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Abstract

This thesis explores why the commonly used broad definition of homelessness endorsed by many analysts and academics in the contemporary literature is not useful in devising effective housing policy to alleviate the most urgent needs of those who are without safe, healthy, permanent and affordable shelter. The broad definition views homelessness as the absence of permanent home over which inhabitants have personal control and which provides shelter, privacy, security at an affordable cost together with ready access to social, economic and cultural public services. It is often contrasted with a narrow definition of homelessness. While the narrow definition only focuses on the needs of the absolute homeless (i.e., people without a roof over their head), the broad definition employs a comprehensive perspective to take into consideration the needs of the at risk homeless (i.e., people who are at the risk of losing their home) as well.

Housing analysts who endorse the broad definition of homelessness believe that by framing the issue in its wider context they may be able to induce public policy change to tackle homelessness broadly in the public agenda. However, contrary to this well-intended motive, this study finds that the broad definition may actually hinder policy decision making to respond effectively and efficiently to those who are most in need. It does so for five reasons: 1) its broadness is inconsistent with the ideological and political realities in a homeownership dominant housing system; 2) it contains an inadequately formulated category of "at risk homeless" which ignores or dismisses the housing difficulties (e.g., affordability, suitability and adequacy) of the at risk homeowners; 3) it fails to establish precise
boundaries of the broadly defined homeless population mainly due to technical and political ramifications; 4) it is weak in coalescing inter-agency, community and individual support and advocacy; and 5) the broader the definition the bigger the social problem and the more the public resources required to address the issue broadly which in turn undermines the concept's utility in generating welfare consensus to mobilize resources in assisting the weakest members in the community.

In order to redirect housing policy decision making to be responsive to the neediest, this thesis proposes that: 1) the potential utility of Housing Dimension of Homelessness must be distinguished from the "general" broad conception of homelessness so that policy specific focus can be given to each individual dimension of homelessness to facilitate immediate actions and solutions to aid each target group (e.g., housing dimension of homelessness focuses mainly on housing aspect of homelessness therefore the concept has the highest utility for investigating housing problems and formulating housing solutions for people with severe basic shelter need. The general broad view of homelessness focuses on all contributing factors of homelessness equally therefore the concept has the highest utility in investigating broader social issues such as social inequality); 2) homeless should be recategorized into five subgroups: at risk renters, at risk homeowners, street homeless, shelter homeless and by-choice homeless in order to increase the concepts' utility for prioritizing needs and allocating public resources to aid the neediest; and 3) policies and programs for the homeless must be targeted at "shelter homeless" and "street homeless" instead of "homeless" as a general broad category to ascertain that the most vulnerable members in the community will receive the highest priority assistance in Canada's housing system.
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Chapter One
Introduction

Contrary to the common perception that the widespread problem of lack of permanent and affordable shelter is only a manifestation of poverty in less developed nations, there is growing evidence that the number of people without shelter of any kind and without continuing and affordable homes in developed countries is increasing at an alarming rate. Canada is no exception.

In 1982, the United Nations’ resolution designating 1987 as the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless (IYSH) was adopted by all member countries in an effort to draw attention to the estimated one hundred million people who have no shelter of any kind and to the one billion people who lack a real home. Stephen Lewis, Canada’s Ambassador to the United Nations at the time, points out that "the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless raises questions that run to the heart of the human condition and for which answers are not in any sense evident (Lewis, 1987:6)." In response to the IYSH, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Canada’s national housing agency, served as the national focal point and supported a wide range of initiatives to identify and highlight the best means of aiding those who have extreme housing difficulties in the country.

Since the mid 1980’s, there has been a significant increase in research on homelessness in terms of its nature, scope, causes and solutions in the Canadian context. In particular, a new wave of research and discussion with special emphasis on the housing aspect of homelessness has been developed by housing analysts and academic experts in the hope of legitimizing the tackling
of homelessness as a serious problem on the public policy agenda. A close examination, however, reveals that despite the quantity and quality of the research, the Canadian government's response to the severe housing difficulties of the bottom rung of the population has been very limited.

In 1987, David Hulchanski, director of the Center for Human Settlements at the University of British Columbia, identified three criteria to measure the success of our efforts at addressing the needs of the population with the greatest shelter problems in Canada. In a background paper for a conference on homelessness in British Columbia, he stated:

The International Year of Shelter for the Homeless will be successful if Canadians throughout the country develop local, regional, and eventually national programs of action directed at three levels:

1) Political Commitment regarding the importance of housing issues and the need to give them adequate support and attention.

2) Policy-level Commitment to creating the administrative framework that will allow an adequate approach to housing problems on an integrated basis; and

3) Policy and Program Implementation, the testing, review, implementation and exchange of experience on solutions that address need and affordability (Hulchanski, 1987:Paper#2:2).

To date, Canada has not shown any significant response to the issue of homelessness in terms of political commitment, policy decisions, and program implementation. Rather, there is a government policy of nondecision or inaction in responding to urgent housing needs of the homeless. There may be economic, political, social, philosophical or other reasons for government not to tackle homelessness as a serious issue on the public agenda. However, one of the main reasons is that there is a terminological problem associated with the broad definition of homelessness which directly or indirectly impedes government response broadly to the issue. Therefore, this study aims at
exploring the reasons why the broad definition weakens the utility of the concept in inducing policy and program responses in the Canadian housing system.

1.1 Linking the Concept of Homelessness and Housing Policy Response

In order to understand the relevance of the concept of homelessness, particularly the recently emerged broad perspective of the concept, in housing policy decisions, it is useful to take a closer examination on two other concepts -- poverty and structural inequality. Table 1 consists of a list of major conditions contributing to a broad concept of homelessness. With reference to this table, all the nine factors including poverty itself that have been identified as the contributing factors to homelessness can also be traced as roots or manifestations of poverty and structural inequality. This means that the concepts of homelessness, poverty and structural inequality have very similar conceptual utilities to help understand the sources of relative deprivation in the Canadian society. However, the reason that the concept of homelessness is singled out for housing policy consideration by housing analysts and academics is that the concept of homelessness, in the broadest sense, has a unique conceptual utility to draw attention to the various aspects of housing deprivation among the poorest and the most disadvantaged people in the housing system while the concepts of poverty and structural inequality are relatively weak in focusing public attention on housing policy issues. As will be demonstrated in the later analysis, the various uses of the term homelessness can be conceptually differentiated. Further, housing dimension of homelessness can be rationally formulated to
Table 1 A List of the Conditions Contributing to Homelessness

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Housing Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Deinstitutionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lack Of Adequate Community Support Services/Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Inadequate Social Assistance Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Family Breakdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Individual Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Social Attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The United Nations' designation of 1987 as the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless gave a renewal in hope to those who are working hard to improve the housing conditions of the homeless in Canada. Housing and community activists, analysts and academics across the country responded to the IYSH by organizing conferences and workshops to facilitate public debates and promote public awareness on homelessness. The results were a much improved and enriched understanding of homelessness as well as some development of local initiatives to address the problem in Canada.

However, this enthusiasm demonstrated by the grass-roots and non-government organizations in combating homelessness is not matched by the
Canadian government's support in terms of housing policy action and program responses. On the one hand, there is an obvious tendency for progressive housing analysts and academics to attempt to broaden the concept of homelessness in the hope of legitimizing the issue on the public agenda. On the other hand, government's maintenance of a policy of inaction or nondecision on homelessness in Canada sheds doubt on its public commitment to deal with the issue broadly. Consequently, the disparity between the broad base advocacy intended by progressive analysts and the action (i.e., inaction) of government in Canada is growing.

Therefore, the question is not what housing policy Canada has in addressing homelessness because evidence indicates that we do not have one yet. Rather, there is a more policy relevant question we should be asking: why does the broad conceptualization of homelessness endorsed by many progressive analysts and academics in the contemporary literature fail to induce the anticipated policy and program responses from the Canadian government to tackle the problem within the broad context?

1.2 Purpose

During the initial stage of this research, it was observed that there is an ideological gap between the objectives of many housing analysts in attempting to legitimate homelessness as a serious social problem by broadening the concept and the near total focus of government policy on assisting homeownership. A broad definition views homelessness as the absence of permanent home over which inhabitants have personal control and which provides shelter, privacy, security at an affordable cost together with ready
access to social, economic and cultural public services (e.g., the broad approach to homelessness is endorsed by David Hulchanski, Peter Oberlander, John Greve, Arthur Fallick and the Single Displaced Persons Project in Toronto). Based on this observation, this study argues that in the context of a capitalistic free market economy such as Canada, in which housing is primarily treated as commodity, the attempt by housing and academic experts to address homelessness broadly is not an effective or helpful step in inducing a government policy and program response to alleviate the extreme housing difficulties encountered by people with the least means and the most problems in the Canadian housing system though the intention of these analysts is indeed admirable.

The main objective of this study is, therefore, to explore the reasons why the broadening of the concept of homelessness in the recent literature has lessened rather than strengthened the utility of the concept for devising an effective policy response. An effective policy response includes the ability to prioritize needs and develop programs for people without shelter and people without secure tenure in Canada's housing system. The policy implications of the broad definition of homelessness is assessed by critically examining it against five criteria. The criteria are derived from a review of the literature and a Vancouver case study. The case study consists of an analysis of the nature, extent and trends of homelessness and a survey of shelter options in Vancouver.

Current literature (e.g., P. Oberlander, D. Hulchanski and A. Fallick) distinguishes between the concepts of the "broad definition of homelessness" and the "narrow definition of homelessness." As well, it differentiates the
"absolute homeless" from the "at risk homeless." As will be shown in the concluding chapter, these conceptual distinctions are inadequate for specific policy decision making and programs development. Therefore, more specific policy focused conceptualizations of the different uses of the term "homelessness" will be proposed for consideration. It will be also argued that the term "homeless" should be understood as comprising of five subgroups of homeless people — by-choice homeless, street homeless, shelter homeless, at risk renters and at risk homeowners. The ultimate purpose here is to stress that specific responses should be devised for each of these groups rather than for one general broad category of homeless within the framework of homelessness.

1.3 Methods

This study uses three methods: 1) a literature review; 2) a case study; and 3) an assessment of conceptual and practical problems of the broad definition of homelessness.

First, a literature review with an emphasis in the Canadian context is carried out to examine issues concerning definitions, categorizations and enumerations of homelessness in the contemporary literature so as to lay the grounds for further discussion.

Second, a Vancouver case study which consists of an analysis of the nature, scope and trends of homelessness and a survey of facilities and services of shelter options for the homeless is conducted. The original aim of the case study was to examine issues of homelessness identified in
literature against social realities by using a structured two-part questionnaire and personal interviews. During the survey study, I talked to young people in emergency centers; I met desperate single-mothers with children seeking refuge in crisis shelters; I saw street homeless old men and bag lady wandering aimlessly on the streets of the downtown eastside; and I consulted professionals who assist those who seek help in crises or difficult situations.

As the research proceeded, however, I discovered that the more empirical information I gathered on homelessness through the case study, the more I realized that the broad definition of homelessness is problematic for the development of public policies to aid the people with the greatest needs. In view of this intellectual enlightenment, findings resulting from the case study are, therefore, used as evidence for my critique that the broad definition of homelessness hinders policy and program development which would respond to the people who are most in need.

There are three types of case studies: exploratory; explanatory and descriptive. An exploratory approach is employed in this study. According to Yin a case study is a method of empirical investigation which examines a contemporary phenomenon in its real life context. He also suggests that an exploratory case study starts off with some rationale and direction, even if the initial assumptions might later have been proven wrong (Yin, 1989:23-30).
1.4 Organization

There are six chapters. Following this introduction, the literature review in chapter two provides an overview of three key aspects of homelessness: 1) definitions of homelessness; 2) putting faces to homeless people; and 3) enumerations of the homeless population. Chapters three and four is the Vancouver case study. While chapter three helps identify the source, nature, extent and trends in homelessness, chapter four surveys the facilities and services provided by the fifteen emergency and special shelters for the homeless people in Vancouver. The case study shows the problems experienced by the homeless people in real-life context and helps to understand why their problems have not received policy actions as a first priority.

Drawing on this research and empirical evidence, chapter five provides a synthesis of the findings in order to direct an exploratory search for the reasons why the broad definition of homelessness endorsed by the contemporary literature has weaken rather than strengthened the utility of homelessness against five policy decision making criteria. It closes with an summary assessment of the utility of a broad definition of homelessness for housing policy and program decisions.

Chapter six completes the remaining task of this study: 1) it conducts a thorough reconceptualization of the various uses of the concepts and terminologies of "homelessness"; 2) it recategorizes "homeless" population into five subgroups for future policy considerations; and 3) it proposes the most effective potential uses and policy implications of each individual
concept in a systematic manner. This thesis concludes that the concept of homelessness has potential utility for housing policy and program development to alleviate hopelessness among the most vulnerable members of the community if it is redefined strategically to focus on specific categories. The highest priorities should be given to assisting "shelter homeless" and "street homeless" if they have reached the critical mass. The provision of housing should be based on the criteria to provide permanent and affordable shelter that meet the basic safety and health standards to enable decent community living.
Chapter Two

Literature Review:
Definitions of Homelessness
and the Homeless Population

2.1 Defining Homelessness

A review of literature on homelessness reveals a significant lack of consensus on how the problem should be conceptualized and how the issue should be framed. The contemporary world has viewed the issue from many different perspectives and has not yet agreed on which courses of action are appropriate solutions.

Homelessness as a social problem has evolved from a process of collective definition rather than existing independently as a set of social arrangements with an intrinsic makeup. According to Hulchanski,

a social problem is a unique configuration of events and behaviours, unique because some condition or situation is singled out for attention, and efforts to solve the problem influence the course of social change. This is the starting point for the political debate over policy options. Until then, the political debate is over whether or not there is a problem society ought to address (Hulchanski, 1987a:2).

The definition of the problem of homelessness has significant social, economic and political implications in public policy. For example, if homelessness is defined as a housing problem, then the response will focus on housing solutions. If homelessness is defined as a mental health issue, then the efforts will be channelled primarily toward public health policy and programs. If homelessness is defined as a poverty problem, then the answers
to the problem will be heavily based on income assistance programs. If homelessness is perceived as a temporary problem, then the response to the problem tend to be short term in scope. In other words, the way the terms homelessness and homeless are used depends upon the reason for raising these issues in the first place.

To date, a variety of formulations of definitions of homelessness have been developed. They vary in scope from narrow and exclusive to broad and comprehensive. The commonly accepted definition of homelessness, however, is simply the most narrow view of homelessness which is the lack of a roof over one's head. This restrictive approach is problematic because it ignores other elements such as basic health and safety, security of tenure and affordability, which together constitute the essential foundation for healthy community living.

For those who endorse a narrow view, homelessness is rooted in individual weaknesses (e.g., people sleep in streets "by their own choice.") This limited view of homelessness is based on two assumptions: 1) people have real options; and 2) relatively few people are seriously deprived of shelter. Therefore, in the event people become shelterless, it is their own preference not to choose other available options. By attributing the causes of homelessness to free choice, therefore, society should not be held responsible for the tragic consequences of people sleeping on the streets and in public parks. The definition proposed by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), for example, closely parallels the narrow interpretation of the problem:
Homelessness refers to people in the streets who, in seeking shelter, have no alternative but to obtain it from a private or public agency. Homeless people are distinguished from those who have permanent shelter even though that shelter may be physically inadequate. They are also distinguished from those living in overcrowded conditions (US, HUD, 1984:7).

In a similar fashion, many political conservatives in the United States seem to believe that the government has little obligation to care for the homeless in their country. This attitude is perhaps best exemplified by the President Reagan's often quoted remark that "the homeless are homeless, you might say, by choice (Bassuk, 1984:45)."

