

Catalogue no. 75-001-XIE



PERSPECTIVES

ON LABOUR AND INCOME

JULY 2004

Vol. 5, No. 7

■ SAVING FOR
POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION

■ HOUSING COSTS OF
ELDERLY FAMILIES



Statistics
Canada

Statistique
Canada

Canada

At Your Service...

How to obtain more information

Specific inquiries about this product and related statistics or services should be directed to: *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 9 A-6 Jean Talon, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0T6 (telephone: (613) 951-4608; e-mail: perspectives@statcan.ca).

For information on the wide range of data available from Statistics Canada, you can contact us by calling one of our toll-free numbers. You can also contact us by e-mail or by visiting our Web site.

National inquiries line	1 800 263-1136
National telecommunications device for the hearing impaired	1 800 363-7629
Depository Services Program inquiries	1 800 700-1033
Fax line for Depository Services Program	1 800 889-9734
E-mail inquiries	infostats@statcan.ca
Web site	www.statcan.ca

Standards of service to the public

Statistics Canada is committed to serving its clients in a prompt, reliable and courteous manner and in the official language of their choice. To this end, the agency has developed standards of service which its employees observe in serving its clients. To obtain a copy of these service standards, please contact Statistics Canada toll free at 1 800 263-1136.

Perspectives on Labour and Income

(Catalogue no. 75-001-XIE; aussi disponible en français: *L'emploi et le revenu en perspective*, n° 75-001-XIF au catalogue) is published monthly by authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada. ©Minister of Industry 2004. ISSN: 1492-496X.

PRICE: CDN \$6.00 per issue, CDN \$52.00 for a one-year subscription, plus applicable taxes.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any other means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from Licence Services, Marketing Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0T6.

Symbols

The following standard symbols are used in Statistics Canada publications:

.	not available for any reference period
.	not available for a specific reference period
...	not applicable
p	preliminary
r	revised
x	confidential
E	use with caution
F	too unreliable to be published

Highlights

In this issue

■ Saving for postsecondary education

- In 2002, half of children under 19 had an average of \$8,600 put aside for them by their parents for postsecondary education.
- Higher-income families saved more than lower-income families, but half the difference was explained by factors other than income.
- Children in mortgage-free homes had greater savings than those from mortgaged or rented homes.
- Regardless of income level, children whose parents were aware of the Canada Education Savings Grant had significantly more savings than those whose parents were unaware of the program.
- Parents who expected their child to receive grants for postsecondary education based on financial need saved significantly less. Almost a third of all children under 19 had parents who expected them to receive such assistance, even though it is likely that many will not.

■ Housing costs of elderly families

- In 1999, homeowners whose major income recipient was 65 or over had lived in their home for an average of 25 years, and 90% had completely paid off their mortgage.
- Because of long tenure, appreciation accounted for 60% of the equity of senior homeowners compared with 46% for homeowners with a major income recipient between 45 and 64 and 29% for those under 45. As a result, the average senior homeowner was paying about \$1,000 per year in property taxes on appreciation alone.
- Senior homeowners had accumulated more than three times the wealth of senior renters (double if home equity is excluded). As well, senior homeowners had nearly twice the income of their renting counterparts (\$41,000 compared with \$23,000).
- Senior renters with low incomes paid 43% of their income to the landlord. Senior homeowners with low incomes who were mortgage-free paid an average of 12% of their income for property taxes; those who still carried a mortgage paid an average of 56% in mortgage payments and property taxes.

Perspectives

PERSPECTIVES

ON LABOUR AND INCOME

THE COMPREHENSIVE JOURNAL

on labour and income
from Statistics Canada

Yes, I want PERSPECTIVES ON LABOUR AND INCOME
(Catalogue no. 75-001-XPE).



Subscribe to *Perspectives on Labour and Income* today!

ORDER FORM	MAIL Statistics Canada Circulation Management 120 Parkdale Avenue Ottawa, Ontario Canada K1A 0T6	PHONE 1 800 267-6677 Quote PF024082	FAX 1 877 287-4369 (613) 951-0581	E-MAIL order@statcan.ca	METHOD OF PAYMENT (Check only one)			
	Charge to my: <input type="checkbox"/> MasterCard <input type="checkbox"/> VISA <input type="checkbox"/> American Express				Card Number _____ Expiry Date _____			
	Name _____				Authorized Signature _____			
	Company _____ Department _____				Cardholder (Please print) _____			
	Address _____ City _____ Province _____				<input type="checkbox"/> Payment Enclosed \$ _____			
	Postal Code _____ Phone _____ Fax _____				<input type="checkbox"/> Purchase Order Number _____			
	E-Mail address _____				Authorized Signature _____			
	Catalogue No. 75-001-XPE	Title Perspectives on Labour and Income			Subscription 1 year 2 years 3 years	Price (CDN \$) 63.00 100.80 132.30	Quantity	Total CDN \$
	No shipping charges for delivery in Canada. Outside Canada, please add shipping charges as indicated. Canadian clients add either 7% GST and applicable PST or HST (GST Registration No. R121491807). Clients outside Canada pay in Canadian dollars drawn on a Canadian bank or pay in equivalent US dollars, converted at the prevailing daily exchange rate, drawn on a US bank. Federal government departments must include with all orders their IS Organization Code _____ and IS Reference Code _____.				Subtotal _____			
	Your personal information is protected by the Privacy Act. Statistics Canada will use your information only to complete this sales transaction, deliver your product(s), announce product updates and administer your account. From time to time, we may also offer you other Statistics Canada products and services or ask you to participate in our market research.				Applicable GST (7%) _____			
If you do not wish to be contacted again for promotional purposes <input type="checkbox"/> and/or market research <input type="checkbox"/> , check as appropriate.				Applicable PST _____				
				Applicable HST (N.S., N.B., N.L.) _____				
				Shipping charges U.S. CDN \$24, other countries CDN \$40				
				Grand Total _____				

Saving for postsecondary education

Sophie Lefebvre

In today's labour market, two out of three jobs require more than a high school education. In general, postsecondary graduates have a higher employment rate, are less vulnerable in the face of economic downturns, and enjoy higher earnings. Canadian families seem to understand the benefits of a postsecondary education: One study showed that parents of 95% of children under 19 believed that education beyond high school is important (Shipley, Ouellette and Cartwright 2003).

