more than a month ago. Do not forget that Mr. and Mrs. Dawson are the people with no running water and no furnace. The Hon. Member thinks that that is okay. My family is from northern Ontario and I understand a little bit about the North. I think there are many northern families who would like to have running water and heating facilities and I think it is an outrage for the Hon. Member to state that he thinks it is fine and dandy for people to live without that.

**Mr. Gormley:** He didn't say that. Be fair.

**Ms. Copps:** You weren't here when the Hon. Member spoke. That's exactly what he said.

Why has the Hon. Member said nothing when the fact is that this family and hundreds of others across Saskatchewan were cut off because funding available from Canada Mortgage and Housing was fully committed? There was no money for any family in rural Saskatchewan as a result of the Government's policies which led to a 25 per cent cut-back in RRAP funding. Why was he not talking about critical issues like running water and heating rather than L-shaped living-dining rooms?

● (1550)

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, one suspects that physiologically there is a correlation between how wide open one's mouth is and how closed one's ears are from time to time.

People choose to live without central heating. People choose to live in certain kinds of ways. The Hon. Member is trying to lay upon the table a piece of information in partial form. Are we dealing with a millionaire? I asked that question before. Yes or no? Are we dealing with someone whose income and shelter meet the core definition? Yes or no?

The public policy issue we were supposed to debate today is: Would the definition of poverty of the National Council of Welfare produce a better situation? How much money was available in housing funds in September, 1984, on election day? Was an entire year's budget pork-barrelled out prior to election day? What responsibility does the Hon. Member have, as a member of the Liberal Party, for ignoring housing needs for six months or seven months in an attempt to win an election with borrowed money, which drove up interest rates for everyone? What obligation does she have to answer to the House for that kind of public policy?

**Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to participate in the debate on the extremely important matter of housing and on the proposal of the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) for a national housing strategy. It is not quite the direction in which I think we ought to be going, but certainly the subject is an important one and I want to put a few observations on the record for my own riding. As well, I want

to raise some of my own concerns and to indicate my particular interest in housing for women.

Over the past few winters in Canada we have seen a proliferation of food banks and food depots run by churches and voluntary organizations. We have seen Canadians lining up for food for the simple reason that they do not have enough money because they are spending so much of their very limited resources on housing. Many of these people have some form of income. A lot of them are women with family benefits, women raising children without adequate support, and toward the end of the month they do not have enough money because of extremely high charges for rent.

I think of a disabled woman in my constituency who visited my riding office. Her income was slightly over \$400 per month. She shares an apartment with a monthly rent of \$600 with another woman, so they both pay \$300 per month in rent. This means that she has \$100 per month left over for all other expenses—metro, food, clothing, and everything else. She is pressed into going to food banks because of inadequate housing. Her name is on waiting lists for subsidized housing along with some other 20,000 Metro people.

Rooms are costing an enormous amount of money. People on very limited incomes or people on welfare simply do not have enough money to go around. We have people going to hostels and hostels turning people away. We have a revolving door in the hostel system. The people who go to hostels, as well as those who run them, tell us that they do not want hostels. They want adequate housing. Hostels are not a response to the critical issue of inadequate affordable houses and apartments for Canadians.

My riding of Broadview—Greenwood is no worse than other ridings. It has some poor housing, some good housing, and some in between housing. However, it has many people who are on waiting lists because they simply cannot afford accommodation, and people are sharing accommodations because of inadequacy.

Many of the people with real housing needs that are not being met are women. Women are in this difficulty for two reasons. One is the old association between women and poverty. More women are poor. Women who have jobs do not earn as much money as men. Of course, women are still responsible for most of the child care when families break up. Most of the single parents are women. They have the responsibility for children. They have lower incomes, very little support money, yet higher expenses because they have children to look after. As a result they are really pushed in paying for housing.

Only 37 per cent of women own their own homes compared with 71 per cent of men. They do not have the money to buy houses, so 63 per cent of women rent compared with 29 per cent of men. Women rent poorer and cheaper accommodation than men because they do not have enough money. The figures indicate that 61 per cent of women and 27 per cent of men pay less than \$450 per month on rent. Men, far more often than