On the contrary, many analysts and academics who adopt a broad view recognize many aspects of "relative deprivation" inherent in homelessness are rooted in structural deficiencies, not the mere lack of physical shelter. Homelessness in a wider context is seen as neither a temporary condition nor a product of a mono-causal factor. Rather it is a multi-dimensional social, economic, political and physical event. In this respect, to develop a policy or programs to alleviate homelessness is a difficult task because no simple solution or quick fix alone can resolve this inordinately complex housing problem. Instead, solutions require political commitment and widely based involvement of government, industry, non-profit organization, community as well as homeless themselves.

The United Nations has employed a comprehensive definition of homelessness. The broad definition proposed by the U.N. contains two main categories: 1) absolute homelessness, referring to individuals living on the streets with no physical shelter; and 2) relative homelessness referring to people living in homes that do not meet basic health and safety standards.
Within this broad approach, the U.N.'s focus is on all aspects of "human settlements": good quality housing units; security of tenure and personal safety; access to safe water and sanitation; proximity to employment opportunities; education facilities and health services; and affordability. This comprehensive conception of homelessness is a sharp contrast to a narrow definition of the issue.

Similar to the UN's broad conception of homelessness, the Canadian contribution to the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless is another example which supports a broad perspective of the problem. According to this broad definition, homelessness is

the absence of a continuing or permanent home over which individuals and families have personal control and which provides the essential needs of shelter, privacy and security at an affordable cost, together with ready access to social, economic and cultural public services (Oberlander and Fallick, 1987:11).

In short, homelessness means much more than mere lack of permanent physical shelter. It is also imbued with a variety of opportunities and a set of relationships which are vital to person's security and well-being in the community.

In addition, there is a trend in academic circles to extend the conceptualization of homelessness to include other aspects of emotional and psychological well-being perpetuated by the notion of a "home." The concept that a home is more than a physical shelter adopted by John Greve two decades ago becomes even more popular now with progressive analysts in the recent literature. According to Greve,
what seems to be crystallizing from the present concern with definitions is a distinction - and an awareness for the need for such a distinction - between "houselessness" and "homelessness." There is a trend away from the former - from the view that homelessness means simply being without accommodation - to a recognition of homelessness as a more complex state, something multi-dimensional, involving the quality of life, and particularly of relationship between members of a family (or household), and not just the possession of a roof over one's head. The emphasis is shifting away from "house" towards "home" with all this implies psychologically and emotionally (Greve, 1964).

In explaining the important elements that constitute a home, the report of the Single Displaced Persons Project, initiated by a group of directors and clergy of Toronto inner city churches, wrote that

the most obvious element of homelessness is the lack of housing; but just a "home" is more than physical shelter, homelessness includes a lack of this base for the rest of life's activities. "Home" is associated with personal identity, family, relationships, a role in the community, privacy and security, and the possession of personal property. Homelessness or the lack of a home affects all these areas of an individual's life (Bosworth and Freiler, 1983:7).

Recent evidence suggests that for analysts and academics who adhere to a broad definition of homelessness believe that the causes of homelessness in Canada are varied, changing over time and are different from city to city (Oberlander, 1987:6). The number of homeless is growing and the composition of homeless population is changing.

Clearly, the political debate over homelessness is more than developing a statement to describe an emerging social problem. How the nature, scope and causes of homelessness are defined significantly influences the types and scope of policy and program response required to remedy the problem. To date, few governments are willing to accept the broad definition of homelessness
endorsed by the U.N. and many progressive academics while many are treating the problem within the narrowest scope.

2.2 Putting faces to the homeless

Within the context of a broad definition of homelessness, the homeless in the 1990s are a heterogeneous group: they come from all walks of life, of all ages, of both genders, of all races and with vastly different experiences. Most, however, share poverty as well as the inability to exercise control over their lives. The traditional stereotypes of an "indigent vagrant who has opted out of society into a bottle," "skid row," "bag lady," "bum," "transient" and "tramp" (which are typical images of homeless within a narrow interpretation of homelessness) are no longer adequate images of homeless within the broad view of the problem.

Developing along the notion of a broad perspective of homelessness, today's homeless in the Canadian city such as in the City of Vancouver can be divided into two main groups: 1) absolute homeless which include people who wander on the streets or "take a break" in drop-in centers during the day. When night falls, they either sleep on streets and in open public places or seek refuge in emergency centers or sit through the night in some "hang outs" (e.g., the Dug Out) or cheap restaurants in the downtown eastside; 2) at risk homeless people consist of many groups: low income families which face unaffordable rent hikes; tenants who are on the edge of being forced out of their homes because of conversion or demolition; mental patients and substance abusers who have to move from rooming houses to rooming houses due to discriminatory practices of landlords; disabled persons who have little or no
choice in rental market; young people who have family or personal problems that are affecting their living arrangements; and battered women who cannot or too scared to return to abusive situations. As the composition of homeless changes, there are more young people, single women and single-mothers with children in the homeless population in Canada. Within the broad framework of homelessness, the homeless of the 1990s can surprisingly look more like the neighbor next door rather than the "old bums in rag seeking refuge underneath cardboard on the streets."

2.3 Counting the Homeless

To this date, no accurate, reliable and acceptable enumeration on the size of homeless is available in Canada whether the definition is based on a narrow or a broad conception of homelessness. The difficulty in establishing a commonly acceptable estimate of the homeless mainly stems from the lack of consensus on what constitutes homelessness and who should be counted as homeless. As the disagreement on definition of homelessness continues, the composition of homeless remains undetermined and the accurate size of the population of homeless is impossible to quantify with social and political acceptance.

Apart from the conceptual problem of determining who ought to be counted and why, there is also methodological problem in conducting a scientific estimation of the number of homeless. In reality, all official statistics about housing conditions rely on an address. Ironically, absolute homeless people by definition are people without a permanent place to stay. Without an address in which absolute homeless can receive mail, they exist literally
outside society's formal tracking system. Hence, this becomes a technical problem in accurately measuring the size of the absolute homeless i.e., the population which the narrow definition of homelessness is solely concerned with.

On the other hand, to obtain a precise estimate on the at risk homeless population which is based on the broad definition of homelessness is even more difficult. The at risk homeless are a fluid and mostly invisible population. Their size fluctuates with factors, such as economic conditions, availability of support services, supply of affordable housing and severity of weather conditions. As a result, the exact measurement of at risk homeless population is technically hard if not impossible to produce for the purpose of housing policy decision making.

The ultimate measurement of the size of homeless individuals depends on the criteria selected in defining homelessness. If measurement is taken according to homeless individuals without physical shelters within the context of the narrow definition, then a small number will occur. Instead, if estimate is based on the notions of absolute homeless and at risk homeless emerged from the broad definition of homelessness, then a much bigger number will likely result. A frequently cited survey on homelessness will illustrate this point. In 1986, the Canadian Council on Social Development (CCDS) estimated that between 20,000 and 40,000 absolute homeless people lived on the streets in Canada (McLaughlin, 1987:5). These figures were low estimates because they exclude the people who were at the risk of being homeless (Young, 1987:34). Moreover, the CCSD later in its National Inquiry on Homelessness also pointed out that appropriately 4.5 million people in Canada lived below
the Statistics Canada's low income cut off line. This was a significant
increase over 1979 when 3.7 million Canadians lived in poverty (McLaughlin,
1987:9).

The Urban Core Workers Association in Vancouver conducted an "Urban Core
Shelterless Survey" from November 1989 to April 1990. The report emphasizes
the distinction between shelterless and homeless.

Shelterless are individuals who have no roofs over their heads. They
sleep in alley-ways, parks, abandoned buildings, or under viaducts or
bridges. In this connection, [they] found people living in parked areas
or vans a difficult group to categorize as some of these vehicles can
afford a fairly cozy shelter with considerable amenities. Cross walk
was another ill-fitting item as the people staying there do have a roof
over their head, but they sleep on chairs and sofas, not beds - and can
only stay from midnight to 6:00 a.m. The homeless, other than those who
lack of tenure or inappropriately housed, are ones who go to emergency
shelters (Buckley, 1990:1).

Buckley, committee member of the Urban Core of Shelterless, points out
that findings from the report though not "scientifically precise" would
certainly be used as "an indicator" to illustrate the nature and the extent of
homelessness based on a narrow definition in Vancouver.

The survey counted an average of 46 (41 male and 5 female) shelterless
people during the six months of the survey period (Table 2). The average age
of the shelterless people was thirty-seven. The youngest was eighteen and the
oldest was seventy-five. The survey areas did not include West End and Mt.
Pleasant which would have undoubtedly raised the count.

The reasons for being shelterless included: alcohol abuse (overwhelming
majority), evictions (fairly high), alcohol and drug abuse, transients,
psychiatric problem, inability to access Ministry of Social Services and Housing (MSSH), the lack of affordable housing and by choice (a few).

### Table 2 Total Number of Shelterless In Vancouver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov.89</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.89</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.90</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.90</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar.90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr.90</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The majority of survey sheets had no summary comments. The next noticeable observation on the list was "unkempt" and "malnourished". Quite a few observers noticed "sores, broken ankle, stab wounds, hepatitis and gum disease" on the shelterless. Three of the more disturbing comments were "stealing to eat", "seen in the garbage container" and "doesn't want to live anymore."

In terms of the total numbers of shelterless people, the figures were almost identical to those of the survey conducted three years ago in the similar areas in Vancouver. However, the report clearly pointed out the number of "turn-aways" was rising and the "length of stay" was increasing at
an alarming rate in emergency centers in the study. The current conditions of
Vancouver's emergency centers will be discussed in details in the survey of
shelter options' for homeless people in Vancouver in chapter four.

The concluding comment of the Urban Core Shelterless Survey signals a
warning that Canadians cannot afford to take lightly:

What [the] six month's survey indicates is that we should not be
complacent: the alarm bells are ringing now. What we appear to have in
Vancouver is a situation where there are not a large number of
shelterless people living in the streets - at least not yet. There is a
growing number of homeless, however, and as such this is a strong
indicator that our situation could quickly change within a few short
years or less, and we could easily become like most major North American
cities where the shelterless are legion (Buckley, 1990:3).

The difficulties involved in enumeration of homeless population are deep
seated in social and political values although they are often masked as
technical problems. As Hulchanski points out, the "methodological
problem...is minor compared to the broader conceptual problem of determining
who ought to be counted and why (Hulchanski, 1987:3)." The controversy over
who should be counted and why they should be counted is a focal point of
divergent and conflicting interests, intentions and objectives. No
methodological technique can resolve the philosophical, political and social
ramifications surrounding the issue of homelessness. As long as the
disagreement in definition of homelessness remains, the estimation of the
precise size of homeless population continues to be a major technical obstacle
for policy decision and program development to assist those who are suffering
the lack of basic shelter need.
The truth is that no matter whether Canadians choose to define homelessness broadly or narrowly, people with severe basic shelter problems exist in our country. Ignoring the problem does not mean that it will automatically go away. The research evidence sadly points out that even the lowest estimate reveals the disturbing fact that something has to be done now in order to stop the situation from deteriorating further. As Hobson points out that

the actual size of the homeless population is not the important issue. Whether or not, Canadians believe that there are 20,000 or 100,000 homeless people in Canada, we must accept the fact that there is a large number of people in our country who are homeless or who live on the edge of homelessness. Too large a number for such an affluent country as Canada (Hobson, 1988:12).
Chapter Three

Vancouver's Housing Issues:

A Context for the Problem of Homelessness

No rational housing policy decision can be made without considering the social, economic and political consequences it implies because it affects all segments of its populace. Similarly, no relevant housing policy on homelessness can be formulated without examining the conditions of the entire housing market. This chapter presents an analysis of the housing market in Vancouver. The examination focuses on housing problems experienced by all residents, homeowners and non-homeowners, rather than on the homeless people alone. The rationale for taking this approach comes from the belief that a thorough understanding of housing trends and total housing needs of the entire community will better illuminate the causes of and trends relating to homelessness.

The City of Vancouver is at an important crossroads. In the early 1970's, the City planned for livability and affordability, creating the South Shore False Creek and Champlain Heights neighborhoods. The issue in 1988 is whether low- and moderate- income households will be welcome in Vancouver (Murphy, 1988:28).

Today, affordability is still the top priority housing issue Vancouverites have to resolve. A recent survey conducted in July 1990 indicates "an astounding 96 per cent of all respondents in Vancouver and 85 per cent in the rest of the region felt their children would not be able to afford to live in the neighbourhood where they grew up (Vancouver Sun, November 10,B2,1990)." Affordability is a complex housing issue. It is affected by local, regional, national and global forces. Among other factors,
high land prices, the lack of supply in low end rental units, unemployment, poverty, inadequate social welfare assistance, the NIMBY syndrome, and strong population growth are the key determinants attributing to the problem of housing affordability in the City of Vancouver.

3.1 High Land Prices, End of Homeownership and High Demand in Rental Sector

Following a period of economic stagnation in the early 1980's, Vancouver experienced a slow but healthy economic recovery. During Expo'86, Vancouver had attracted international attention. After the Expo, the economy was booming again and demand for housing was strong. As demand for houses goes up, land prices escalate. Consequently this triggered a price surge in the housing market. In the City of Vancouver, the median house price on the west side was $350,000 in 1989, up 35 per cent from $270,000 in 1988. The median price for condominiums increased at 9 per cent to $140,000 in 1989 for a new two bedroom. According to CMHC, the City of Vancouver had only a 0.4 per cent vacancy rate for the entire region and fewer than 300 vacancies at any given time during the third quarter of 1989 (Vancouver Sun, October 24, 1989).

In the beginning of the 1990s, Canada is in another round of economic recession. Vancouver's housing market is affected. Critics say prices for homes have already "bottomed off." Nevertheless, a closer examination reveals that median selling prices for relatively affordable homes in suburbs are still rising. In October 1990, the greatest price drop for single detached house was recorded at 8.8 per cent on the West Side in Vancouver. However, the sale prices of houses on the west side neighborhoods are already so costly
that most of the houses are out of reach even for the middle income families, not to mention the working poor (Table 3).

The high prices on houses have prevented low- and moderate-income families from gaining access to homeownership. The rental sector, therefore, by default becomes the remaining viable housing option for them. Rents surge in response to the heightened rental demand. Consequently, the rise of house prices has created a chain reaction negatively affecting affordability of housing for many people, particularly the low income renters.

Table 3 Vancouver's House Prices 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vancouver Area</th>
<th>Median Price Oct.1990</th>
<th>Median Price 3 Mo. Ago</th>
<th>Median Price 1 Year Ago</th>
<th>% Change 1 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>214,000</td>
<td>+ 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>- 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver East</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>+ 9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>+40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>+16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Delta</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>+14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>+ 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>+ 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>212,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>- 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>+17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsawwassen</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>+ 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver West</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>- 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>262,000</td>
<td>- 0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Vancouver Sun, October 30 p.C7., 1990.
3.2 Inadequate Supply of Affordable Rental and Depletion of Low Rent Stock

3.2.1 Market Response to Demand for Affordable Housing

A critical factor contributing to the scarcity of low rent supply in the housing market in Vancouver is "market failure" in the rental sector. Conventional wisdom believes in rental market equilibrium. It assumes that whenever demand goes up supply matches. However, empirical evidence indicates differently: as Vancouver's demand for affordable rental rises, supply remains low. The market is not responsive to the kind of demand which cannot generate profit for developers.

But developers are building. In the late 1980s, condominium conversions and demolition of apartment buildings to create sites for upscale condo development reached unprecedented levels. The most visible demolitions in 1989 occurred in one of the city of Vancouver's most affluent neighborhoods in Kerrisdale. Hundreds of households were affected. Many were senior tenants and long term residents in the area. If City Council approves the 18 demolition permits, 370 affordable rental units in Kerrisdale would be replaced by 250 luxury condominiums, i.e., a loss of 370 affordable and desirable rental units in the city of Vancouver. Connaught Place is one of the recently completed development in Kerrisdale. Sale prices for the new condos in Connaught Place are listed from a low $850,000 to $1.75 million per unit. The estimated rents for these units would be at least $3,000 a month while the previous units in the three-storey walkups have rents in the range of $550 to $600 a month (Vancouver Sun, October 2, 1990).
In addition, three of the four major segments of the City of Vancouver's rental stock are being threatened: the purpose-built rental apartments; the secondary suites in some neighborhoods; and the rooming housing stock in the Downtown Eastside (Hulchanski, 1989:7). Private rental starts dropped from 1071 in 1982 to 88 in 1986.