At the same time that postsecondary education has become a determinant of labour market success, its cost has increased dramatically. Average annual undergraduate university tuition fees have almost doubled, from \$2,023 in 1993-94 to \$4,025 in 2003-04 (Statistics Canada 2003). The increase in tuition fees and other education costs may be partly responsible for the increase in student debt. The average amount owed to student loan programs by university graduates increased 76% between 1990 and 2000 (Allen and Vaillancourt 2004). The Postsecondary Participation Survey found that one-third of students who left before graduating in 2002 did so for financial reasons (Barr-Telford et al. 2003).

Parents and the federal government apparently believe that saving for children's education will help ensure wider educational opportunities, successful completion of postsecondary education, and a minimal debt burden after graduation. Indeed, parents of more than 9 in 10 children agreed it was important to start saving early. The Survey of Approaches to Educational Planning showed that more children had savings put aside for their postsecondary education in 2002 than in 1999 (50% compared with 41%) (Shipley, Ouellette and Cartwright 2003).

The federal government encourages greater savings for postsecondary education expenses through the Canada Education Savings Grant (CESG), introduced in 1998.

Sophie Lefebvre is with the Income Statistics Division. She can be reached at (613) 951-5870 or perspectives@statcan.ca.

This grant is paid to a child's plan when parents (or others) invest in a registered education savings plan (RESP) (see *RESPs and CESGs*). Since the inception of the CESG, the use of RESPs by families saving for postsecondary education has increased. In 2002, more than half of children with savings had RESPs compared with 40% in 1999 (Shipley, Ouellette and Cartwright 2003).

This study uses the 2002 Survey of Approaches to Educational Planning to describe factors linked to the decision of parents to save for the postsecondary education of their children under 19 in 2002; the amount saved is also linked to these factors. A model was used to estimate cumulative parental savings (non-conditional on the decision to save), taking into consideration characteristics of the family and the child, aspirations and involvement of parents, awareness of saving incentive programs, and grant expectations.

Family and child characteristics

Saving for postsecondary education is influenced by many factors, including the family's financial circumstances and the child's age and performance at school.

Over two-thirds of children from the highest income families had savings put aside for their postsecondary education compared with less than 30% of children from the lowest income group. Also, the amounts invested for children in the highest income families were twice those of the lowest income families (Table 1).

Savings are based on both present and past finances, so a family's wealth is an important factor. One indicator of wealth is homeownership.⁶ Children whose parents owned the family home outright were more likely to have had money put aside for their education than children living in rental housing. In addition, the average amount saved by mortgage-free parents was almost three times greater than the amount saved by parents living in rental housing.

RESPs and CESGs

Any child can be a beneficiary of a **registered education savings plan (RESP)**, which grows tax free until the child is ready for postsecondary education. Parents, grandparents, relatives or friends can all contribute to an RESP.¹ The maximum contribution is \$4,000 per year, with a lifetime limit of \$42,000. An RESP can be a family, non-family, or group plan.²

An RESP allows the subscriber to apply for the **Canada Education Savings Grant (CESG)** on the beneficiary's behalf. Introduced in 1998, the goal of this program is to encourage saving for postsecondary education through RESPs. The federal government contributes 20% up to a maximum annual grant per beneficiary of \$400, with a lifetime limit of \$7,200. Grant room can be carried forward to future years.

Income from an RESP can be paid out once the beneficiary is enrolled as a full-time student in a qualifying program. These educational assistance payments (EAP) consist of earnings on RESP contributions, earnings on the grant, and the grant itself,³ and are included in computing the student's taxable income. If the beneficiary does not go on to postsecondary education immediately after high school, the RESP can continue to earn tax-sheltered income up to a maximum of 26 years. Should the beneficiary decide not to pursue postsecondary education, the contributor can name another beneficiary,⁴ transfer RESP and grant earnings into a personal or

	RESPs in 2002		Contributions to RESPs in 2001			
	Incidence	Median value	Incidence	Median contributions	Median CESG	Received maximum CESG
	%	\$	%	\$	\$	%
Total	26.9	4,000	22.3	1,000	200	32.7
Age						
0 to 5	31.2	2,000	23.6	1,000	200	26.1
6 to 12	27.9	4,000	24.4	1,000	200	29.4
13 to 18	22.1	6,000	18.7	1,400	280	44.6
Adjusted household income						
Less than \$15,000	12.9	3,000	10.0	700	140	25.0 ^E
\$15,000 to \$25,999	21.7	3,000	18.3	900	190	21.8
\$26,000 to \$39,999	29.8	3,600	25.0	1,000	200	30.8
\$40,000 and more	41.6	5,000	34.5	1,200	240	41.1

Source: Survey of Approaches to Educational Planning, 2002

spousal registered retirement savings plan, or withdraw the RESP earnings in the form of accumulated income payments.⁵ For more information on CESGs and RESPs see www.hrsdc.gc.ca.

In 2002, 27% of all children under 19 had RESPs established by their parents, with a median value (including interest and CEGS) of \$4,000. Median amounts varied by age of the child, ranging from \$2,000 to \$6,000. Higher-income families were more likely not only to have RESPs but also to have greater RESP savings.

In 2001, 22% of children received approximately two billion dollars in RESP contributions from their parents. These contributions attracted an estimated 400 million dollars in CEGS. The median contribution was \$1,000 with a \$200 grant. Parents of children aged 13 to 18 were less likely to contribute to RESPs, but when they did, the investments were larger (\$1,400 compared with \$1,000 for younger children). Surprisingly, higher-income families did not invest enough to attract the maximum CEGS. Only 41% of higher-income families contributing to RESPs in 2001 invested \$2,000 or more. Nevertheless, 45% of older children received enough RESP contributions in 2001 to attract the \$400 CEGS (and up to \$800 if enough grant room was available).

