

*Supply—Labour*

provide for the poor. The rich have decided that socialism is necessary in order that they may obtain C.M.H.C. loans and that the poor should be left to the tender mercies of free enterprise.

The president of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation appeared before our committee on January 26 of this year and stated:

Nevertheless, Canada's housing policies in the past have been based on the assumption that the determination of a very large part of our housing production can be left to market forces.

He then went on to say that a very large and increasing proportion of our housing needs cannot be met by private enterprise alone. The hon. member for Lambton-Kent pointed out that we were told by individuals appearing before the committee that people with incomes under \$6,000 per annum could not afford to own homes. I am sure that even the minister is beginning to realize, with reluctance, that even though a great number of homes will be built the people who need live in them will not be able to own them.

The Vancouver Housing Association prepared a brief for our committee in which it stated in respect of home ownership:

So far as home ownership is concerned, building costs, after remaining fairly static in the Vancouver area for several years, rose by 7 per cent between the springs of 1965 and 1966, and have since risen further. Prices of serviced residential lots have risen during the last five years by anything from 10 per cent to 100 per cent according to location, with an average increase of perhaps 25 per cent, and today it is difficult to buy serviced lots in suburban municipalities for much less than \$5,000.

High mortgage interest rates aggravate the effects of rising building and land costs and, while no specific figures are available to us, there are indications that a good many families are tying up an excessive proportion of their income in housing outlays.

This statement is confirmed by what Michael Wheeler of the Canadian Welfare Council wrote in a submission to our committee. He said:

We have no reliable data on the number of families who are enjoying the pleasures of home ownership at the cost of severely strained budgets, nor do we know the actual cost of this strain in terms of other budgetary items that have to be sacrificed or its general impact on family well-being. This is a matter which, like so many other aspects of Canada's housing program, deserves more systematic attention.

I am urging that there should be more planning and an overall survey made in respect of housing needs. In respect of home ownership even the minister is now convinced that we are not going to meet the needs of a

[Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway).]

great many people in lower and middle income groups.

This is what was said by the Vancouver housing association in its brief to our committee:

A canvass of leading real estate firm suggests that apartments falling vacant are renting for amounts from 5 per cent to 10 per cent higher than six months earlier, but in the low rental field increases have been much steeper. Within the last month elderly single persons applying for non-profit housing at the Central Housing registry operated by our association have reported the following increases in their rents:—

From \$45 to \$75 (excluding heat)  
\$45 to \$80  
\$45 to \$85 (shared bathroom)

Vacancies in rental housing, where families with children are accepted, are, according to real estate firms, virtually non-existent, so that it is difficult to quote any meaningful figures, but rents often appear now to be related more closely to what the traffic will bear than to the actual worth of the accommodation.

The greatest single need of Vancouver is low rental accommodation for middle and low income families. As a matter of fact, the director of the war on poverty made the statement as long ago as last fall to the Couchiching conference that Canada is spending more money on tinned dog food than it is on public housing. That certainly does not say very much for our degree of civilization.

• (8:20 p.m.)

There is a tremendous need in Canada for housing for low and moderate income families. If hon. members need an example to underline this I would refer to the matter raised a while ago in this house when it was pointed out that the immigration officials in Europe are saying to would-be immigrants to Canada, "Yes, come to Canada by all means. But if you do come, and have more than three children, do not go to any major Canadian city." They named half a dozen, including Vancouver. They said, Do not go to any major Canadian city unless you have a guaranteed income of at least \$7,500 a year.

This reminds me of the old nursery rhyme. I am emboldened to quote poetry after what happened last night:

"Mother, may I go down to swim?"

"Yes, my darling daughter.

Hang your clothes on a hickory limb;

But don't go near—

—Vancouver, Halifax, Toronto, Montreal or many of the major cities in between, because you will not find housing there." That is the situation in this country. We have only to consider places like Birmingham and others