If the depletion of rental stock is traced back in recent history, the cumulative negative impact of the loss becomes even more alarming. From 1973 to 1976, six inner-city neighborhoods in Vancouver lost 2,400 rental units, and from 1976 to 1981 another 1,000 units per year lost, mainly in the inner city as well. Further, from 1976 to 1981 the number of residential hotels and lodging-houses on the edge of Vancouver's downtown declined from 1,200 to 450 (Ley, 1985).

It was estimated that renters in the "core housing need" (households that spend more than 30 per cent of total income on suitable and affordable housing) rose from 35 per cent to 46 per cent in the City of Vancouver between 1980 to 1985 (McAfee, 1989:3). Moreover, the number of households paying more than 50 per cent of their income on shelter has doubled since 1981 (Hulchanski, Eberle & Stewart, 1990:18).

3.2.2 Governments Response to Demand for Affordable Housing

a.) The City's Response: At the municipal level, the chances of getting more supply of low rent housing from the City is at best minimal. "After many years of innovative responses to the housing need of lower-income households, the City of Vancouver has also become passive" in meeting the lower end
housing demand (Murphy, 1988:28). The secondary suites review program has cost the City $1.2 million to legalize just 63 suites in the 4 year long process while threatens the existence of 260,000 affordable rental units in the City (Vancouver Sun, November 3, 1990). Moreover, the illegal suites review program also affects potentially the majority of the 260,000 landlords who rely on the rental income to assist their mortgage payments, maintenance and improvement of their houses.

The City of Vancouver's initiative to create the Vancouver Land Corporation Properties on city land lease basis to supply affordable housing for moderate income families is at best to be considered as a small contribution to a big housing problem. The lack of appropriately zoned land also restricts the potential to increase supply of units in Vancouver. According to the planning department, 70 per cent of the residential land in the City is currently zoned for single-family dwellings (Planning Department, October 12, 1990). This indicates that zoning has not kept pace with changing demographics and household trends. Moreover, the City has amended its by-law to reduce bulk in an effort to discourage monster houses. It has not, however, realized that at the same time the by-law also reduces potentially the number of legal rental units coming on stream. In the suburban areas, the problem is not the shortage of raw land. Rather the issue is the suburban governments' preference toward single family or upscale multiple residential housing. All factors combine have exacerbated pressure on the supply of affordable housing in Vancouver.

b.) The Senior Governments: Under the British North America Act (1867), housing is a provincial responsibility (though the provincial government
delegates other housing related powers such as land use and zoning to municipalities). Murphy criticizes the British Columbian government for defining for itself a very narrow mandate in public housing. In addition, since 1983, the provincial government has drastically cut back on renter's rights by eliminating the Rentalsman's Office, and terminating the renter's tax credit while retaining a tax credit for homeowners (Murphy, 1988:30).

At the national level, the federal government has traditionally relied on housing programs as well as tax incentives for assisting homeownership and stimulating private rental supply. Social housing unit allocations are generally few and are often susceptible to budget cutback. Figure 1 shows the number of rental housing starts from 1980 to 1986. During this period, virtually all the rental units have been subsidized. The Canada Rental Supply (CRSP) and the Multiple Unit Residential Building (MURB) which are rental housing tax incentive programs, account for the majority of the private rental starts from 1980 to 1984. The supply of the private rental dropped drastically once these programs were over. Hulchanski contends that the "private rental sector cannot and will not supply the new rental housing British Columbian needs now or in the future" (Hulchanski, 1987:Paper #3:6).

In spite of the tight housing conditions, the federal government continues to cut back on social housing unit allocations especially to the co-op sector. In the City of Vancouver, social housing starts have fallen from 7,175 in 1981 to 425 in 1988 - the lowest level in the decade in Vancouver (Hulchanski, 1989:4).
Research evidence also reveals that there is a withdrawal of political commitment by the provincial and the federal governments toward the supply of low rent housing. This is sad news. Since the market is not responsive to social needs, the City of Vancouver needs the federal government who tends to have the money and the provincial government who tends to have the jurisdiction and the social and health facilities to play a key role in increasing the supply of low rent housing. Therefore, until there is a renewal of governments' commitment toward the increase in supply of low rent
housing, it is almost certain that the problem of affordability will get worse before it gets better.

3.3 Unemployment, Poverty and Social Assistance

Historically, British Columbia's economy is based on resource extraction. Mining and fishing are the two major sources of employment in the province. However, jobs in the resource industries are usually seasonal and extremely susceptible to international change in demand. In fact, this becomes one of the reasons that B.C. has a long record of high seasonal fluctuation in employment. In the late 1980s, the Vancouver's regional economy has improved markedly. As well, Vancouver's economy is shifting from a primary resource and tertiary base to a quaternary and service sector economy. Presently, service industry has become the fastest growing sector providing 70 percent of the province's employment. But the growth in employment occurs mainly in low paying, part-time and seasonal jobs related to the hospitality and tourism industries.

Unemployment in British Columbia had been over 10 per cent from 1982 to 1988 (Figure 2). For many years, B.C's unemployment rates were higher than the national averages. Although the unemployment rate had fallen slightly to 9 per cent in 1989 following a sustained period of high unemployment in the 1980s, the rate of unemployment in reality is much higher. Usually, the "official unemployment" figures are 40 per cent lower because they do not reflect the numbers of the "hidden unemployed" (those discouraged or too frustrated to find work), the underemployed, the ones who cannot participate
in labour force due to the lack of appropriate supporting services and the people on government training programs.

**Figure 2**

![British Columbia Unemployment Rate 1979 - 1989](image)

Source: Statistics Canada, Historical Labour Force Statistics Cat. 71-210

Consequently, the historical high unemployment in B.C. becomes a major factor attributing to the persistence of poverty in the province. The number of poor families in the province almost doubled in four years from 65,000 in 1980 to 120,000 in 1984 and the real household incomes in Metropolitan Vancouver declined between 1980 to 1985 (Hulchanski, Eberle & Stewart, 1990:19). This occurred in spite of the growing number of dual income
families. The number of people receiving income assistance under the Guaranteed Available Income for Need (GAIN) program has increased from 124,300 in 1980/1981 to 232,200 in 1984/1985. Even with the assistance of GAIN, many welfare recipients are having a problem in catching up with the high cost of living in Vancouver. According to the Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia, for the GAIN rates to be equal to the average basic costs of living, increases of between 30 per cent to 70 per cent are necessary (SPARK, March 1987).

Another disturbing fact on poverty is the polarization between the poor and the rich. Nearly one third (32.2%) of all households in British Columbia have a household income under $20,000 while over one third (37.2%) have a household income of over $40,000 (Figure 3). The End Legislated Poverty Coalition of Vancouver draws attention not only to the size of the growing poor population but it also points out the increasing depths of poverty.

More people are getting poor. And the poor are suffering greater depths of poverty. About 245,000 B.C. residents, including 85,000 children depend on welfare rates that range from 39% to about 52% of the poverty line. Another 210,000 are officially unemployed. Many more are unemployed but not counted. In addition, because wages are getting lower and part-time work is on the increase, 52% of poor people work. The number of poor B.C. families increase by 85% between 1981 and 1985 (End Legislated Poverty Coalition, Vancouver, 1987).

This signals yet another reason for concern about the adequacy of the current social welfare assistance in affecting people's ability to afford adequate housing.
Figure 3
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3.4 "Not In My Backyard" (NIMBY) Syndrome and Affordability in Housing

The primary objective of participatory neighbourhood planning is to provide a medium to facilitate the exchange of views and negotiate trade-offs so that government and community can arrive at compromises in policy decision through a democratic process. The impacts of citizen participation on the supply and affordability in housing in Vancouver is a complex issue. However, the Not In My Backyard mentality commonly exhibited by neighborhoods toward
developments in the City has directly or indirectly affected the dwindling supply of housing units in the Vancouver housing market.

Although oppositions to developments are not always flawed in principle, they do have several short term negative effects in the tight housing market in Vancouver: 1) NIMBY has directly or indirectly reduced the supply of housing units coming on the market; 2) NIMBY has led to the uneven or inequitable share of density among neighborhoods; 3) NIMBY has caused part of the increase in production cost and final sale price on housing units; and 4) NIMBY has lengthened the approval and development processes. Of course public participation in policy decision making is necessary and has its undeniable merits, particularly in a democratic system. However, the NIMBY mentality exhibited by neighborhoods in Vancouver toward developments has directly and indirectly limited the potential supply of housing units which in turn contributes to the tightening of market conditions that is intricately linked to homelessness.

3.5 Population Growth and Future Housing Demand

Since the mid 1980s, Vancouver had experienced a sustained growth in immigration. According to CMHC, net migration increased 151 per cent from 1984 to 1988 with an annual average gain of 28,419 (Figure 4). Further, a recent provincial government study also indicates that the British Columbia's population is growing faster than any other province. The population growth rate is nearly double of the national average. Presently, B.C.'s population growth rate is at 2.6 per cent while Canada as a whole is at 1.4 per cent. The study also reveals that the population of B.C. will rise to 4.7 million
from the current 3.1 in 25 years (Vancouver Sun, October 2, 1990). This population growth trend implies that demand in housing from migrants into the City of Vancouver will remain high in the coming years.

At the same time, the demand for housing generated by local demographics is also strong. In the 1990s, new households formation becomes higher due to the increase in single person families, as well as a large number of baby boomers entering into their 30's and 40's. In view of the projected growth in
immigration (interprovincial and international) and the increase in new household formation by local residents, the demand for housing in the rental and owner occupier housing sectors is going to remain strong in Vancouver. Unless appropriate housing decisions are formulated and initiatives are implemented in response to meet the growing needs, the housing squeeze is likely to continue. In the long run, many more people will be pushed down and out of the housing system to join the homeless in emergency shelters and on streets.
Chapter Four

A Survey of Shelter Options for

the Homeless People in Vancouver 1990

Homelessness is at the root of almost every urban affliction we suffer; joblessness, malnutrition, substance abuse, violent crime, illiteracy. People become remarkably self-sufficient when they get a roof over their heads, but without stable housing, they just can't function. All the money that governments spend on health, job training, crime prevention and economic development is wasted if we can't house people. Which makes the provision of housing the bedrock of any economic policy (Olive, 1988:7).

In the midst of economic prosperity in the late 1980s, there are increasing numbers of homeless people seeking refuge in emergency shelters, transition houses and drop in centers in the City of Vancouver. The new homeless are a heterogeneous group.

The objective of this survey is to gather empirical evidence to examine the availability, adequacy and appropriateness of existing program responses to meet the housing needs of homeless people in the City of Vancouver by surveying the facilities and services offered at various types of shelter options with special emphasis on emergency centers. Through a two-part questionnaire and personal interviews, this survey is designed to gather first hand information and informed opinion from practitioners who are working closely with the homeless population.

The survey is limited in several aspects. Not all the relevant agencies are surveyed though the intent is to select a representative cross section of the kinds of shelter and programs that are most closely related to meet the needs of the homeless population. Moreover, the survey only represents a
"snapshot" of the extent and the problems that are encountered by the selected agencies and their clientele. Therefore, information collected is not sufficient to be taken as conclusive findings. However, the survey findings can be used as valid indicators toward a deeper and better understanding of the source, nature and trends of homelessness in Vancouver.

This survey of shelter options for homeless people was conducted during October and November 1990. Fifteen shelters were surveyed. Three of the shelters offer both emergency as well as residency programs. Nine of the shelters provide emergency shelter service while nine others have relatively longer terms of residency programs to meet the different needs of their clients. In this survey, the total number of beds offered by the nine emergency programs is 230 and the total number of beds offered by the residency programs is 824. The number of women who use the drop in center in the Vancouver downtown area is 80 on average each day while the maximum number of women using the center is 150 per day in 1990. In addition, officials and management personnel were interviewed from St. James' Social Services Society, Triage Outreach Program and Anchorage Job Training Program (terminated September, 1990) (Table 4). In total, eighteen practitioners were interviewed from the shelters and six others were interviewed from other related program services.

The information collected from the field survey is documented in appendix A in a series of tables under eighteen headings: mandate, services offered, restrictions, maximum stay, average stay, hours of operation, cost to clients, number of beds, occupancy rate, percentage of repeaters, number turn away, client types, client source of income, reasons for seeking
accommodation, agency referred to, agency referred from, change in demand in 1990 and source of funding.

Table 4 The Total Number of Shelters and Programs Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Shelter</th>
<th>No. of Beds</th>
<th>No. of beds in Emerg. Prog.</th>
<th>Other Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charity</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Res.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (Drug&amp;Alcohol)</td>
<td>120 (Intermediary care)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmuir</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Surrey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishtar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookout</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond House</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Maria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triage</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl House</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80 avg/day
(Max 150/day)

The summary of this survey findings and observations is presented in two parts. Part one highlights the quantitative findings from information provided in the tables. Part two summarizes the qualitative findings and observations that cannot not be shown in tables.
4.1 A Summary of the Findings in the Tables in Appendix A

4.1.1 Mismatch in supply and demand of facilities and services raises questions in adequacy of services and discretionary powers of managers.

The philosophy and resources of the agencies have a strong influence on the nature and quality of services and facilities provided to client groups. Over half of the agencies surveyed have mandates which restrict their service to either men or women of over the age of eighteen. This means that the under 18 year old clients have to find refuge elsewhere. Although six agencies would accept both male and female clients, the proportion of female clients accepted is generally rather small (e.g., only 5 per cent of the Alexander & Central Residency are female). This raises question on suitability and effectiveness of the "mixing" arrangement of both male and female clients in the same residency.

Five agencies would accept adults with children but only two of them (one in Richmond and one in the City of Vancouver) would accept family with both parents. According to Ms Barbara Charlie, the program co-ordinator, the Owl House is the only place in the City of Vancouver that would accept families with both parents. However, as the number of families requiring emergency services grows, there is insufficient spaces to meet the changing needs of homeless families seeking assistance from the shelters.

In 1990, the demand for shelter services increased substantially. This has directly or indirectly caused the agencies to become more discriminating in the selection process for reasons of maintaining "security, peace and
order." Seven of the fifteen shelters' program managers or co-ordinators explicitly indicate that their agencies would not admit "trouble makers." Some of the agencies even keep a "bar list" or "black list" in order to guard themselves against individuals who behave poorly. Sometimes, the objective standard of what constitutes trouble making behavior is hard to determined. These decisions are generally based on the discretionary power of the admitting agents. Since over two thirds of the agencies' occupancy rates have reached 90 to 100 per cent regularly, there are many absolute homeless people going around looking for shelter services. In turn, agents have to exercise more discretionary power in selecting the types of clientele they want to serve while the absolute homeless people have less options open to accommodate their immediate needs.

4.1.2 Insufficient funding creates problems in provision and maintenance of adequate level of staffing and services for homeless people.

Clients usually come to shelters with multiple needs. They require accommodation, food, clothing, psychiatric and emotional counselling, welfare assistance and legal aid services etc. Fourteen of the fifteen shelters surveyed offer either emergency, residency or a combination of the two programs for clients who are seeking assistance. However, over two thirds of these shelters are not fully equipped to meet the clients' needs. Some agencies do not offer food (e.g., Alexander and Central Residence and Women's Centre). Others do not have professionally trained staff to offer medical attention, emotional, behavioral and/or psychiatric counselling.
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Recently, due to the tight housing market conditions and the
dehospitalization of psychiatric patients in the City of Vancouver, there
is a significant increase in the number of psychiatric patients who are
seeking shelter services, particularly in emergency centers. Lookout, Owl
House and Women's Centre are having an especially difficult time in stretching
staff to cope with the increase in demand for facilities and services. These
gaps between the clients' needs and services provided by shelters can be
attributed partly to the insufficient funding and understaffing of agencies.
This in turn lowers the shelters' level of services in meeting the needs of
the homeless people.