The average saved increased with the age of the child, the amount for children 13 to 18 being almost three times higher than that for those under 6. Obviously, parents of older children would have had more time to start saving, so the incidence of saving and the amounts saved, conditional on saving, could be expected to increase with age. In fact, the age groups showed no significant differences in the likelihood of having saved.

As a child progresses through school, academic ability, measured by performance at school, may indicate to parents whether the child is a likely candi-

date for postsecondary education. Parents whose children perform well at school may be more inclined to save. Indeed, 55% of children with A averages had savings, compared with 42% of those with C averages, and only 28% of those with below C.

Another influencing factor is the saving for the child's education by others—grandparents, other relatives or friends. However, in reality few do so; in 2002, only 14% of children had saving plans established by persons other than parents. Those with such plans were also more likely to have savings from parents (59% versus 49%). Average amounts saved by parents did

Table 1: Savers and amounts saved by family characteristics

	Proportion of children†	Proportion of savers	Average amounts saved		Tobit model expected value of savings††
			Savers	Overall	
	'000	%	\$		\$
All children	7,172	50.2	8,600	4,300	
Adjusted household income		%			
Less than \$15,000	24.1	29.1	5,400	1,600	3,600*
\$15,000 to \$25,999	25.3	45.8	6,900	3,100	4,700*
\$26,000 to \$39,999	23.4	56.3	7,900	4,500	5,200*
\$40,000 or more	27.2	67.9	11,400	7,700	6,500
Ownership/mortgage					
Owner with mortgage	56.9	54.8	7,700	4,200	4,700
Owner without mortgage	14.7	67.5	14,000	9,400	8,100*
Renter	27.5	31.7	5,300	1,700	4,000*
Parents' highest education					
High school or less	28.7	36.6	7,300	2,700	4,400
Trade	12.5	43.1	8,500	3,700	4,900**
College	24.6	54.4	7,600	4,100	4,900**
Bachelor's	22.0	62.0	8,700	5,400	5,200*
Master's or above	9.6	65.3	13,300	8,700	6,500*
Siblings					
None	24.8	50.5	9,500	4,800	4,400*
One	46.3	53.9	8,300	4,500	5,100
Two	21.5	46.3	8,400	3,900	5,100
Three or more	7.4	38.0	7,900	3,000	5,400
Province					
Newfoundland and Labrador	1.6	52.9	8,200	4,300	3,100*
Prince Edward Island	0.5	45.2	7,100	3,200	900*
Nova Scotia	2.9	52.1	6,500	3,400	3,400*
New Brunswick	2.3	51.6	6,200	3,200	3,000*
Quebec	22.4	41.0	6,700	2,800	4,300*
Ontario	39.8	53.6	9,800	5,300	5,700
Manitoba	3.7	56.8	7,400	4,200	4,100*
Saskatchewan	3.4	58.1	10,900	6,300	4,900**
Alberta	10.8	52.5	7,400	3,900	4,900*
British Columbia	12.5	49.0	9,300	4,500	5,600
Family composition/ labour force status					
Two parents – two working	52.9	58.4	8,900	5,200	5,100
Two parents – one working	23.8	46.0	8,300	3,800	4,800
One parent – one working	12.5	40.8	8,900	3,600	5,200
Parent(s) – none working	9.1	28.6	6,400	1,800	4,400**
Other family types	1.7	40.1	8,500	3,400	4,600
Other savings besides parents					
No	86.0	48.9	8,500	4,200	4,800
Yes	14.0	58.6	9,000	5,300	6,100*

Source: Survey of Approaches to Educational Planning, 2002

* Statistically different from the reference group at the 1% level.

** Statistically different from the reference group at the 5% level.

† Totals may not add to 100% because of missing variables.

†† Savings are conditional on the average values of the explanatory variables.

not seem to be significantly affected by the presence of other savings plans.

Parental aspirations and involvement

Parental aspirations are known to be related to the likelihood of a child's participating in postsecondary education. In 2002, two-thirds of children were expected by their parents to get a university education (Shipley, Ouellette and Cartwright 2003). The saving behaviour of parents clearly demonstrates that they plan financially based on their aspirations (Table 2). In fact, the higher the postsecondary credential they hoped the child would obtain, the more likely they were to save, and the greater the amount saved.⁷

The hours parents spend with their child, and the frequency with which they talk about school or read aloud, can be indicators of involvement in their child's education. Saving for education can be considered another (Hossler and Vesper 1993). One might expect that parents who are more actively involved are more likely not only to save but to save more. The incidence of educational savings was higher for children whose parents spent more time with them and who interacted regularly about education (See *Data source and definitions*); however, the average savings amount did not differ significantly. Children who regularly participated in activities outside school were also more likely than those who did not to have savings (54% compared with 37%)—but again, the average amounts were similar.

Household savings—for example, RRSPs—are known to be sensitive to changes in tax laws and in the

