

*Supply*

meeting of needs first, will be global and will see that the needs of all Canadians are met.

I want also to say something about co-ops. Co-operative housing is good housing, by and large, certainly, if my riding of Broadview—Greenwood is any example. We have excellent co-ops, the Bain Co-op, the Riverdale Co-op, the Innstead Co-ops, which are among the best in Toronto if not in Canada and the world. Unfortunately, the co-op idea is not fully appreciated by the Government and is often attacked by members of the Government so that we have something of a catch-22 situation.

We are told that co-ops house a lot of people who do not need to be in co-ops because they have adequate incomes. However, co-ops have to take people with adequate incomes in order to pay the housing charges because they do not have adequate subsidies to rent to people who cannot pay market rates. There are co-ops in my riding which would happily take a larger proportion of people on subsidies and feel they could integrate them well into their co-op communities but are not allowed to do so because of inadequacies of subsidy. If only 15 per cent of the units are subsidized, it means that most of the people who would be moving in would be in the middle and better off income brackets. The Riverdale Co-op subsidizes close to 50 per cent of the units. It would happily subsidize more if it was given the money. But it had to close its waiting list a year and a half ago for subsidized housing. It had its limit. There was a long waiting list. Some people have been on the waiting list to be given a subsidized unit in a co-op for four years. When units come up, they cannot be given to the people who need them the most because they do not have any more subsidy money.

There is also a problem with co-ops in Toronto which want to renovate. Here we have, you might say, housing stock which is not totally deteriorated but needs fairly substantial renovations. Renovations cost money and the maximum unit prices which are allowed by CMHC are set too high. In order to purchase a house and do the necessary renovations, they go beyond the limits. So we have co-ops which are doing excellent work, which would like to expand, but because of the rules as they are at present, they are simply not able to do so. Certainly, those artificial limits which prevent the expansion of really well functioning co-ops should be looked at again.

The Liberal motion before us shows a certain amount of concern and goodwill. However, I do not think it is all that well thought out in terms of policy. I do not agree that the focus should be only on this core needy group. I think the Liberals themselves have a great deal to answer for in the inadequate housing stock we now have in Canada. The decline of activity in CMHC did not start as of September 4, 1984. It started under the Liberal Government. The enormous disparities in support by way of tax concessions to better off people and direct grants to lower and middle income groups through social housing began under the Liberals. It was not invented by the Conservatives, although they are happy to continue it and obscure the fact that public money is going to subsidize the wealthy. They are happy about that. They like the ability to be

able to say that we have to gear money to the needy because they have hidden away their much larger grants through a subsidy system in tax exemptions. The Conservatives are happy with this situation but they did not invent it. The Liberals invented it.

The refusal to develop a real national housing strategy which treats housing as a right, puts need first and devises a system to meet needs, is a Liberal as well as a Conservative fault. The fact that more than a million Canadians are inadequately housed did not just happen since the last election. It is not just a problem of this Government. It has been a growing problem. There has been neglect over a long period of time and the Liberals themselves must bear some of the responsibility.

Rather than the motion we have before us today, I would much prefer the approach taken by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) who has argued very positively for an alternative strategy, one which would put the needs of Canadians first and which would outline how we reach the needs of the more than a million Canadians who are inadequately housed. There would be a direct building program and rehabilitation of substandard housing. We should have a plan so that, over the next five years, 500,000 units could be provided. We would, in short, take the very serious needs for housing as a problem which deserves concerted attention. We would devise a strategy and would treat it as we have other areas such as medicare and public education. These are now recognized as rights. One does not have to be poor and needy and pass a means test in order to qualify for consideration of those rights. We should really treat the housing situation as a high priority and devise strategies accordingly.

I would far prefer to support that kind of constructive, aggressive, creative and far more imaginative approach. I think that is the kind of approach the seriousness of this problem deserves. I think that is the kind of discussion we should be having in this House, not this much more narrow focus on a defined group of core needy people, totally ignoring the fact of enormous subsidies going through a completely different system which is handily shoved aside and not discussed at the same time. This kind of disproportion is unfortunate and means we do not see where the resources might be to bring to bear on the really serious problem of people who do not have adequate housing while so much public money is going to those who can really afford to pay for it themselves.

**Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleague, the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps), for introducing an opposition motion which gives us the opportunity to discuss housing policy in Canada. It is not frequent enough that we have this chance to talk about a national housing strategy. I believe it is the first opportunity we have had since the new Government took office in September of 1984.