4.1.3 Increase in demand and clients' prolonged period of stay have seriously
undermined shelters' capacity to accommodate crisis situations.

All of the fifteen shelters surveyed indicated a noticeable increase in
demand for their services in 1990 compared to the previous two years. As
well, they have also predicted that this upward trend will continue in 1991.
In addition to the larger number of homeless people that the shelters have
accommodated, the increase in demand for services is reflected by the near
saturated occupancy rates, the large number of turnaway and self referrals,
more frequent telephone inquiries, prolonged average stays and long waiting
lists.

According to Ms Karen O'Shannacery, executive director of Lookout, it
has an occupancy rate of 101% and is currently turning away 70 to 75
individuals each month (this figure represents only one third of the actual
number of people being turned away). Further, client's average stay at
Lookout has also significantly lengthens from 9 nights in 1988 to 13 nights in 1989, the longest being 208 days. The situations at other agencies are not better. The average stay of clients in the other eight emergency shelters is between one to two weeks while the maximum stays are usually one to two months. These prolonged periods of stay by clients in the emergency shelters have seriously undermined the shelters' capacity to function its role in the provision of emergency service to accommodate crisis situations. In addition, the extended period of stay by clients in the residency programs also increases the backlog of the homeless people in gaining admission into tenancy programs.

4.1.4 When emergency shelters are full, cheap restaurants and "hang outs" by default become the shelter option of last resort for homeless.

During the survey period, the occupancy rates in the nine emergency shelters were recorded between 90 per cent and 101 per cent. This high level of demand for services has caused problems in terms of the provision of emergency accommodation for clients who are seeking help. It has also created delay in linkages to services with other supporting agencies (e.g., relocating clients to other emergency centers). According to Mr. John Talbot, manager of the Catholic Charity Men's Hostel, when the hostel is full, he will have little choice other than referring his clients to the Dug Out in the downtown eastside which is a "hang out" that offers free coffee, tea and a warm shelter for people to sit through the night. Other emergency centers also have similar problems. Consequently, when the emergency shelters are full and there are no places to go, the cheap restaurants in the downtown area and the "hang outs" have by default become the shelter option of last resort for
people who are in shelter crises before they have to hit the streets and shiver in the cold.

4.1.5 The change in composition of the new homeless creates gaps between demand and supply of facilities and services.

The survey reveals that the traditional stereotype of homeless as transients and old male bums who have opted out of society is inadequate and misleading. The people who are seeking refuge in emergency centers, transition houses, drop in centers and heavily subsidized low rent shelters in Vancouver are diverse. They consist of transients, unemployed, former psychiatric patients, schizophrenics, drug abusers, alcoholics, immigrants, refugees, destitutes, families, single parents with children, women in abusive situations, and runaway and problem youths. The composition of the homeless in the 1990s is changing. Among the new homeless, the number of psychiatric patients, younger people, immigrants and refugees from out of town, single women, single mothers and low income families are increasing in a noticeable rate.

The records of over 90 per cent of the emergency shelters surveyed and the drop in center indicate a marked increase in the number of psychiatric patients following the provincial government's policy of deinstitutionalization. This represents a major shift of clientele from a predominance of the traditional alcoholic to mental patients. But many shelters are not equipped and staffed to provide psychiatric assistance to the clients who are seeking help.
Moreover, Triage, Dunsmuir, Sancta Maria, Richmond House, Alexander and Central Residency and Lookout have indicated that clients who are coming to the shelters to seek assistance are getting younger. According to the record of Lookout, the average age of clients in 1988 was 38.6. In 1989, the average age of the clients showed a significant drop to 33.4. Triage and Richmond House have a large number of 18 to 20 year old clients.

Further, nine of the fifteen shelters surveyed point out that they have accommodated more immigrants and refugees from out of town in 1990. This clientele comes from all over the Lower Mainland and across the country. Some of the clients are coming from the interior of B.C., Calgary and Alberta while others have arrived from as far as Montreal, Toronto and Charlottown. Although there are usually more people coming from out of town to take advantage of the mild weather in Vancouver during the cold season, there is a noticeable increase in the number of clients coming from out of town in 1989 and 1990. As well, Catholic Charity House, Dunsmuir House, Owl House have also recorded a marked increase of refugees who are referred to them through the immigration office, MSSH and the police.

The population of homeless women and families are growing too. Owl House, Evergreen Surrey Emergency Shelter, Ishtar, and Women's Drop In Center have recorded marked increase in single women and single mothers' caseloads. Ms Karen Tully, coordinator of the Women's Drop In Centre, contends that there is a serious lack of affordable and appropriate shelter options for women with mental, emotional and physical problems, particularly in the downtown area, because many of the subsidized or emergency shelters are just for men. Only
four of the fifteen shelters surveyed would allow single mothers with children despite the rapid increase in demand for service in this client group.

The change in composition of the new homeless has created a discrepancy between the availability of appropriate shelter options and the clients' needs. This means that there is an urgent need for broader range of shelter types to bridge the gap.

4.1.6 Social welfare system often maintains people in the revolving door of poverty.

More than two thirds of the agencies indicate that the number of the "familiar faces," "repeaters," and "regulars" are increasing. Of the six agencies that can provide estimates of repeaters, four of them have short term repeaters or regulars between 50 to 60 per cent. Records from the other two agencies show a rate of 10 per cent repeater in Richmond House and about 37 per cent of the clients return within a period of three months to Lookout.

The large number of repeaters reflects in part the fact that the welfare system's shelter component (appropriately $250 per month) is so low that welfare recipients cannot afford permanent and decent housing with the welfare assistance in the tight housing market in Vancouver. As a result, many have to drift in and out of temporary shelters in search of a roof over their head.
4.2. A Summary of the Findings and Observations from the Survey and Personal Interviews with Professionals and Practitioners in Welfare Services

4.2.1 The divergent perception on the nature of homelessness reflects the persistence of a lack of consensus on the definitions of the problem.

Although the twenty four informants interviewed may not have the same opinion on causes and solutions of homelessness, they do perceive homelessness, whether it is in a narrow or broad sense, as undesirable and unnecessary in a country as rich as Canada. Eighteen interviewees contend that the general concept of homelessness means more than just the lack of physical shelter. In a broader view, homelessness is caused, they say, partly by the client's inability to afford a permanent home, the lack of family and community support, the eroded right to housing, as well as being powerless in a whole range of negative societal conditions, such as in pay equity, substance abuse and abusive situations.

However, the other six of the interviewees perceive homelessness in much narrower terms. To them, homelessness is an unfortunate condition in which people "have no places to go," "have no roofs over their heads," "have to sleep on streets, on top of garbage tanks or on park benches" and "don't know where the next meal will come from." Four of the interviewees truly believe that the absolute homeless are either acting by their "own choice," "don't want to conform," "are taking a free ride" or "deliberately bring it on themselves."
This divergent perception of homelessness is a reflection that our society has yet to come to an agreement on who should be counted as homeless, who deserves societal assistance, and how should homeless be helped.

4.2.2 There is disagreement on the adequacy of welfare assistance but interviewees unanimously agree that affordable housing is the key factor contributing to homelessness in Vancouver.

At least six of the twenty four professionals contend that the issue of homelessness is more than the problem of sufficiency of welfare assistance. Mrs. Gutteridge, founder and board of director of the St. James Social Services, points out that "homelessness is not just the lack of a home. It is a reflection of the clients' lack of ability, both social and psychological, rather than mere the insufficiency of welfare assistance." "People should buy only what they can afford." Therefore, "throwing money away would not improve the situations." "The clients need help in improving their life management skill such as in welfare cheque management (Gutteridge, interview, November, 1990)."

Mr. Frank Kan, manager of the Alexander and Central Residence, thinks that if some welfare recipients do not "waste" so much money on "bottles," "cigarettes," "returning and giving favors" and "taking taxies," they should have sufficient funds to hold on to until the next welfare cheques are due. Mr. Taylor, coordinator of the Dunsmuir House, believes that some of the clients are taking a "free ride." And Mrs. Hewitt of Dunsmuir house who has fourteen years of experience in the "helping people business" also agrees that
"throwing more money away doesn't help improve the welfare dependency of clients." She contends that "society must learn how to stop giving."

"Society must learn how to give so little that people still have incentive to keep working." Among the six interviewees who hold a positive view on the sufficiency of welfare assistance, many of them sincerely believe that even if welfare recipients do not have money there are still plenty of places organized by community and church charity groups that would offer absolute homeless with free shelters, free food and free clothing to help them through crises.

Although there is disagreement on the sufficiency of welfare assistance, there is unanimous opinion that the lack of affordable housing is the main factor contributing to the problem of homelessness in Vancouver. Ms Robin Hamilton of Evergreen Surrey Emergency Shelter and Ms Karen Tully of the Women's Center point out that rents in the City of Vancouver are "out of line." For example, Ms Hamilton indicates that currently it would cost $445 to $500 a month to rent a decent one bedroom apartment in the suburban area in Surrey. Ms Karen O'Shannacery, executive director of Lookout, contends that "the number of welfare abusers is very small." But the gap between the shelter components (about $275 per month) and the market rents (about $475 on the Eastside and $570 in the West End for a one bedroom apartment, CMHC, April, 1990) is so big that it is almost impossible for welfare recipients to rent any decent, adequate and affordable housing in the overheated housing market in Vancouver. Consequently, many clients have to drift in and out of emergency shelters to avoid ending up on streets.
4.2.3 "Supportive housing" is a viable housing option for the homeless to regain dignity and self-sufficiency.

Fifteen of the eighteen interviewees in the survey of shelter options believe that the lives of many clients have been so "disoriented" by the vicious circle of poverty, mental illness, joblessness, eviction and personal or family problems that only about 2 per cent to 5 per cent of them are capable of getting rid of their welfare dependency and becoming self-reliant once they have been trapped in episodes of homelessness.

Although the estimated rates of clients who regain self-sufficiency are low, they are not totally hopeless. Realizing that housing alone cannot solve the multi-faceted problems that homeless people face, many practitioners do reckon that "supportive housing" is one of the feasible alternatives that would provide a better chance for homeless people to stabilize their conditions and get back on their own feet. Ms Gallagher of the YWCA, Ms O'Shannacery of Outlook, Ms Tully from the Women's Center, Ms Hamilton from Evergreen Surrey Emergency Shelter, Ms Sutton from Powell House, Ms O'Brien from Triage and Mr. Taylor from Dunsmuir trust that "supportive housing" is one of the viable means that could help their clients to regain control of life in a "stabilized" and "supportive" environment ("Supportive housing" means the provision of stable, secure and affordable living environment together with necessary support services, such as life skill training, medical or psychological counselling etc.).
4.2.4 Mutual help creates a sense of self for the homeless.

To encourage mutual help among clients has a positive impact to improve the quality of life for clients. The Women's Center has clients volunteer to staff the reception desk. Dunsmuir House has residents offer informal assistance to help one another in solving personal problems (e.g., exchange opinion in job hunting experiences). Triage has clients volunteer to share housing keeping routine. Sancta Maria House encourages residents to prepare their own breakfast to suite their own taste. Although these are minor responsibilities for clients to take on, they may be the necessary big step for clients to reestablish their sense of self. Therefore by providing a chance for clients to participate meaningfully in a supervised environment, the mutual help system enhances the possibility of clients to live a normal life.

4.2.5 "Wrong mixing" of clients is a mistake.

It causes more harm than good to clients if their needs cannot be served accordingly. At least five of the eighteen interviewees from the survey of shelter options point out that the increase of psychiatric patients following the deinstitutionalization of mental hospitals in B.C. has an adverse impact on the "order" and "peace" of the shelters surveyed. Mr. Talbot, manager of Catholic Charity Men's Hostel, says that "if psychiatric patients and substance abusers are put together they often cause trouble." Mr. Ted Browcliff and Ms Judy O'brien, coordinators of Triage, also indicate that the inappropriate mixing of psychiatric patients with disabled persons would not work: they often aggravate and hurt each other. Consequently, the wrong
mixing of clients also undermines the effectiveness of services provided by shelters. In order to better help clients and improve efficiency of services at shelters, a wider range of shelter options for clients is necessary.

4.2.6 Protection of the existing stock of affordable and good quality shelter options is necessary.

According to Ms Karen O'Shannacery, executive director of Lookout, the City of Vancouver has already lost five emergency shelters in the recent years. As well, Dunsmuir House and Catholic Charity Men's Hostel are experiencing pressure from the development community because of the shelters' proximity to the central business district in the downtown area. Unless some deliberate and preventive measures are taken to protect these valuable stock of shelters in Vancouver, the homeless people in the City will have less chance of getting a roof over their heads and have to sleep on streets if the housing situations in the City continue to tighten.

4.2.7 Smaller projects are easier for neighborhoods to accept and better blend into the community.

Among the fifteen shelters surveyed, the Owl Place and Sancta Maria House are two of the better physically designed projects observed in terms of their hominess and friendliness in appeal. Their designs are better because they look like any other ordinary single detached homes rather than intimidating institutions. Their designs are consistent with the neighborhoods where they are situated. Therefore they are more easily accepted and better blend into the neighborhoods. More importantly, the
interior designs of these two projects also give a feeling of "home" to those who are desperately seeking security and safety from the outside world.

4.2.8 Job placement program is a necessary step to complement life skills training program in order to enable clients to participate in society.

Having a life skill training program for homeless people is not sufficient because the chances that no one wants to hire them are high. In order to initiate solution to a difficult situation, many agencies have tried to provide employment opportunity for their clients within the agencies. According to Ms O'Brien, coordinator, Triage has tried to arrange employment placement for their clients within the agency and from outside. For example, a female client is currently hired to provide domestic services in Triage. Ms Sutton also tries to employ clients to assist domestic work in the Powell Place. Though the kinds of jobs that clients are able to do are usually low pay manual or domestic work, nevertheless, these jobs have great benefits in stabilizing clients' conditions to enable participation in society.

4.2.9 Prevention of homelessness is a more preferred option than "bandaging" homelessness "after the fact."

Ms Gallagher of the YWCA and Ms Hamilton of Evergreen Surrey Emergency Shelter strongly believe that the current system of emergency shelters is a only a passive response to catch people after they have fallen through the "social safety net." Relying on this reactive tactic of "bandaging" homelessness "after-the-fact" cannot make the problem go away by itself. Instead, government should take on a more responsive role in the prevention of
homelessness by a combination of methods. For a long term solution, a plan to increase the supply of "supportive housing" must be emphasized. At the same time, a sufficient stock of "short term shelter/emergency options" must be maintained to accommodate crisis situations. More importantly, the three levels of government should take greater responsibility to increase the supply of affordable housing in the City. Last but not the least, municipalities should exercise their role in "pressuring the senior governments to demonstrate greater commitment in financing and effort in alleviating the problem of housing deprivation for those who are the weakest members in the community (O'Shannacery, interview, November, 1990)."
Chapter Five
Utility of the Broad definition of Homelessness
in Housing Policy Decisions

There are two major concerns in the assessment of the utility of the broad concept of homelessness: 1) the utility of the concept as an analytic framework and a heuristic device to understand an untidy and complex social reality; and more importantly, 2) the concept's effectiveness in helping to bring structure and organization to the policy decision making process.

Bearing these two concerns in mind, the following is an exploratory search for the usefulness of the broad concept of homelessness in affecting housing policy choices and programs. A set of five policy making criteria has been identified to guide this assessment.

5.1 Homelessness and Homeownership: the utility of the broad definition of homelessness in a homeownership dominant housing system.

No feasible housing policy can be effectively formulated without considering the varieties of constraints and conditions present in the existing housing system. In order to fully comprehend the implications of the broad definition of homelessness in the decision making process, current policy and programs that dominate the housing market mechanisms must be examined.