Table 2: Savers and amounts saved by other characteristics

	Proportion of children†	Proportion of savers	Average amounts saved		Tobit model expected value of savings††
			Savers	Overall	
	'000	%	\$		\$
All children	7,172	50.2	8,600	4,300	
Child's characteristics		%			
Age					
0 to 5	27.7	52.6	4,700	2,500	4,400
6 to 12	39.0	50.4	8,000	4,000	4,900
13 to 18	33.3	48.1	12,900	6,200	5,500*
Academic performance					
A average	30.5	55.4	11,400	6,300	5,500
B average	23.6	47.4	9,400	4,500	4,600*
C average	9.2	41.8	9,500	4,000	4,400*
Below C average	2.6	27.7	11,100	3,100	3,500*
Not yet attending school	34.2	51.5	5,100	2,600	5,100
Sex					
Boys	51.3	49.4	8,700	4,300	5,100
Girls	48.7	51.0	8,500	4,300	4,800
Aspirations and involvement of parents					
Hope for postsecondary education					
None	9.4	33.5	5,700	1,900	3,700*
Trade	2.3	35.4	10,300	3,600	3,800*
College or CEGEP	15.2	39.7	7,200	2,800	4,300*
University	66.0	55.5	9,000	5,000	5,400
Other	7.2	50.7	8,800	4,400	
Interaction with child					
10 hours or less	24.2	45.5	9,000	4,100	4,800
11 to 20	21.7	51.0	9,700	4,900	4,900
More than 20	53.4	52.0	8,000	4,200	5,000
Interaction about education					
Less than 4 times per week	38.9	44.2	8,900	3,900	4,700**
4 or more times per week	60.4	54.4	8,500	4,600	5,100
Extra-curricular activities					
Regular	56.3	53.6	10,200	5,500	5,300
Irregular	18.4	36.9	9,500	3,500	4,400*
Not yet 5 years old	25.4	52.4	4,500	2,400	4,600
Aware of CESGs					
No	46.8	36.0	7,800	2,800	3,900
Yes	53.2	62.8	9,000	5,700	6,000*
Expect grant based on financial need					
Yes	31.9	41.2	6,900	2,900	4,300*
No	38.2	61.1	10,100	6,200	5,500
Maybe	25.5	47.0	7,900	3,700	5,000*

Source: Survey of Approaches to Educational Planning, 2002

* Statistically different from the reference group at the 1% level.

** Statistically different from the reference group at the 5% level.

† Totals may not add to 100% because of missing variables.

†† Savings are conditional on the average values of the explanatory variables.

labour market. It is therefore reasonable to assume that educational savings would be influenced by the introduction of savings incentive programs such as the CESG in 1998. Awareness of such a program could prompt parents to begin saving or add to existing savings (see *Program awareness*). Indeed, those who were aware of the CESG were more likely to save than those who were not (63% compared with 36%). The average amount saved was also greater.

Some parents anticipate that their child will receive financial help once enrolled in postsecondary education. About one-third of children had parents who expected them to receive grants based on financial need. Such expectations may lead parents to save less or not to save at all. Six in 10 children whose parents did not expect them to receive any grants had savings, compared with 4 in 10 children whose parents expected grants. Among children with savings, the average amount saved for them by parents not expecting grants was \$10,100—substantially more than the \$6,900 saved for children whose parents expected grants.

Factors that influence education saving

Parents set aside educational savings to insure that their children will have enough money to cover some or all of their postsecondary education costs. As shown, factors such as household income, home-ownership, and age and academic ability of the child seem to be related to the incidence of saving and the amount saved (conditional on saving). The aspirations of parents also seem to be related. However, the factors are closely interrelated. To understand the

Data source and definitions

The Survey of Approaches to Educational Planning was conducted in October 2002 by Statistics Canada in partnership with Human Resources Development Canada. The sample was representative of children 18 years or younger living in the 10 provinces. Approximately 10,800 households with children participated. Respondents were interviewed by telephone for one randomly selected child. The information was collected from the person most knowledgeable about the child—in most cases, a parent.

If savings had been set aside for the child's postsecondary education, questions were asked about the current value of the plan, including earnings and interest, also taking into account the Canada Education Savings Grant, if applicable. Any type of savings plan was considered: bank account, term deposit, saving bonds, RESP, or RRSP. The analysis considered only saving plans held by household members. Parents were asked to report the current value of savings specifically dedicated to the selected child.

Using cross-sectional data means that the characteristics of the child and the family were observed only for 2002, but the savings could have been accumulating for many years.

A small group of children were excluded from the original sample (1.6% of the weighted sample): those who were never expected to attend schooling (0.24%), those whose parents who did not state if they knew of the CESG program (1.34%), and a few whose cumulative savings were unreasonably high and distorted the results (0.03%).

Postsecondary education: any type of formal education after high school including college and university as well as apprenticeships, trade/vocational programs, general and vocational college, CEGEPs (in Quebec), and other programs.

Adjusted household income: total income from all sources during the last 12 months before taxes and deductions, adjusted by the square root of the household size.

Others saving besides parents: Parents were asked if anyone else was preparing or had a financial plan for the child's postsecondary education.

Child's academic performance: based on the respondent's knowledge of the child's school work and report cards; how well the child performed overall at school. A is 80% and up; B is 70%-79%; C is 60%-69%.

Hope for postsecondary education: Respondents were asked how far they hoped the child would go in school.

Interactions with child: Respondents were asked how much time they or their spouse usually spent interacting with the child.

Interactions about education: For children who had attended grade one, information was from the question on how many times the parent or spouse talked about school activities or things the child studied in class. For children who had not attended grade one, the information was derived from the question on how often the parent or other adult read aloud to the child.

Involved in activities: Respondents were asked about the child's participation in non-school organized activities, such as sports, social activities, or cultural activities. A child who participated at least once a week was classified as participating regularly.

Aware of CESG program: When the respondent was aware of the program that provides an additional 20% on RESP contributions, the child was classified as living in a household aware of the CESG.

Expect grant based on financial needs: Respondents were asked if they expected any part of the child's postsecondary education to be paid by grants or bursaries based on financial need.

relative contribution of a given factor in the amounts saved, a censored regression model was used (see *Tobit model*).

Financial means

Not surprisingly, a higher level of income meant more savings for a child's postsecondary education. Children from a family with an adjusted income of \$40,000 or more had, on average, about \$3,000 more in savings than children in a family with an adjusted income of less than \$15,000 (Table 1). Controlling for factors such as other family characteristics, child's characteristics, parental aspirations, and program awareness greatly reduced the difference between the savings of the lowest income group and the highest income group. Initially, the former had an average of \$1,600 in savings and the latter had \$7,700. Controls reduced this difference by half to \$2,900.