Nationally, in the fifteen years following the end of World War II, Canada was transformed from a nation of renters to a nation of homeowners.
Despite of the recommendation of the Marsh and Curtis Reports (Canada Parliament 1944), the 1940s and the 1950s were dominated by policy responses to facilitate and stimulate construction for homeownership. According to Rose, "the best conclusion we can arrive at concerning national housing policy from 1945 through 1964 is that the government of Canada was strongly in favor of the attainment of homeownership by every family (Rose, 1980:35)." From the mid 1970s to the early 1980s, the federal government had also introduced and implemented a variety of financing instruments, tax incentives and housing programs in an effort to encourage homeownership and stimulate market supply of new homes (Figure 5). In terms of provincial programs, British Columbia, for example, terminated the renter's tax credit in 1983 while retaining a tax credit for homeowners. There are 60 per cent homeowners and 40 per cent renters across the country. This ratio has not changed much since the 1960s. This implies that the Canadian national housing policy of promoting homeownership is very much preferred by all three levels of government. This preference is due to the fact that homeownership is an efficient and effective way to privatize costs associated with the provision of housing.

Another reason that homeownership is a preferred option to provide housing is that historically housing policies and programs are intricately linked with macro economic policy. For a long time, governments have been using the production of houses as an economic tool to create jobs and stimulate economy.
Figure 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evolution of Federal Home Ownership Programs, Canada, 1945 to 1988</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1945</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Federal Mortgage Loans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NHA Mortgage Insurance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Federal Mortgage Loans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Gains Tax Exemption for Home Owners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assisted Home Ownership Program (AHOP)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Time Home-Buyers Grant Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registered Home Ownership Savings Plan (RHOSP)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program (RRAP)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Home Insulation Program (CHIP)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada Mortgage Renewal Plan (CMRP)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada Home Ownership Stimulation Plan (CHOSP)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada Home Renovation Plan (CHRTP)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mortgage Rate Protection Program (MRPP)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: J.D. Hulchanski, School of Community and Regional Planning, The University of British Columbia, 4/88.
The government's commitment to use housing for economic management is easy to understand because of its tremendous economic multiplier effects on the nation's economy. Goldberg points out that

in 1980, the total output in the Canadian economy as measured by the gross national product (GNP) amounted to approximately $228.1 billion. Total investment in new and existing housing units during that year amounted to $13.9 billion (1/3 of all construction), or 4% of GNP, excluding operating expenditures for heating, lighting, furnishing, property taxes, and maintenance and repairs. If we also add the operating costs of just over $2.8 billion for repairs and maintenance, $24.3 billion for rent, imputed rent (rental value of owned housing) and heat and light, and $11.6 billion for household furnishings and equipment, the total for housing and housing-related expenditures rises to $52.6 billion, or 18.2% of GNP in 1980 (Goldberg, 1983:6).

From the evidence above there is no doubt that the government's commitment to homeownership is solid. It is very likely that the Canadian governments will continue to fully support and, in housing policy issues, emphasize homeownership in the future. On the contrary, the political commitment to provide subsidizing low rent housing is uncertain.

To sum up, the Canadian government's attitude towards homeownership is the following: 1) homeownership is the preferred housing tenure due to low government direct expenditure requirements; 2) since homeownership represents the majority tenure in the housing market (60% of Canadian households), the building industry that is responsible for this supply is a huge economic generator and an anti-recessionary device; 3) in general, homeowners have relatively high consumer purchasing powers. As such they are considered a great economic multiplier in the goods and services sector; and 4) homeownership tenure generally serves Canadians' housing needs well except for a small minority. For these reasons, it is obvious that the policy of
homeownership will continue to be a high priority on the governments' policy agenda. At the same time, it can also be quite safely said that the problem of homelessness will remain as a peripheral issue in the housing scene. Because of the huge public expenditure required to address the broadly defined homeless problem, the government's present inaction on homelessness will likely persist.

In short, as long as most of the cost of housing provision can be privatized, the provision of subsidized rental housing will likely remain ad hoc, piecemeal, fragmented, reactive and residual. Social housing policy and programs become mere by-products contingent on economic conditions rather than necessary provisions to meet social needs. Because of the huge expenditure required and the lack of economic incentive to provide social housing, the utility of the broad definition of homelessness in inducing policy responses in relieving the harsh housing conditions of the homeless is very low in a housing system dominantly based on homeownership. As well, homelessness is unlikely to induce federal and provincial governments to redirect their housing priorities.

5.2 Inadequate Formulation of the "At Risk Homeless": the broad definition of homelessness contains the category of "at risk homeless" which is inadequately formulated to fairly address housing needs of at risk homeowners.

The research and empirical evidence of this study points to the fact that analysts who want to define homelessness broadly have failed to define the concept of the "at risk homeless" consistently according to their
comprehensive formulation of homelessness. In general, analysts either tend to neglect homeowners who have problems in terms of adequacy, suitability and affordability in housing (i.e., the at risk homeowners) or they are quick and ready to dismiss the category of at risk homeowners entirely from their analysis even if they recognize the serious housing problems that many of the homeowners encounter.

For analysts who insist on using a broad interpretation of homelessness, their intentional or unintentional exclusion of the "at risk homeowners" from the "at risk homeless" is problematic. Similar to renters, there is a large number of homeowners who also have various kinds of serious housing problems. To illustrate this, the following are some examples: 1) homeowners who live in substandard housing with poor amenity and infrastructure in rural and small remote communities; 2) homeowners who have insufficient or unstable financial means for mortgage repayments (e.g., the working poor homeowners and homeowners who are facing layoff and unemployment due to economic recession); 3) homeowners who live in substandard housing due to the lack of financial means to keep up with maintenance (e.g., seniors who are relying mainly on old age security or small pensions); 4) homeowners who are emotionally or psychologically deprived of a "home" (e.g., battered women); and 5) native homeowners who live in isolated land reserve with little employment opportunities and badly developed infrastructure. In his critique on housing crisis, Malpass also clearly points out that it is a common misconception that people generally think that homeowners are beneficiaries rather than victims of homeownership.
low-income purchasers are in many ways victims of homeownership rather than beneficiaries, in the sense they live in the poorest quality housing, which they cannot afford to maintain or improve to a satisfactory standard, they pay a high proportion of income on mortgage repayments and obtain least assistance with their housing costs. It is argued that the policy of homeownership is not accompanied by mechanisms for channelling help to those in greatest need (Malpass, 1986:20).

Moreover, as of the early 1985, CMHC had already brought our attention to the housing problems experienced by both the renter as well as owner households. According to CMHC's estimates, more than 500,000 renter households cannot afford physically adequate and uncrowded accommodation and nearly 200,000 homeowners in Canada have serious housing affordability problems (CMHC, 1985:10).

Further, using the criterion of adequacy, suitability and affordability and data from 1985, CMHC also developed a profile of the extent to which Canadian households experience one or more of the three housing problems and the incidence of core housing need among these households. According to CMHC's estimates, of the 8.75 million private households, housing problems were experienced by 33.8 percent of all households - 28 per cent of owner households and 44 per cent of renter households. In other words, nearly one million owner households were having housing problems concerning either adequacy, suitability and/or affordability.

Another problem is that even if analysts recognize the serious housing deficiency that many of the homeowners face, they often choose not to include the "at risk homeowners" in their analysis. They manage to do that simply by justifying that the at risk homeowners are not the neediest group. For example, Murray contends that
all these [ownerhouseholds] may have had serious housing problems, but they did have housing. They are at the medium level of jeopardy; they are not at the bottom end of the continuum of uncertainty. Thus these household do not represent the focus of this book - those without shelter and those with no fixed address - but they are the households from which the homeless are most likely to be drawn (emphasis added, Murray, 1990:19).

Of course analysts have the right to establish their boundaries in performing their intellectual inquiries. An analyst has the right to confine his or her analysis solely on the housing problems of the homeless renters and non-homeowners. But it becomes very disturbing and problematic if too many analysts are taking a sectional or incomplete interpretation of the "at risk homeless" category in their analyses while insisting that a broad definition of homelessness should be adopted for the purpose of policy decision making.

Available research and empirical evidence support the conclusion that the formulation of the "at risk homeless" population based on a broad definition of homelessness in most of the literature reviewed at best represents only the majority but not the entire population which is at the risk of being homeless. The intentional and/or unintentional exclusion of the "at risk homeowners" from the "at risk homeless" population is unfair. It is not only contradictory to the ideological goals of the comprehensive definition that many of the analysts have ambitiously attempted, it also obscures the thorough understanding of the concept of the "at risk homeless" as well as undermines the magnitude of homelessness within the broad definition of the problem. Besides, the broadening of the concept of the "at risk homeless" adds rather than eliminate problems in terms of producing reliable and accurate estimates of the homeless population.
Given these conceptual and technical ramifications in the inadequate formulation of the "at risk homeless" population, it can be concluded that the concept of the "at risk homeless" is of very limited use in helping policy makers to clearly, fully, and accurately, identify their target groups for the purpose of fairly addressing the housing needs of at risk renters as well as at risk homeowners.

5.3 Imprecise Estimates and Allocation of Public Resources: the utility of a broad definition of homelessness in producing reliable estimates for allocating public resources.

Public resources are limited and housing budgets are small compared to health, education, and other expenditure categories. Therefore, housing policy decisions ought to be made on the basis of reliable and accurate estimates of need. According to Fallick,

without reliable estimates of the scope and the scale of [homelessness], there is little likelihood that governments will commit scarce resources (particularly financial) to these issues, and consequently, the chances of implementing systematic and effective strategies to reduce the problems of the homeless are lessened (Fallick, 1988:260).

Among many reasons, the difficulty in accurately measuring the size of the homeless population mainly stems from the lack of consensus on how homelessness should be defined. The disputes over definitions are not simply about scholastic issues. They involve defining the goals of social welfare policies. The broader the definition, the bigger the size of the homeless population. The bigger the problem, the greater the actions and resources
needed to remedy the situation. For these reasons, the definition of homelessness, for public policy purchase, becomes extremely political.

In terms of public resource allocation, policy responses to the three commonly found definitions of homelessness in society are as follows. First, the decision to have no official definition of homelessness implies that there is no problem and, logically, no policy response is required. Second, a narrow definition implies that only a small number of people are experiencing the problem therefore there is no need to allocate extra resources, hopefully the agencies can tough it out within the existing budget. Third, a broad definition implies that a large number of people is affected and homelessness is a serious social problem. In this case, a major redirection of public resources is necessary to address the problem and the cost to remedy the situation would be astronomical.

Among other things, there are three main problems contributing to the unsettled issue of how homelessness should be defined in Canada. First, the federal government of Canada has no official definition of homelessness. In British Columbia, neither the provincial government, the municipal governments, nor CMHC have an official stand on the issue. Governments' non responsive attitude to homelessness is contradictory to the broad view of homelessness advocated by progressive analysts. Second, the images of homeless projected by media typically represent the narrowest conception of homelessness. Again, this is inconsistent with the broad definition of homelessness endorsed by analysts. Third, many people, particularly the ones who are being identified as the "at risk homeless", are reluctant to be labelled as the "homeless" within the broad framework of homelessness.
In short, these three factors combined seriously affect the utility of the broad definition of homelessness in producing a socially and politically acceptable enumeration of the homeless in Canada for two reasons. First, the broad definition of homelessness favored by many housing analysts and academics has not received the same level of social and political acceptance by either the three levels of government, media or people who have housing difficulties. As the contest of interests continues, the definition of the concept of homelessness and the boundaries of the homeless population remain undetermined. Subsequently, the enumeration of the homeless is impossible. Second, even if the broad definition of homelessness is accepted, the invisible and volatile nature of the at risk homeless prevents it from producing credible statistics as basis for public expenditures. Therefore, without the utility to substantiate a socially and politically acceptable estimate of the homeless population, the broad definition of homelessness is not very useful in producing reliable estimates for the purpose of allocating scarce public resources particularly in periods of fiscal restraint.

5.4 Homelessness and Inter-agency Coalition Building: the utility of the broad definition of homelessness in coalescing inter-agency support and advocacy in housing policy decision making and program development.

A housing policy aimed at assisting people with no shelter of any kind and people at the risk of loosing their homes implies that a course or courses of action have to be adopted so as to increase the supply of low rent and social housing. A policy is a series of decisions. In order to realize these decisions, actors are needed to formulate the policy and implement the plan.
At the operational level, there are yet another three problems with the utility of the broad concept of homelessness in helping to develop a strong coalition among the agencies advocating housing policy for the homeless: 1) the variety of labels used to describe the homeless by housing and welfare agencies implies differences in organization agenda which impede inter-agency coalition in advocacy work for the homeless; 2) the broad spectrum of housing issues identified with the broad view of homelessness undermine the concept's utility in targeting and prioritizing policy choices for the homeless; and 3) the lack of clearly identifiable community-based advocacy groups on the issue of homelessness severely weakens the possibility of mobilizing community support and advocacy to advance the urgent housing needs of the homeless.

Since departmentalization is the way that our society is organized, conflicts resulting from inter and intra agency cooperation are inevitable. The broad definition implies that a large number of welfare agencies and organizations are involved in delivering services and assistance to the large number of homeless people. Among the agencies that are assisting the homeless, there are conflicts in their organizational objectives, contests in funding, as well as struggles in power sharing. Very often, the label of "the homeless" has to be modified in order to suite the aiding agency's organizational goals. Consequently, the term "homeless" is being hidden, blended or substituted with other labels such as the ones mentioned previously. Although the blending of the labels does not necessarily work against the objective of helping the homeless, it contradicts the intention of those who attempt to use the broad definition to exemplify the magnitude of homelessness. As well, the differences in labelling also lead to the dispersion of resources and the inhibition of the formation of a strong
coalition between the housing and other welfare agencies in advancing the urgent need of decent and affordable housing for the homeless.

Moreover, the complex issues that the broad definition of homelessness come to stand for do more harm than good in soliciting community and inter-agency support. The baggage of the label of homelessness is heavy but it plays a limited role in coalescing collective action. Because complex negative social issues requires huge public expenditure with little economic and political incentive for government and society to act on. Therefore the more complex the issue of homelessness that analysts package it, the less the chance that homelessness would gain its legitimate status in the public agenda.

Further, a closer examination of the results of the research and survey points to another disturbing fact. Although homelessness in a broader sense is a very serious problem in Vancouver, there is no organization advocating affordable housing for the "homeless" under the banner of "homelessness." This means that there are no prominent organizations or agencies that are actively involved in housing advocacy for the underprivileged with either the word "homeless" or "homelessness" in their organizations' names (see Appendix D for a list of names of housing advocacy organizations in Vancouver). This fact cannot be taken lightly. Names stand for ideologies, goals, objectives, directions and advocacy of organizations. The organization names can be the important linkages between the clients and the agencies. The lack of explicit endorsement for the homeless and the issue of homelessness from community and public groups reflects the weak mobilization force that the concept of homelessness has in uniting public support.
In short, the differences in labelling of the "homeless" people have greatly undermined the possibility of forming a strong coalition to advance the housing needs of the "homeless." The complexity in the formulation of the issues of homelessness instills economic and political skepticism rather than incentive to allocate resources to tackle the problem. Finally, the lack of direct advocacy from public, non-profit and community groups has severely weakened the possibility of gaining a strong public support to pressure government response in alleviating the worsening housing situations of the homeless. In view of these weaknesses associated with the broad definition of homelessness, it becomes clear that the concept is not useful in coalescing inter-agency support and advocacy in housing policy decision and programs development for the homeless in the community.

5.5 Homelessness and Welfare Consensus: the utility of the broad definition of homelessness in generating welfare consensus in the Canadian society.

A social problem such as homelessness does not exist in a vacuum. The nature of the problem itself, the way it is perceived, and the kinds of solutions considered as feasible are shaped by economic, political and social conditions, as well as by general beliefs prevalent in society at a particular time. Therefore, the examination of the issue of homelessness raises many philosophical, social and policy implications. And the significant question concerning these inquires is whether such an examination results in transforming our overwhelming feelings toward the homeless into actionable solutions.
The collapse of Keynesian welfare consensus has significant social, economic and political implications on housing policy decisions. The weakened welfare consensus not only results in budget constraints on social spending including housing but also reinforces society's negative attitudes toward the homeless. Politically, homelessness is a negative social problem that government would like to forget rather than be reminded of because it is embarrassing and expensive to resolve.

Homelessness reflects governments' failure in performing their constitutional duty to maintain "peace, order and good government" because "good" governments do not, would not and ought not let their people suffer the plight and desperation of being "homeless" especially in a country as rich as Canada. Therefore homelessness is a political stigma which governments are reluctant to accept. They would rather treat it as a side issue.

Another reason why the Canadian governments are silent about the issue of homelessness is that not everyone is affected by it. Mainstream economists contend that housing conditions are generally good and improving. According to Murray, at a maximum, there are only 1 per cent of Canadian population on the streets or in the emergency shelters or hostels (Murray, 1990:44). For this reason, Canada is not faced with a social-economic epidemic in homelessness. Rather some economists believe that homelessness is merely a temporary and minor problem existing among a small segment of population in our society.
Besides, not everyone agrees that all the causes identified to exacerbate homelessness are necessarily bad. For instance, some politicians trust that gentrification is not necessarily a negative thing to society.

Gentrification is much praised for rejuvenating inner cities and for adding tax revenues to strapped city governments; it is also much celebrated for creating cosmopolitan and urban communities. The process have been promoted and financially assisted by all levels of government (Fallis, 1990:58).

In other words, homelessness may be considered as a necessarily minor social cost to generate the much needed economic benefits for the wider society.

On the contrary, governments' less than lukewarm attitude toward the alleviation of homelessness is not entirely without reasons. In some way governments are still deterred by the economic hurts of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs in the 1950s and 1960s. According to Rose,

in Vancouver...and in many other community the monetary costs which can be more or less directly attributed to blighted housing and the slum environment have been enormous when compared with the revenues derived by the local municipality from the normal property tax assessed against land and property in their neighbourhood (Rose, 1967:47).

Consequently, on the economic side of the equation, the broad definition of "homelessness" in the current housing system is equivalent to "public subsidy," "locked in expenditure," "drain on public purse," "foregone revenue," "economic burden," "transferred income," "expensive costs" and "economic waste" to governments as well as the general public. While on the moral side of the equation "social conscience," "ethics," "equality," "social justice" are usually grossly undervalued by the society at large. Against the
tide of the pervasive negative societal attitudes toward the broad issue of homelessness, those who are compassionate to the sufferings of the homeless find it doubly difficult to marshal the necessary wide public support within the broad framework of homelessness.

Besides, society does not think that everyone deserves help. In his critique on People and Public Housing Policy, Rose points to the fact that not everyone believes in the efficacy of housing and welfare assistance. For those who are skeptical about social assistance, they hold the view that some families do not change with improvement in housing and the physical environment. A proportion of family is beyond the help of our social services and beyond the fundamental changes in their housing accommodation and physical environment (Rose, 1967:46).

It is precisely these kinds of negative perceptions of the homeless people that accord the residual character to the issue of homelessness.

In summary, the collapse of welfare consensus in Canada is another main reason that a housing policy developed around the broad definition of homelessness is unlikely to be supported by government and society. "Homelessness" symbolizes failure that politicians, public and individuals are reluctant to admit. "Homelessness" requires huge expenditures to fix but some politicians and people are skeptical of the uncertain effects of social housing policy and program response. As well, some people believe that a portion of the homeless people are beyond help while others are self-induced homeless. Consequently, society has not yet agree on who deserves assistance from society. All factors combined constitute a good case for not acting on the problem of homelessness. This in part explains why Canada still does not have a specific housing policy or rather has a policy of inaction on
homelessness. Without the power to generate political and social support, the broad definition of homelessness is not useful in mobilizing large scale redistribution of public resources for the development of policy and programs to assist the large number of homeless people resulting from the broad conception of the problem.

5.6 A Summary of the Findings on the Utility of the Broad Definition of Homelessness in Policy Decision and Programs Development

Table 5 presents the summary of the findings of this thesis on the utility of the broad definition of homelessness in housing policy decision making. The research and empirical evidence from the literature review and the Vancouver case study concludes that the broad definition of homelessness is too controversial and too imprecise for specific policy and programs development in assisting those who do not have shelter of any kind and those who are at the risk of loosing their homes. It does so for the following five reasons:

1) The huge public expenditure required and the lack of economic incentive to deal with the large population of homeless (i.e., the absolute and the at risk homeless) resulting from the broad definition of homelessness runs contrary to the dominant ideological and political realities in a homeownership focused housing system.

2) The broad definition of homelessness contains the category of "at risk homeless" population with its focus on low income renters is biased and unfair in recognizing similar housing
difficulties experienced by the at risk homeowners.

3) The broad definition of homelessness imposes great difficulty, if not an impossibility, in producing a socially and politically acceptable enumeration of homeless due to the controversial nature of the concepts in establishing precise boundaries for the target group.

4) The broad definition of homelessness is weak in coalescing wide inter-agency and community support and advocacy to advance the desperate shelter need of the large number of homeless because of differences in organizational agenda, economic and political skepticism in efficacy of social assistance and no-direct advocacy to pressure policy response.

5) The broad definition of homelessness creates a bigger social problem that weakens the concept's utility in generating welfare consensus to mobilize resources in assisting the homeless.

In short, the broad definition of homelessness has lessened rather than strengthened the utility of the concept in devising policy decision, prioritizing needs and developing programs to alleviate the severe housing problems for those without shelters of any kind and those at the risk of losing their homes in the Canadian society.

In order to improve the utility of the concept of homelessness for policy decision making and programs development, a redefinition of the concept based on a more focused interpretation and a more precise categorization of the homeless population are necessary in the following chapter.
Table 5: An Assessment of the Utility of the Broad Definition of Homelessness in Housing Policy Decisions

An Assessment of The Utility of the Broad Definition of Homelessness in Housing Policy Decisions

Utility of the Broad Definition of Homelessness in a Homeownership-Dominant Housing Market
Utility of the Broad Definition of Homelessness in Fairly Addressing Housing Needs of At-Risk Homeowners
Utility of the Broad Definition of Homelessness in Producing Reliable and Accurate Estimates for Allocating Public Resources
Utility of the Broad Definition of Homelessness in Coalescing Inter-agency and Community Support and Advocacy
Utility of the Broad Definition of Homelessness in Generating Welfare Consensus

The Utility of the Broad Definition of Homelessness for Housing Policy Choices & Programs Development is of Limited Use

(1) irrelevant (2) not useful (3)*Limited Use (4) Useful (5) Very Useful
* Subject to Improvement or Modification of the Concept.
Chapter Six
Rethinking the Utility of the Concept of Homelessness
for Housing Policy and Program Development:
Concluding Comments

Given the intractability of many social problems, the role of analyst is to locate problems where solutions might be tried. If the analyst is able to redefine problems in a way which makes some improvement possible then this is as much as can be expected (Ham and Hill, 1984:6).

6.1 Conceptual Confusion and Ambiguity in the Contemporary Literature on Homelessness

The literature review points to the fact that the key concepts and terminologies used in discussion of issues relating to homeless individuals are conceptually confusing, ambiguous and inadequate. To demonstrate the validity of this criticism, a summary of the comparison of contents implied by different uses of the concept of a narrow and broad view of homelessness is presented in Table 6. The two major sources of conceptual confusion and ambiguity are discussed below.

First, the confusion results from the lack of distinction between the different emphases in the study of homelessness. There are at least two possible areas of emphases in the study of homelessness -- the study of the issue of homelessness as a "general" social problem (e.g., social inequality) and the study of the issue as a "specific" social problem, (e.g., the housing dimension, geographic dimension, mental health dimension or welfare sufficiency dimension of homelessness). Such intellectual distinction is subtle but significant in influencing an analysts' conceptualization,
Table 6 Summary Comparison of Different Definitions of the Concept of Homelessness in the Contemporary Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Concepts with Emphasis in H.</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Causes</th>
<th>Housing Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeless(1)</td>
<td>multi-causal factors but the main cause</td>
<td>a) a lack of a roof over one's head or a lack of a continuing or permanent affordable home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness(1) (housing issue)</td>
<td>a) absolute homeless</td>
<td>is the lack of permanent and affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) at risk homeless</td>
<td>other factors includes poverty, domestic violence, &amp; substance abuse, deinstitutionalization, unemployment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness(2)</td>
<td>structural deficiency</td>
<td>no roof over one's head and lack of permanent shelter e.g., emergency shelter is not permanent shelter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. absolute homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness(3)</td>
<td>by own choice</td>
<td>no roof over one's head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. absolute homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. General Concept</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Contributing Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness(4) (broader social issue e.g. social inequality)</td>
<td>multi causal factors but the main cause may be one or a combination of these factors.</td>
<td>poverty &amp; income problem, mental health, inadequate social assistance rates, deinstitutionalization, Unemployment, family breakdown, lack of adequate Community support facilities and services individual responsibility Support Services/Facilities Social Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
selection of research method and formulation of solutions in dealing with the problem. For example, if homelessness is viewed as a general social problem, then emphasis is on social inequality, i.e., equal weight of emphasis is given to each individual factor. If homelessness is perceived as a housing problem, then special attention is focused on the dynamics in housing market. If homelessness is studied as a problem unique to certain locations then analysis concentrates on geographic factors. However, the possibility of applying the concept of homelessness to the study of one unique aspect of this complex issue has seldom been clearly identified by most analysts and academics in the literature reviewed (with the exception of Fallick.) This in turn undermines the usefulness of the concept as a functional tool in guiding in-depth investigation of the various aspects of homelessness.

The second kind of conceptual confusion and ambiguity comes from the inadequate formulation of concepts and terminologies found in the homelessness literature (including Fallick's formulation.) It must be stressed that the only existing terminologies that are commonly used by housing analysts and academics to draw conceptual distinction between the comprehensiveness and exclusivity in the scoping of homelessness are the terms "broad" and "narrow." However, analysts do not always state clearly whether a "broad" or "narrow" view is used in their text (e.g., E. Bassuk's "The Homelessness Problem" (1983); N. Kaufman's "Homelessness: A Comprehensive Policy Approach" (1984) and T. Main's "The Homeless of New York (1983)," etc.) Many simply assume there is sufficient common understanding and agreement on the concept of homelessness, whereas, in reality, the lack of consensus on the definition of the concept is significant.
Moreover, even if the researchers do point out whether they are using a "broad" or "narrow" definition of homelessness, these two loosely defined distinctions are still very problematic. On the one hand, the broad definition of homelessness, i.e., homelessness(1) in Table 6, is inadequate because the term itself is actually not broad enough to include the category of at-risk homeowners and the housing difficulties that the at-risk homeowners encounter. On the other hand, the narrow definition of homelessness is not specific enough when it is being used in housing literature. Simply by looking at the term "narrow definition of homelessness" in housing literature, readers have no way of knowing exactly whether homelessness(2) (i.e., a somewhat narrow definition of homelessness) or whether homelessness(3) (i.e., the narrowest conceptualization of homelessness), or whether both homelessness(2) and (3) are being referred to by analysts in their text.

In addition, the similar kind of conceptual ambiguity is also found in the use of the terms "homeless" and "absolute homeless." As indicated in Table 6, there are at least three different meanings implied by the term "homeless" and "absolute homeless" depending on the specific context they are being used in housing literature. Without qualifications in the text (which is usually not the case), these terms are very confusing for readers.

6.2 Reconceptualization of Homelessness and Recategorization of the Homeless Population for Investigation of the Housing Dimension of Homelessness

In order to improve the utility of the concept of homelessness in the investigation of the housing dimension of homelessness, a recategorization of
the homeless population and a redefinition of the different concepts of "homelessness" would help resolve much of the unnecessary conceptual confusion.

6.2.1 Table 7 presents a recommendation for a comprehensive approach to conceptualizing the complex housing dimension of homelessness. This study proposes that five conceptualizations of homelessness can be adopted. The term "housing dimension of homelessness" is the main conceptual framework under which four other more problem specific concepts of homelessness are found: the at risk homelessness; shelter homelessness; street homelessness; and by-choice homelessness. As well, the people, causes, definitions, most effective potential usage, and policy implications of each different concept are provided in the Table 7.

For example, the concept of housing dimension of homelessness refers to the absence of continuing or permanent and affordable shelter (e.g., emergency shelters are not permanent shelters) of any kind that meet the basic health and safety standards (i.e., the minimum standards established by the community which essentially reflects the public's willingness to pay) to enable healthy community living. In the study of the housing dimension of homelessness, there are five categories of homeless people that analysts can examine closely. They include the by-choice homeless, street homeless, shelter homeless and at risk renters and at risk homeowners (i.e., at risk homeless). The causes for their housing difficulties are multi dimensional. Among other factors, lack of permanent and affordable housing, unemployment and poverty, deinstitutionalization, domestic violence and substance abuse are some of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Causes</th>
<th>Housing Conditions</th>
<th>Most Effective Potential Use</th>
<th>Policy Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Dimension</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>multi-causal factors</td>
<td>absence of continuing or permanent and affordable shelter (e.g., emergency shelters are not permanent) of any kind that meet the basic health and safety standards (i.e., the minimum standards established by community) to enable healthy community living.</td>
<td>improve the understanding of the complexity of the worst kind of manifestation of housing deprivation.</td>
<td>no specific policy and program response are needed to address this broadly defined aspects of homelessness because the concept is still too imprecise and too controversial for specific policy action though it highlights the urgent housing needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Homelessness</td>
<td>(1) by-choice</td>
<td>but the main cause is the lack of permanent and affordable housing.</td>
<td>(2) street homeless</td>
<td>(3) shelter homeless Other causes include poverty, deinstitutionalization, domestic violence, substance abuse &amp; unemployment etc.</td>
<td>(4) at risk homeless (a) at risk renters (b) at risk homeowners hidden housing situations in which renters and/or homeowners suffer substandard living or at the risk of losing their continuing or permanent and affordable shelters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>multi-causal factors</td>
<td>visible absence of affordable and permanent shelters e.g., people who have to resort to emergency shelter as the only shelter option or people who are forced to take temporary shelter in abandon buildings.</td>
<td>focus efforts and resources for policy and program solutions to alleviate homelessness in its visible form.</td>
<td>specific policy and programs responses with special emphasis to provide permanent housing at an affordable cost is a necessary priority. e.g., housing for the homeless persons or supportive housing etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Risk</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>multi-causal factors</td>
<td>the most visible absence of affordable and permanent shelters e.g., people who are forced to sleep on the streets when emergency shelters are full or when conditions in emergency shelters are too intimidating.</td>
<td>focus efforts and resources for policy and program solutions to alleviate homelessness in its visible form.</td>
<td>specific policy and programs responses with special emphasis to provide permanent housing at an affordable cost is a necessary priority. e.g., housing for the homeless persons or supportive housing etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>multi-causal factors</td>
<td>the most visible absence of a roof over one’s head e.g., people who chooses to sleep outside rather than in emergency centers or people who choose outdoor life as a preferred lifestyle.</td>
<td>improve understanding of the sub-groups of homelessness population.</td>
<td>no specific policy action and response is needed because it is inappropriate for society to interfere with individual freedom and choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Shelter Homeless</td>
<td>multi-causal factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in market failure and social inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>multi-causal factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in market failure and social inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-Choice</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>Own choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
major factors that contribute to the adverse housing situations experienced by these people.

The concept of housing dimension of homelessness can be used most effectively to yield an in-depth understanding of the complex nature of the systematic housing deprivation generated by the homeownership-dominant housing system in Canada. It should not, however, be used as the conceptual framework for policy response to homelessness because the concept is still too broad for specific action and program development. Among other reasons, the concept includes imprecise target populations (i.e., the at risk homeless and by-choice homeless) that create rather than minimize problems in legitimization as well as in enumeration of the homeless. Therefore, it is recommended that no specific policy response to homelessness should be developed based on the broad framework of "housing dimension of homelessness."