Children who lived in a mortgage-free home were most likely to have greater savings—\$8,100 on average. Even after controlling for income and other factors, they had significantly more savings than children living in a mortgaged home—a difference of \$3,400. On the other hand, the difference between the latter and those living in rental housing, while still significant, was relatively smaller, at \$700.⁹

Parental education

Children with at least one parent holding a university degree had significantly more savings accumulated than children with parents who had a high school diploma or less. Families in which at least one parent had a master's degree or above saved \$2,000 more, on average, than families in which parents had a high school diploma or less. Since household income and

Tobit model

A regression model is useful to understand the effect of one variable on an outcome when all other explanatory variables are held constant. But ordinary least square methods provide biased estimates when the dependent variable is truncated. In fact, the amount saved for postsecondary education is truncated since the value cannot be negative. If parents did not save, cumulative savings equal zero. Just under half of the children did not have savings and hence had a zero value for cumulative savings. In this case, a Tobit model can be used to estimate the relationship between the independent variables and the amounts saved for all children, including those with zero savings. The Tobit model takes into account that the dependent variable is truncated and constrained to be non-negative. The results in Tables 1 and 2 and the chart are the expected value of savings calculated from the estimated coefficients using a Tobit model and the mean values of the variables.

educational aspirations were controlled for in the model, part of the explanation for the larger savings may be that parents with a university degree are more aware of the different expenses faced during postsecondary studies.

Province

Saving rates also differed by province. Children in all provinces except British Columbia had significantly lower savings than Ontario children. This is consistent with Ontario's undergraduate university tuition fees being the second highest in the country (Statistics Canada 2003). Parents likely expect their child to study in their own province and plan their savings accordingly. Similarly, children living in Quebec, the Atlantic provinces, and Manitoba had the lowest amounts saved; Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador and Manitoba also had the lowest undergraduate tuition fees. In Quebec, fees were frozen in 2003-04 for the seventh straight year at \$1,900 (\$1,700 for residents), approximately a third of fees in Ontario (\$4,900).

Siblings and other relatives

Children with at least one sibling had almost \$1,000 more in accumulated savings than those without siblings. Since income was adjusted by household size, the presence of a sibling might reflect a higher propensity to invest since parents will have to assist more than one child.

Even after controlling for other factors, children with savings originating from someone outside their household had significantly more savings from their parents. These 'others' may be filling the gap between expected costs and parents' ability to save or finance their children's postsecondary education when the time comes.

School performance and expectations

Children who were A students had more accumulated savings than those who had lower marks (Table 2). Students with B or C grades had about \$1,000 less than A students on average, and those with below C had about \$2,000 less. Parents seem to save more as they realize their children are performing well in school and are likely to pursue higher education.

The saving behaviour of parents was also related to aspirations for their child. Children expected to get a university education had more savings than children expected to get a college or CEGEP diploma—\$5,400 compared with \$4,300. This may be partly because a college diploma is generally less expensive than a university degree.


Children living in households in which parents were interacting regularly with them about education had accumulated slightly more savings. School-aged children whose parents were more involved had \$400 more of accumulated savings than children with less involved parents, even after controlling for factors such as parents' education and child's academic performance. Another factor associated with parents' involvement is the child's regular participation in extra-curricular activities. Children regularly involved in activities outside school had more savings than those not regularly involved, a difference of \$900. However, the number of hours children spent with their parents did not seem to affect the amount saved.

CESG awareness

Children whose parents were aware of the CESG program had, on average, over \$2,000 more in savings than children whose parents were not aware—\$6,000 compared with \$3,900.¹⁰ Since the participation rate in the RESP program was significantly lower for the lowest income families—13% compared with 42% for the highest income families (see *RESPs and CESGs*)—it might be assumed that the program had different effects on accumulated savings for families of different income classes.

In fact, there was no difference by income class. For children in the lowest income families, awareness of the program amounted to \$2,100 more being saved, compared with \$2,300 in the highest income class (Chart).

Chart: Regardless of income, the expected value of savings was higher when families were aware of the CESG.



Source: Survey of Approaches to Educational Planning, 2002

Financial assistance

Parents who expected their child to receive grants for postsecondary education based on financial need saved significantly less (\$1,200 less) for their child's education when all other factors were held constant. This has important implications since parents do not seem to have an accurate perception about the probability of receiving financial help. Parents of 29% of 13 to 18 year-olds expected their child to receive such grants, but only 15% of 18 to 24 year-olds enrolled in postsecondary institutions in 2002 (or earlier) actually received funds from outside the family (Shipley, Ouellete and Cartwright 2003). It would seem that savings will fall short of actual needs for large numbers of students hoping to pursue higher education.

Summary

Characteristics such as financial capacity and education of parents are related to saving for postsecondary education. Characteristics other than income explained

about half of the difference in savings between the highest income group and the lowest income group. Homeownership was especially strongly linked. Carrying a mortgage can interfere with the capacity to save, even if the family income is relatively high. Parents who were aware of the Canada Education Savings Grant program saved significantly more, regardless of income. The expectation of grants based on financial need to help pay for postsecondary education was associated with lower accumulated savings.

Perspectives

Notes

- 1 Depending on the type of plan, spouses and common-law partners can be joint subscribers. The subscriber must be a person, not a corporation, trust or other organization.
- 2 Family plans can have more than one beneficiary. However, each beneficiary must be related by blood or adoption to the subscriber and be under 21 when named. Contributions can be made only until a beneficiary turns 21. A non-family plan can have only one beneficiary. The beneficiary does not have to be related to the subscriber, and can be over 21 when named. A group plan is operated on a pooling principle, and if the beneficiary fails to qualify for payment, the earnings are distributed to other beneficiaries who do qualify.
- 3 A portion of each EAP is considered to be attributable to CESG paid into the plan. This portion is based on the ratio of grant to total investment earnings in the plan, and reduces the remaining balance in the plan's CESG account.
- 4 However, in order to keep the CESG, the new beneficiary must be under 21 and either a brother or sister of the former beneficiary, or both the new and old beneficiaries must be under 21 and related to the subscriber.
- 5 Accumulated income payments are made to the subscriber out of an RESP's investment earnings (contributions are refunded as a lump sum). Payments can be made only if the plan has been in existence for 10 years, all beneficiaries past and present have reached age 21, no beneficiary is attending school, and the subscriber is a resident of Canada. Payments are taxable income for the subscriber and subject to an additional 20% tax (varies by province) unless transferred to an RRSP (contribution refunds are not taxable). The grant portion is returned to the Government of Canada.
- 6 In 1999, 75% of families with positive financial wealth owned their residence compared with only 44% of families with no financial wealth (Morissette 2002).
- 7 Except for trade, which represents a very small group of children.