6.2.2 Conceptual Differences between the Broad Definition of Homelessness and the Housing Dimension of Homelessness

At this stage, it is important to point out the two significant conceptual differences between the formulation of the housing dimension of homelessness in this thesis and the broad definition of homelessness advocated by contemporary literature. First, most importantly, the concepts in the housing dimension of homelessness focuses on the absence of shelter for individuals while the broad definition of homelessness emphasizes the lack of homes. "Shelters" are physical structures which can be determined by objective standards set by public processes whereas "homes" are subjective value judgement which cannot be objectively measured. In order to frame the
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issue in a more operational manner, this chapter recommends the use of the term "shelter" rather than the term "home" as the objective criterion for housing provision.

Second, the definitions of the different concepts in the housing dimension of homelessness do not include the concepts of "privacy", "personal control" and "access to community support/services" that are endorsed by the broad definition of homelessness. However, this should not be taken to mean these factors are not important. The problem is that for practical policy decision making purposes, the incorporation of these subjective factors impedes rather than mobilizes collective action to address the problem. Consequently, the emphasis of housing dimension of homelessness is focused on the more objective aspects of housing such as health and safety standards. The term "shelter," therefore, avoids confusion with the general term "housing" and the subjective term "home."

6.2.3 The Housing Needs of At Risk Homeless and By Choice Homeless should be Addressed Differently from the Housing Needs of Street Homeless and Shelter Homeless

Although the concepts of at risk homelessness and by choice homelessness (as defined in Table 7) are relevant to the study of housing dimension of homelessness, this study finds that they are not appropriate concepts for devising specific housing policy and program responses for people who do not have permanent and affordable shelters of any kind.
The operational problems involved in the concept of at risk homelessness are similar to the five difficulties inherent in the broad definition of homelessness except that the formulation of the category of at risk homelessness is more complete by including homeowners. However, such inclusion expands the scope of the difficulty rather than placing tighter boundaries on the problem for solution identification purposes. Among other things, the difficulty in developing a socially and politically acceptable enumeration for both the at risk renters and at risk homeowners population is greater than counting the at risk renters population alone.

Therefore, for policy and program development purposes, it is more strategic to address the housing needs of the at risk homeless under other existing housing frameworks such as "affordable housing," "seniors housing," "housing for core needy," "housing for disabled persons," or "housing for single parent." In other words, the at risk homeless' housing needs would be better met if these needs are addressed under existing well defined categories such as "core needy," "seniors," "single-mothers," or "disabled persons" rather than under one general broad category of "homeless". In fact, the Canadian government and the third sector have been devoting much of their efforts in improving the housing conditions of the at risk category through the non-profit housing program even though the people being helped are not called at risk homeless and their housing needs are not met directly under the framework of homelessness.

For the by-choice homeless, we must recognize that in a democratic society such as Canada, it is not appropriate for society to interfere with individual freedom and choice no matter how small or how big this population
is. There is ultimately very little policy makers can do to change the by-choice homeless who are adamant about their lifestyle. As a result there is no need for specific policy actions and program response for the by-choice homeless.

6.2.4 Street Homelessness and Shelter Homelessness are the Targets for Policy Response under the Framework of the Housing Dimension of Homelessness

This study proposes that policy action to address the acute housing needs of people who do not have permanent and affordable shelter of any kind should be targeted at the "street homeless" and the "shelter homeless" population.

Street homelessness is visible absence of a roof over one's head and shelter homelessness is visible absence of continuing or permanent and affordable shelters. In other words, street homeless and shelter homeless are people who lack permanent and affordable shelter of any kind that meet basic health and safety standards (i.e., the minimum standards established by the community). In short, the street and shelter homeless are the neediest group requiring housing assistance in the Canadian housing system.

By focusing policy decision and program responses at the levels of street homelessness and shelter homelessness, there are definite advantages over the much advocated choice of responding to the needs of homeless within a broad definition of homelessness. First, street homeless and shelter homeless are more precise target populations and their number can be determined with minimum controversy about their enumeration. Second, the housing needs of
street homeless and shelter homeless are more serious (from a social welfare point of view) than the at risk renters and the at risk homeowners. This implies that priority for the allocation of public resources should be accorded to the street and shelter homeless. Third, by separating the by-choice homeless from the street and shelter homeless in policy formulation, program design and program implementation, it may reduce (but not eliminate) social and political resistance in taking actions to address the housing needs of the neediest in our community.

6.3 A Wholistic Approach is Necessary for Conceptualizing the Housing Dimension of Homelessness

This study also concludes that the investigation of the housing dimension of homelessness must not be conducted in isolation of the housing system as a whole if the goal is to obtain a thorough understanding of the deep rooted causes and effects of the various types of homelessness. A wholistic approach, a system view, must be adopted.

Figure 6 is a schematic conceptualization of the Canadian housing system with a focus on the housing dimension of homelessness. The housing condition above the red line in the diagram represents the ideal state of market equilibrium in which homeowners and renters can obtain secure and affordable housing in the market.

However, housing condition below the red line signifies housing system failure in which the housing needs of certain groups of people are not met. The at risk homeowners and at risk renters (i.e., at risk homelessness) are
Figure 6  A Schematic Conceptualization of the Canadian Housing with Emphasis on the Housing Dimension of Homelessness
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the earliest manifestation of housing system problem. At this stage, prevention of shelter and street homelessness is possible if appropriate remedial measures are taken for the at risk groups. On the other hand, if the at risk homeless population becomes greater, then shelter and street homelessness will likely increase. This study contends that when at risk renters and at risk homeowners are squeezed down to the bottom of the housing system, they will first seek refuge in temporary shelters (e.g., emergency shelters or transition houses). However, if temporary shelters have no room for them, people will be forced to sleep in the streets or public places thereby resulting in the worst manifestation of housing system failure — street homelessness.

From the research evidence in this case study, it is reasonable to postulate that if the number of at risk homeless in the City of Vancouver continues to grow then more people will be forced down and out of the housing system. Since almost all the temporary shelters surveyed in this study indicated very low vacancy rates, it is logical to predict that more and more at risk renters and homeowners may be forced onto the streets if the housing situations for the at risk homeless and shelter homeless continues to worsen.

6.4 There is More Hope for the "Homeless" in the Redefined Paradigm of Homelessness

Are the homeless hopeless? There is no easy answer to this immensely complicated issue. The first step is to put the question back into the original context in which it is being raised: whether this problem is best approached from a broad or narrow definition of homelessness as suggested by
the literature reviewed or whether it is best approached from the paradigm recommended by this study.

If the question is based on either a broad or narrow definition of homelessness as in the literature and the goal is to attain permanent and affordable homes for the at risk and the absolute homeless people, then the homeless are quite hopeless.

Due to conceptual deficiencies, i.e., the technical, economic, social, political and philosophical problems inherent in both the broad and narrow definitions of homelessness discussed earlier, the utility of the concept, particularly the one based on a broad view, in affecting policy action and program response in meeting the housing needs of the homeless (i.e., the at risk and the absolute homeless) is very low. In other words, the prospect of the homeless in obtaining secure and affordable homes is quite grim.

On the other hand, if the question is approached within the context of the reconceptualization of homelessness suggested in this study and the goal is to use the concept for advocating a policy response to provide permanent and affordable shelter for the street homeless and the shelter homeless, then the situation of all the five categories of the homeless (i.e., the at risk renters, at risk homowners, shelter homeless, street homeless and by-choice homeless) are becoming more hopeful.

The at risk homeowners are more hopeful because their housing difficulties are no longer being ignored; the at risk renters are more hopeful because their housing needs are being addressed via the other commonly
accepted housing frameworks; the shelter and the street homeless are more hopeful because their extreme housing needs are becoming less controversial and better defined; and the by-choice homeless are more hopeful because society would restrain from interfering with their choice and freedom. In this sense, the homeless (which refer to the five new subgroups) are not hopeless.

6.5 Excess Optimism should be avoided and Continual Advocacy is Necessary

However, this optimism must not be over estimated. Even though the proposed approach based on the housing dimension of homelessness is focused only on the neediest groups, it does not necessarily mean that society and politicians are willing and ready to tackle the issue as their first priority. Like all other social welfare issues, homelessness, particularly the housing dimension of homelessness, is a tough issue because of its enormous economic, social, political and philosophical implications. Therefore, social and political resistance is to be expected. As well, it must be recognized that no substantial effort is to be accorded until street homeless and shelter homeless have reached the critical mass.

Although reccceptualization of homelessness and recategorization of the homeless population improve the potential utility of the concept in inducing specific action response to aid those with least control and most to lose, it is only a necessary, but not sufficient, first step to bring about real social change particularly in terms of program delivery. Continual research, advocacy and solution strategy formulation are prudent to resolve the many
more problems that are still in the way of reaching the goal of eliminating the worst manifestation of housing deprivation in the Canadian society.

6.6 A Rational Challenge to Tackle the Housing Dimension of Homelessness

Empirical and research evidence reveals that the appeal for moral conscience often cannot gain much mileage toward the quest for action response in social welfare issues from the mainstream, even though we cannot totally discount the compassion in humanity. However, if social consciousness cannot convince most of us to dig deeper into our pockets, then may be we should try to use economic rationality to learn some lessons from other north American cities. According to Kaufman,

Homelessness is a costly social problem. It is not only costly, however, if we allow it to continue to expand and increase in scope... As reported in the New York Times (19/2/83), New York has gone from an annual budget for homeless programs of $18 million in 1978 to $135 million in 1983. What is sad to note is that the problem has not been solved even with that kind of money (emphasis added, Kaufman, 26:1984).

Two points deserve deeper considerations. First, the sevenfold increase in expenditure needed to contain the wider spread of homelessness in New York is not a scarce tactic. Rather this is the social and economic reality of what would happen in Canada's urban future if we do not take serious action on the problem of homelessness now.

Second, to gloss over the swelling number of homeless by merely adding more temporary facilities now does not mean that the problem will lessen or disappear in the years to come. Conversely, without getting to the roots of the problem by placing equal or greater emphasis on long term solutions, the
adverse negative effects of homelessness will likely cumulate in the future. As the scope of the problem expands, the high quality of livability that Canadians currently enjoying will very likely shrink. As well, the costs to remedy a bigger problem will logically escalate.

6.7 Sustainable Livability Tomorrow requires Responsible Action Today

The two valuable lessons that we have learned from the blueprint of sustainable development are that: 1) we should not leave less of what we have got now to our future generations; and 2) we should not mortgage our grandchildren's future to satisfy our present needs. Leaving the issue of homelessness unaddressed now is imposing a decrease in quality of life for our future generations; and leaving the fair share of costs unpaid now in alleviating street homelessness and shelter homelessness, is deferring, not eliminating, the expense of cleaning up the socially manufactured "human pollution" in our living environment for our children and grandchildren. The choice is clear.
HOMELESSNESS IN METROPOLITAN VANCOUVER:

A SURVEY OF SHELTER OPTIONS FOR THE HOMELESS 1990
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Mandate</th>
<th>Services Offered</th>
<th>Restrictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charity Men’s Hostel</td>
<td>emergency shelters for men and destitutes since Oct. 1958</td>
<td>accom., phone, linen, meal tickets ($7 at rest of own choice), stationary</td>
<td>18+, physically mobile, no drug or alcohol, non violent, no trouble makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Alexander Residence</td>
<td>low cost housing for people have no other options, evicted or have relocation prob. about 10 years ago</td>
<td>accom., referral to other support services for food or information, free coffee and snacks, maid service once weekly</td>
<td>singles male or female, 18+, residents in the community, physically able and mobile, no trouble makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City Mission</td>
<td>provide care for the needy in the East End &amp; facilities in the Community since 1907</td>
<td>intermediary care: accom., food, doctor care, alcohol &amp; drug treatment and counselling</td>
<td>must meet long term care requirements by provincial Govt. physically mobile no severe psy. prob. no emergency shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmuir House for Men (The Salvation Army)</td>
<td>affordable accom. for men with low-income since 1950</td>
<td>accom., food, counselling, maid services, networking to social services.</td>
<td>no sub. abusers, 11:00 lock up, male only 19+, no trouble makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Eastside Women’s Centre</td>
<td>Drop in center for women &amp; children offers resource and a safe place to reorganize life since 1978</td>
<td>a place to stay in day time, prog. activities, showers &amp; laundry, clothing, coffee, typewriter, photocopier, phone, emerg. bus fares, referrals for social &amp; legal services</td>
<td>women only, no alcohol or drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Mandate</td>
<td>Services Offered</td>
<td>Restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>temporary shelter for women &amp; men with children who are physically &amp; emotionally abused or threatened (tran. house since 1988)</td>
<td>accom., food, laundry info., counseling, advocacy for battered women</td>
<td>no severe psy. prob., no drug &amp; alcohol, women 19+, must be physically mobile, no limit on childrens' age or sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishtar</td>
<td>safe place for women &amp; children to stay and support while sorting out options since 1973</td>
<td>accom., food, counseling</td>
<td>no drug or alcohol, no boy over 14, no psy prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishtar Transition House Langley</td>
<td>housing &amp; emerg. shelter for men &amp; women with varied needs and have little or no options since 1972</td>
<td>accom., food, support service, relocation to permanent housing advocacy for clients' needs activity progs., friendship</td>
<td>no trouble makers (barred list), no severe psy. patients, no substance abusers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockout Emergency Aid Society</td>
<td>housing &amp; emerg. shelter for men &amp; women with varied needs and have little or no options since 1972</td>
<td>accom., food, support service, relocation to permanent housing advocacy for clients' needs activity progs., friendship</td>
<td>no trouble makers (barred list), no severe psy. patients, no substance abusers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookout Emergency Aid Society</td>
<td>housing &amp; emerg. shelter for men &amp; women with varied needs and have little or no options since 1972</td>
<td>accom., food, support service, relocation to permanent housing advocacy for clients' needs activity progs., friendship</td>
<td>no trouble makers (barred list), no severe psy. patients, no substance abusers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Place</td>
<td>sanctuary for women &amp; children in crisis &amp; in needs since 1977</td>
<td>accom., food, entertainment, life skills training networking to social service, follow up if required</td>
<td>women &amp; their children, no boys older than 15, no substance abusers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Place</td>
<td>sanctuary for women &amp; children in crisis &amp; in needs since 1977</td>
<td>accom., food, entertainment, life skills training networking to social service, follow up if required</td>
<td>women &amp; their children, no boys older than 15, no substance abusers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Place</td>
<td>sanctuary for women &amp; children in crisis &amp; in needs since 1977</td>
<td>accom., food, entertainment, life skills training networking to social service, follow up if required</td>
<td>women &amp; their children, no boys older than 15, no substance abusers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond House</td>
<td>emergency shelter for young men &amp; Residents in Richmond since 1987</td>
<td>temp. shelter, food, informal counseling, information on various services</td>
<td>no trouble makers, 15+, from 8:00am to 4:00pm have to be out, do not allow to have money, no single female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Mandate</td>
<td>Services Offered</td>
<td>Restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Maria House</td>
<td>long term shelter in family setting for women with sincerity to make a change over 20 years</td>
<td>private accom., food, typewriter, laundry, counselling, TV, reading room</td>
<td>18+ women only, no drug or alcohol, physically mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056 W 7th Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triage</td>
<td>provide shelter &amp; services to 'socially misfits' since 1982</td>
<td>accom., medication, food, life skills, training, limited employment placement</td>
<td>18+, must be socially misfit with no funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906 Main St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl House</td>
<td>emergency shelters for families, in crisis with no money since 1975</td>
<td>accom., food, referrals, laundry, no counselling, no baby sitting</td>
<td>no substance abusers, no psy. prob., physically mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906 W 15th. Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>mission is to provide low cost and emerg. service to needy &amp; women in crisis since 1905</td>
<td>long and short term low cost accom., weekly maid service, fitness, laundry, TV, kitchen facilities, food for refugee</td>
<td>no trouble makers, no substance abusers, no serious psy., no male guests are permitted above lobby without permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580 Burrard St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Maximum Stay</td>
<td>Average Stay</td>
<td>Hours of Operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charity Men’s Hostel 150 Robson St. Vancouver</td>
<td>no limit reassessment if up to 3 mons</td>
<td>a week</td>
<td>4:00 pm to 11:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central &amp; Alexander Res. 42 E.Cordova St. Vancouver</td>
<td>no limit unless incapable of taking care of themselves</td>
<td>couple of months</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City Mission 233 Abbott St. Vancouver</td>
<td>90 days for Drug &amp; Alcohol no limit for long term care hospitalisation for acute clients</td>
<td>61 days for Drug &amp; Alcohol treatment prog. 8 years for long term care</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmuir House for Men (Sal.Amy) 500 Dunsmuir St. Vancouver</td>
<td>no limit e.g.few weeks to 20 years</td>
<td>a week for emerg couple of months for residency</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Eastside Women’s Center 44E.Cordova St Vancouver</td>
<td>during operating hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>M,T,TH &amp; F: 11am-5pm 11am-5pm weekly holidays closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of Beds | 80 beds | 132 beds Alexander: 28 beds | 20 beds | 20 beds | 165 private rms. 30 beds in dormitory | max. no. of visit this yr is 150 per/day avg. 80 per/day
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Maximum Stay</th>
<th>Average Stay</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Cost to Client</th>
<th>No. of Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Surrey Emerg. Shelter &amp; Comm. Res. Center</td>
<td>30 days longer if necessary</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>no charge</td>
<td>10 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishtar Transition House Langley</td>
<td>30 days extension if necessary</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>24 hours as of Sept.17, 1990.</td>
<td>no charge</td>
<td>12 beds (4 rooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powel Place 329A Powell St Vancouver</td>
<td>a month + longer if necessary</td>
<td>one month or longer</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>no charge</td>
<td>40 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond House The Salvation Army 11820 Aztec Road Richmond</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>a week</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>no charge</td>
<td>8 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Maximum Stay</td>
<td>Average Stay</td>
<td>Hours of Operation</td>
<td>Cost to Client</td>
<td>No. of Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Maria House</td>
<td>no limit</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>$420.00 monthly</td>
<td>8 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056 W 7th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triage</td>
<td>no limit but once obtain funds must clear out</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>No MSSH pay $21.20</td>
<td>28 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906 Main St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl House</td>
<td>one month</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>pay by MSSH or $16.00 per day</td>
<td>12 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906 W 15th Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16.00 per day</td>
<td>$16.00 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>yes about 13 to 23 stay year round about 50 stay from Sept to May</td>
<td>one to nine months</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>$415 to $450 monthly for single rooms, $365 monthly for subsidized rooms (about 10% rooms)</td>
<td>272 beds: single &amp; twins 8 beds: women in crisis $15 per/bed, free if no money, 3 rms always held open for refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>% Repeater</td>
<td>Number turned Away</td>
<td>Client type</td>
<td>Client's source Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charity Men's Hostel</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>refugees, (Latin Americans &amp; Asian), unemployed destitutes</td>
<td>usually no money some on GAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Robson St., Vancouver</td>
<td>2900 bed/nights annually</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central &amp; Alexander Res.</td>
<td>Central: 98.86%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>welfare recipients, pensioners, small &amp; UIC recipients approx. 35%; age 45-59 5% female</td>
<td>GAIN 32%; OAP 39% HPIA 13%; UIC 6% D.VET 4%; Work 3% Work Pension 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 E. Cordova St., Vancouver</td>
<td>Alexander: 98.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City Mission</td>
<td>&gt; 85% for Drug &amp; Alcohol seasonal fluct.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>those don't feel mentally &amp; physically safe in comm.</td>
<td>95% GAIN Pension Vet. Pension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 Abbott, Vancouver</td>
<td>89% long term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmuir House for Men (Sal. Army)</td>
<td>95.8% could be 100% if housekeeping can keep up</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>retired men &amp; vet. welfare recipients students, working men parolees, refugees and out of town clients</td>
<td>GAIN CAP VET. PENSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Dunsmuir St., Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small % UIC Small% wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Eastside Women's Center</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65% regulars</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>sub. abusers, psy. patients following deinstitutionalization</td>
<td>GAIN HPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44E. Cordova St, Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>% Repeater</td>
<td>Number turned Away</td>
<td>Client type</td>
<td>Client's source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*550: 89-90</td>
<td>battered,</td>
<td>GAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter &amp; Comm. Res. Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*250: 87-88</td>
<td>emotionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>abused women &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey 13468 A 72th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>their children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Year runs from April 1 to March 31</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishtar</td>
<td>75%-100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>women in</td>
<td>GAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>abusive situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookout Emergency Aid Society</td>
<td>Emerg. prog.:</td>
<td>30% return</td>
<td>70 to 75 monthly</td>
<td>mental patients</td>
<td>GAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346 Alexander St.</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>within 3</td>
<td>represents only</td>
<td>substance abusers</td>
<td>HPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Tenancy prog.:</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1/3 actually</td>
<td>legal &amp; physical</td>
<td>OAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>months</td>
<td>recorded</td>
<td>ailments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Place</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Approx. 10</td>
<td>substance abusers,</td>
<td>GAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329A Powell St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in a month</td>
<td>new immigrants,</td>
<td>OAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>depending on</td>
<td>battered &amp; evicted</td>
<td>UIC &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>season</td>
<td>women, psy.patients</td>
<td>HPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>if have children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond House</td>
<td>75% average</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>do not turn away</td>
<td>young men 17-21,</td>
<td>GAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Salvation Army</td>
<td>summer low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prob. with family</td>
<td>UIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11820 Astec Road</td>
<td>winter 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or with the law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>runaway, sub. abuser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>% Repeater</td>
<td>Number turned Away</td>
<td>Client Type</td>
<td>Client's source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Maria House</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3-5 calls daily</td>
<td>sub. abusers, battered &amp; abused women, runaway, age 28-68</td>
<td>GAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056 W7th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triage</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>about 70 monthly</td>
<td>substance abusers, psy, handicaps unemployable</td>
<td>55% GAIN, HPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906 Main St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl House</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6-12 daily</td>
<td>50% Native, 75% single mothers, 1/3 from out of town, mostly from 20s-30s immigrants</td>
<td>GAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906 W 15th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>75% average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>women in transition battered women, working women, students refugees</td>
<td>GAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580 Burrard St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Reason for seeking Accommodation</td>
<td>Agencies Referred to</td>
<td>Agencies Referred from</td>
<td>Change in Demand in 1990</td>
<td>Source of Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charity Men's Hostel</td>
<td>no home and no money</td>
<td>The Dug Out</td>
<td>MSSH, police, immigration office</td>
<td>noticeable</td>
<td>MSSH Church &amp; Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Robson St. Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td>where one can sit through the night</td>
<td>concerned citizen, community group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central &amp; Alexander Res.</td>
<td>no place to go, eviction, unable to find affordable housing</td>
<td>'recommend' clients to GVRD's low cost housing near by (i.e. the Blood Alley)</td>
<td>MSSH, police, words of mouth, Vet. Affairs,</td>
<td>received more enquiries</td>
<td>CHHC 2% low financing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 E.Cordova St. Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase in psy. patients</td>
<td>Staffed by City of Vancouver, B.C. Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City Mission</td>
<td>unable to care for themselves required treatment or counselling</td>
<td>no referral</td>
<td>long term care unit of the Ministry of Health</td>
<td>more, particularly mental and psy. patients</td>
<td>60% Govt. 40% Clients &amp; Donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 Abbot St. Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Eastside Women's Centre</td>
<td>seeking housing/emerg shelter, legal infor. in psy.crisis, food, addiction problems, filling applications</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>self referrals, friends</td>
<td>marked increase following deinstitutionalization</td>
<td>1/3 City Mt.Pleasant Bingo Assoc., United Way, donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 E.Cordova St. Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmuir House for Men (Salvation Army)</td>
<td>seeking affordable housing, companionship</td>
<td>Dormitory if not full,rooming houses or near by hotels</td>
<td>MSSH self referrals, inter agency ref. town clients</td>
<td>marked incr. of refugees &amp; out of</td>
<td>Rents MSSH Church Donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Dunsmuir St. Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Reason for seeking Accommodation</td>
<td>Agencies Referred to</td>
<td>Agencies Referred from</td>
<td>Change in Demand in 1990</td>
<td>Source of Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>physically &amp; emotionally abused victims</td>
<td>transition houses or hotels</td>
<td>self referrals MSSH, transition house, police</td>
<td>more, 1 more bed is added this year</td>
<td>MSSH &amp; Donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Emerg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter &amp; Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13468 A 72th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishtar</td>
<td>living in abusive situation</td>
<td>other transition house or emerg. shelter in Lower Mainland</td>
<td>self referrals doctors, MSSH, comm. agencies</td>
<td>increased</td>
<td>MSSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookout Emerg.</td>
<td>no appro.shelter options, req.assistance in medication, hygiene, behavioral prob</td>
<td>other emerg. centers, MSSH</td>
<td>MSSH, self referral, district offices 101% in 1990</td>
<td>99% in 1989</td>
<td>60% Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346 Alexander St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Place</td>
<td>women in abusive situations, lack of affordable housing need a break to reorganize life</td>
<td>Owl house, Kate Booth, YWCA</td>
<td>walk in, MSSH &amp; other agencies</td>
<td>increased</td>
<td>MSSH operating funds, St. Social Services Society owns building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Soc. Ser.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329 A Powell St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond House</td>
<td>temp. shelter needed before long term accom. is available taking a ‘free ride’</td>
<td>other agencies MSSH mainly</td>
<td>Outside: Rich. Res. now 40%:50% before 50%:50% increased: teenagers</td>
<td>increased</td>
<td>contract with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Reason for seeking Accommodation</td>
<td>Agencies Referred to</td>
<td>Agencies Referred from</td>
<td>Change in Demand in 1990</td>
<td>Source of Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Maria House 2056 W 7th Ave, Vancouver</td>
<td>can't cope with temptations on the streets, no money for market housing</td>
<td>waiting list E.Fry, Homestead</td>
<td>self referral MSSH, jail, correction centers, police</td>
<td>overall 90% approx also out of town clients</td>
<td>MSSH, jail, correction centers, police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triage 906 Main St., Vancouver</td>
<td>multi probs, avoid isolation &amp; loneness wanting to quit addiction, need help</td>
<td>Lookout</td>
<td>MSSH, Jail, Hospital, anyone</td>
<td>more psy. patients 4 yrs ago 12-14 in Summer &amp; 20 maxi; Now 26 year round</td>
<td>$72 per day per person 2/3 from Min. Health &amp; $21.20 from MSSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl House 1906W15thAve, Vancouver</td>
<td>no place to stay evicted abusive situation</td>
<td>Lookout, Powell Place, NewDawn Recovery Home for Women, Homestead</td>
<td>MSSH, no self ref.</td>
<td>increased planning to open another house</td>
<td>MSSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA 580 Burrard St., Vancouver City</td>
<td>safe &amp; affordable accom., accessible women in abusive situations, close to work.</td>
<td>MSSH during day time, at off hours refer to emerg.shelters, if in crisis would let clients sleep on couches with blankets</td>
<td>MSSH self referral hospitals, other social service agencies, housing registries</td>
<td>marked increase in psy. patients less refugee a bit more of clients from back east &amp; out of town</td>
<td>Hotel Revenue United Way Grants from Province &amp; Fed. Government donations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B  
A List Of Names Of Organizations that are Actively Advocating or Providing Housing for Low Income and Special Needs Groups in Vancouver.

1. Affordable Housing Advisory Association
2. B.C. Housing Coalition
3. B.C. Women's Housing Coalition
4. Columbia Housing Advisory Association (Co-op Low Cost)
5. Downtown Eastside Residents Association (DERA)
6. End Legislated Poverty
7. Entre Nous Femmes Housing Society
8. Fraser Valley West Unn Housing Society (Native Indians)
9. Kerrisdale Concerned Citizen for Affordable Housing
10. Kits Housing Registry
11. Kitsalano Neighbourhood Planning Committee
12. Little Mountain Tenants Association
13. Lower Mainland Community Housing Registry
14. Lu'ma Native Housing Society
15. Mavis/McMullen Housing Society (Single Women/with Children)
16. Multi Service Network
17. New Westminster Tenants Association
18. Red Door Housing Society
19. Residential Tenancy Branch
20. Senior Housing Information
21. Single Mothers Housing Network
22. Tenants' Rights Coalition
23. UEL Tenants Society
24. Urban Core Workers' Association (Urban Core Shelterless Committee)
25. Vancouver's Housing Registry
26. Vancouver Housing Registry
27. Vancouver and District Public Housing Tenants Association
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A List of Shelters Visited and Practitioners Interviewed for the Survey of Shelter Options in Vancouver 1990

1. Anchorage Salvation Army Service
   248 East 11th Ave
   Vancouver
   (2775 Sophia St.)

   Captain Champ
   Ex-program coordinator

2. Central City Mission
   233 Abbott St.
   Vancouver

   Alex Reivin
   Director

3. Catholic Charities
   Men's Hostel
   150 Robson St.
   Vancouver V6B 2A7

   John M. Talbot
   Manager

4. Central Residence & Alexander Residence
   42E Cordova St.
   Vancouver V6A 1K2

   Frank Kan
   Residence Manager

4. Downtown Eastside Women's Centre
   44 E.Cordova Street
   Karen Tully
   Coordinator
5. Dunsmuir House  
500 Dunsmuir St.  
Vancouver V6B 1Y2

Gordon Taylor  
Counsellor

Mrs. Hewitt  
Administrator

6. Evergreen Surrey Emergency Shelter & Comm Shelter  
13468 A 72 Ave.  
Surrey

Robin Hamilton  
Supervisor

7. Lookout Emergency Aid Society  
346 Alexander St.  
Vancouver V6A 1C4

Karen O'Shannacery  
Executive Director

Glenn MacDonald  
Social Service Aid

8. Powell House  
St. James Social Services  
329 Powell St.  
Vancouver V6A 1G5

Yvonne Sutton  
Co-ordinator

9. Richmond House  
The Salvation Army  
11820 Aztec Road  
Richmond V6X 1H8

Gordon Taylor  
Co-ordinator
10. Sancta Maria House
2056 West 7th Ave.

Mary Soya
Manager

11. St. James Social Services
330 Powell St.
Vancouver

Mrs May Gutteridge
Founder and Board of Directors

Ms. Kathy Swain
Executive Secretary

12. Owl House Society
1906 West 15th Ave.
Vancouver V6J 2L3

Barbara Charlie
Coordinator

13. Triage
906 Main St.
Vancouver

Judy O'Brien
Coordinator

Ted Browcliff
Coordinator

Paul Upton
Resident

14. Triage Outreach Project
349 Powell St.
Vancouver
Berry McArthur  
Program Coordinator

15. Ishtar Transition House  
Langley

Peggy Brown  
Child Care Coordinator

15. YWCA  
580 Burrard St.  
Vancouver

Karen Gallagher  
Director
A List of Academics and Professionals Interviewed and Agencies contacted:

1. CMHC
   Vancouver Branch
   Lee Owen
   Information Officer
   Chris
   Social Housing Services Division

2. DERA
   9 East Hastings
   Vancouver
   Darryl Watt
   Researcher
   Deborah Weisbert
   Advocacy for Residential Tenancy Act

3. Dr. Fallick, Arthur L.

4. Murphy, Derek
   United Way
   1625 West 8th Ave.
   Vancouver

5. The Tenants Rights Coalition
   203-2250 Commercial Drive
   Brad Haughian

6. SPARC
   106-2182 West 12th Ave.