Program awareness

Given that awareness of the CESG program was found to be associated with increased savings, it seems reasonable to conclude that making more parents aware of the program might increase savings. Parents aware of the CESG program in 2002 were from higher-income families, were more educated, lived in owned housing, and had high aspirations for their child's education. Parents of children (under 6) were also more likely to be aware of the incentive program.⁸ Parents who were saving and aware of the CESG also had higher income, were more educated, were more likely to own their residence, and had higher educational aspirations than parents who were saving but unaware of the CESG.

Parents who expected their child to receive grants based on financial need also had significantly less savings. Although families who were more likely to expect grants had lower income and lived in rental housing, a surprising 19% of children in the highest income families were expected to receive such grants. It seems improbable that all these children will receive financial help, so perhaps parents need to be better informed about the details of such programs.

	Aware of the CESG		Expected grants based on financial needs
	All	Savers only	
	%		
All children	53.2	66.5	31.9
Adjusted household income			
Less than \$15,000	35.3	48.0	41.4
\$15,000 to \$25,999	46.3	57.1	39.0
\$26,000 to \$39,999	60.2	70.7	28.9
\$40,000 and more	69.5	76.5	19.3
Parents' highest education			
High school or less	36.6	49.4	34.3
Trade	43.3	56.4	34.9
College	58.3	69.2	33.0
Bachelor	68.3	77.3	29.2
Master's or above	73.6	79.6	24.0
Family composition/labour force status			
Two parents – two working	60.0	70.4	28.0
Two parents – one working	53.1	65.6	34.1
One parent – one working	43.3	57.2	36.7
Parent(s) – none working	32.5	50.1	41.6
Other family types	29.2 ^E	37.5 ^E	33.0 ^E
Ownership/mortgage			
Owner with mortgage	58.7	69.0	29.5
Owner without mortgage	60.4	72.5	24.5
Renter	38.3	50.6	41.0
Hope for post-secondary education			
None	37.4	51.8	34.8
Trade	38.9	51.0 ^E	30.0
College or CEGEP	39.4	52.5	33.6
University	59.0	70.3	32.0
Other	54.8	67.9	24.0
Age			
0 to 5	62.1	73.5	33.1
6 to 12	52.0	65.6	35.9
13 to 18	47.2	61.3	26.2

Source: Survey of Approaches to Educational Planning, 2002

8 A logistic regression model was run, and for those variables, the coefficients of the categories were significantly different from the reference group.

9 It could be argued that paying off a mortgage and building home equity is another way to save for postsecondary education, but it is difficult to verify this hypothesis. If true, this could explain in part why households with a mortgage had lower savings.

10 An OLS regression model was estimated on savers only to determine if savers who knew about the CESG had more cumulative savings than savers who did not know about it. The coefficient of being aware of CESG was not significant, suggesting that being aware of this program increases the likelihood of taking the decision to save only and not the amounts saved.

References

Allen Mary and Chantal Vaillancourt. 2004. *Class of 2000: Profile of postsecondary graduates and student debt*. Education, Skills and Learning Research Paper Series no. 16. Catalogue no. 81-595-MIE2004016. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Barr-Telford, Lynn, Fernando Cartwright, Sandrine Prasil and Kristina Shimmons. 2003. *Access, persistence and financing: First results from the Postsecondary Participation Survey*. Education, Skills and Learning Research Paper Series no. 7. Catalogue no. 81-595-MIE2003007. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Hossler, Don and Nick Vesper. 1993. "An exploratory study of the factors associated with parental saving for postsecondary education." *Journal of Higher Education* 64, no. 2 (March-April): 140-165.

Morissette, René. 2002. "Families on the financial edge." *Perspectives on Labour and Income* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 75-001-XIE) 3, no. 7. July 2002 online edition.

Shipley, Lisa, Sylvie Ouellette and Fernando Cartwright. 2003. *Planning and preparation: First results from the Survey of Approaches to Educational Planning 2002*. Education, Skills and Learning Research Paper Series no. 10. Catalogue no. 81-595-MIE2003010. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Statistics Canada. 2003. "University tuition fees, 2003-04." *The Daily*, August 12, 2003.

Housing costs of elderly families

Raj K. Chawla and Ted Wannell

Residential property taxes are on the rise in many Canadian municipalities, although the reasons for the upward pressure may vary from region to region. While all homeowners feel the burden of rising property taxes, concerns are often raised for elderly homeowners since most of them live on fixed incomes. In fact, some municipalities offer tax rebates for senior homeowners. Other policies, such as tax credits in some provinces, aim to relieve the housing cost burden for all low-income individuals and families.

Taxes can be regressive or progressive. A tax is termed regressive if its rate decreases as income rises. And property taxes are demonstrably regressive with respect to family income (Boadway and Kitchen 1999; Chawla and Wannell 2003; Maslove 1973; OFTC 1993). The income tax system is progressive since to some extent it is based on ability to pay.¹

Property tax, on the other hand, does not take this notion of ability to pay into account, and is instead levied on the assessed (market) value of property owned. Indeed, elderly low-income homeowners pay a greater proportion of their income on property taxes than their non low-income counterparts: 11.7% compared with 4.2% (Chawla and Wannell 2003). On the other hand, non low-income families have their income taxed at a rate more than five times that of their low-income counterparts (17.8% compared with 3.4%). Rising property taxes may create economic hardship for elderly homeowners with low incomes.

Concerns about the property tax burden for seniors are often related to the long period that many have lived in their homes, resulting in a discrepancy between the assessment base (the current market value of the home) and their ability to pay. The recent surge in resi-

dential housing prices has often been greatest in mature neighbourhoods with concentrations of older homeowners. Thus a general rise in mill rates (tax paid per dollar of assessment) and a relatively high increase in assessed value can create a problem for many elderly homeowners in these neighbourhoods.

Furthermore, senior families generally live on fixed incomes with little prospect of their income rising to meet expense increases that exceed cost-of-living adjustments to their public pensions. In contrast, young low-income families are at the start of their careers, and most can expect their earnings to increase with labour market experience.

But taxes are just part of the financial picture of families. While rising house prices may stimulate higher property taxes, they also represent a source of untaxed capital gains. Furthermore, the vast majority of elderly homeowners no longer carry a mortgage, which constitutes the largest component of shelter costs for the majority of younger homeowners. This article examines housing costs within the context of income and assets. The primary focus is on elderly homeowners, but younger families and renters are included for comparison. Since low-income families are also of interest to policymakers, this dimension is explored as well (see *Data source and definitions*).

Most senior families own their home mortgage-free

Although one can imagine scenarios where couples downsize their housing once children leave, or move into rental accommodation in their senior years, most elderly families own their home and have been there for some time (Table 1). In 1999, two-thirds of families with a major income recipient 65 or over owned their home. Furthermore, with an average of 25 years in the same home, 9 in 10 of these families had completely paid off their mortgages. Overall, 60% of senior families lived in their own home mortgage-free.

Raj Chawla and Ted Wannell are with the Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division. Raj Chawla can be reached at (613) 951-6901, Ted Wannell at (613) 951-3546 or both at perspectives@statcan.ca.

Table 1: Homeownership by age of major income recipient

	Total	Renters	Owners	
			No mortgage	With mortgage
65 and over				
All families	2,231,800	732,100	1,353,000	146,700
%	100.0	32.8	60.6	6.6
Low-income families	253,100	173,400	70,500	9,200
%	100.0	68.5	27.8	3.6
Under 65				
All families	9,959,300	4,097,100	2,021,500	3,840,600
%	100.0	41.1	20.3	38.6
Low-income families	1,870,400	1,508,000	153,900	208,500
%	100.0	80.6	8.2	11.1

Source: Survey of Financial Security, 1999

Among families with a major income recipient under 65, the rate of homeownership was somewhat lower—just under 6 in 10. However, given their lower average tenure, nearly two-thirds were still carrying a mortgage. Overall, just 1 in 5 non-senior families owned their accommodation mortgage-free.

Looking more specifically at low-income households, the rate of homeownership is again higher

among elderly families (31%) than among younger families (19%). While the vast majority of low-income senior homeowners did not carry a mortgage (88%), well over half of their younger counterparts (58%) did. Overall, more than 1 in 4 low-income senior families (28%) owned their accommodation free and clear compared with just 8% of other low-income families.

Elderly families' homes have appreciated through long tenure

As mentioned, many seniors have achieved their mortgage-free status by virtue of staying put and steadily chipping away at their mortgage principal. In addition to their debt shrinking, something else was happening—the value of their home was rising. In 1999, the average estimated home equity of home-owning senior families was \$138,000, of which \$83,000 (or 60%) was appreciation from the original purchase price (Table 2).

Younger homeowners generally had less equity and had not owned their home long enough to experience the same kind of appreciation as senior families. Families in which the major income recipient was between 45 and 64 had nearly as much equity in their homes as senior families (\$131,000), but significantly less appreciation in value (\$61,000 or 46% of the equity). Families with a major income recipient under 45 had far less home equity (\$76,000 on average) and appreciation (\$22,000) than older families.

Table 2: Home equity, appreciation and wealth by age of major income recipient

	Home equity (E)	Appreciation (A)	Wealth (W)	E/W	A/W	A/E	Average tenure
		\$			%		years
All ages	109,200	48,900	386,000	28.3	12.7	44.8	13.4
Under 45	75,600	22,000	236,500	32.0	9.3	29.1	7.1
45 to 64	131,000	60,600	505,500	25.9	12.0	46.3	14.2
65 and over	137,700	83,300	468,500	29.4	17.8	60.5	25.2

Source: Survey of Financial Security, 1999

Data source and definitions

The **Survey of Financial Security (SFS)** was conducted between May and July 1999. The sample contained 23,000 dwellings from the 10 provinces. Excluded were persons living on Indian reserves, members of the armed forces, and those living in institutions such as prisons, hospitals, or homes for seniors. The SFS interview questionnaire is available free through the 'Definitions, data sources, and methods' module on the Statistics Canada Web site (www.statcan.ca). For more details about the sample, response rates, handling of missing data, weighting, and so forth, see *The assets and debts of Canadians: An overview of the results of the Survey of Financial Security* (Catalogue no. 13-595-XIE).

The survey collected socio-demographic and labour force characteristics of persons aged 15 and over, and assets and debts of their families. Income for 1998 was compiled from authorized linkage to tax records or collected in person, although respondents could also complete the questionnaire themselves. Financial information was sought from the family member most knowledgeable about the family's finances. Proxy response was accepted.

The survey asked about major ongoing expenses associated with the principal residence: mortgage payments, property taxes (including school taxes, if paid separately), rent, electricity, water, and other services. Rent was not apportioned to property tax, utility charges, or landlord's share. Although expenses could be reported monthly or quarterly, they were processed and compiled on an annual basis.

Missing property tax data were not imputed, so homeownership families who did not report property taxes paid in 1998 were excluded from the sample. Thus Tables 1, 3 and 4 are based on a sample of 15,886 or an estimated 12,187,000 families. On the other hand, Table 2 uses a sample of 8,835 or 6,323,000 homeownership families who, in addition to property taxes, reported year and purchase price of property. Families who had inherited or been gifted all or part of the property were not to report such information.

Quality of survey data on property taxes

The SFS estimate of property taxes paid in 1998 was \$12.6 billion, compared with \$18.3 billion published by the Public Institutions Division (PID) of Statistics Canada (Statistics Canada 2003). The PID data for 1998 are based on a census of municipalities obtained from provincial departments of municipal affairs. One would expect a higher estimate from the administrative data simply because of differences in coverage. While the SFS covers only owner-occupied dwellings, the administrative data also include rented and vacant dwellings as well as non-residential (commercial and industrial) properties. Overall, the SFS/PID ratio of property taxes was 69.2%.

Property: Refers to an owner-occupied home or farm. Property owned but used for rental or business purposes is excluded.

Family: Refers to economic families and unattached individuals. An economic family is a group of persons sharing a common dwelling and related by blood, marriage (including common law) or adoption. An unattached individual is a person living alone or with unrelated persons.

Elderly family: One with a major income recipient aged 65 or over.

Major income recipient: The person in the family with the highest income before tax. If two persons had exactly the same income, the older person was treated as the major income recipient.

Pre-tax family income: Sum of incomes received by the six oldest family members aged 15 and over during the calendar year 1998 from all sources: wages and salaries, net income from farm and non-farm self employment, investment income (interest earned, dividends, net rental income, etc.), government transfers (Employment Insurance benefits, Old Age Security, child benefits, Canada or Quebec Pension Plan benefits, social assistance, etc.), retirement pension income, alimony and scholarships. Excluded are income in kind, tax refunds, gambling gains, and inheritances.

Low-income family: Families are classified using the after-tax, low-income cut-offs for 1998 (Statistics Canada 1998).

Income tax paid: Federal and provincial income tax paid during the calendar year 1998 by all family members.

Market value of owner-occupied home: As reported at the time of the survey by the family member most knowledgeable about the family finances. It is not an assessed value, which is usually less than the market value.

Purchase price of home: Price initially paid (down payment plus any mortgage) for the home occupied at the time of the survey.

Appreciation in home value: Market value less purchase price.

Home equity: Market value of owner-occupied home less outstanding mortgage.

Years of residence: 1999 less the year the current home purchased. It is not necessarily the first home ever owned.

Shelter cost is a standard concept that includes mortgage payments and property taxes for owner-occupied residences, rent payments for renters, and utility payments and insurance for both groups. **Housing cost** in this article refers to shelter cost net of utility payments and insurance.

Effective property tax rate: Property tax paid as a percentage of market value.

Gini coefficient: A measure of inequality in the distribution of income, it lies between 0 (no inequality) and 1.0 (total inequality—that is, one family has all the income).

These differences in equity and appreciation are directly related to the housing tenure of younger and older families. Families with a major income recipient under 45 had lived in their homes just over seven years. That doubled to 14 years among families with a major income recipient between 45 and 64, then shot up to 25 years among senior families.

The long tenure of senior families and the resulting appreciation of their homes can result in property tax rises. Taking the country-wide average property tax rate of 1.22% (Chawla and Wannell 2003) as a rough guideline, senior homeowners paid about \$1,000 of property taxes in 1999 on appreciation. This may present a problem for some seniors on fixed incomes. On the other side of the ledger, capital gains on the principal residence are not subject to income tax, so appreciation can be a direct contributor to family wealth. Moreover, 9 in 10 senior homeowners no longer face monthly mortgage payments, which, on average, greatly exceed property tax payments. For example, among all homeowners with mortgages, annual mortgage payments (\$9,500) averaged more than five times the annual tax bill (\$1,700).

Senior homeowners have greater income and wealth than renters

In any discussion of tax reform, the broader financial situation of different groups must also be considered. With reference to property taxes, the comparison group for homeowners would be those living in rental accommodation, since different mechanisms would be necessary to provide equivalent benefits.

Inequality increases with housing tenure

The pre-tax income distribution of homeownership families becomes more unequal as time in the home increases. The Gini coefficient—an indicator that rises as inequality rises—was 0.320 for families with less than 5 years of residence compared with 0.409 for those with 30 or more years. Years of residence also reflects the aging of the family's major income recipient—hence, the distribution of income among families becomes more unequal as the major income recipient ages. This means that pre-tax income inequality among the elderly would be higher than among the non-elderly—confirmed by their respective Gini coefficients of 0.377 and 0.332.

Regardless of the income concept used, family income inequality grew as tenure increased. The relationship was relatively less pronounced for elderly families than for non-elderly. The after-tax family income Gini coefficient was 9% higher for the long-tenured elderly than for those with less than 5 years in the same residence. The comparable difference among the non-elderly was 30%.

Income taxes reduce family income inequality—the Gini coefficient always drops from pre-tax income when income tax is netted out. On the other hand, property taxes raise inequality—the post-property tax Gini is always higher.

Gini coefficients for income under different concepts by tenure

Tenure	Total pre-tax	Less property tax	Less income tax	Less property and income tax
All families	0.356	0.363	0.316	0.324
Under 5 years	0.320	0.326	0.288	0.295
5-14 years	0.342	0.349	0.305	0.312
14-29 years	0.370	0.378	0.325	0.333
30 years and over	0.409	0.420	0.353	0.364
Major income recipient 65+	0.377	0.387	0.314	0.323
Under 5 years	0.342	0.352	0.295	0.305
5-14 years	0.350	0.360	0.303	0.313
14-29 years	0.377	0.387	0.313	0.322
30 years and over	0.395	0.406	0.322	0.331
Major income recipient under 65	0.332	0.338	0.298	0.304
Under 5 years	0.312	0.318	0.281	0.288
5-14 years	0.327	0.332	0.292	0.298
14-29 years	0.347	0.353	0.307	0.314
30 years and over	0.390	0.399	0.365	0.376

Source: Survey of Financial Security, 1999

Senior homeowners had substantially higher incomes (\$41,000) than senior renters (\$23,000). Furthermore, senior homeowners had accumulated more than three times the wealth (Table 3). Even if one subtracts home equity, which accounts for 30% of the wealth of senior homeowners, their holdings of other assets were more than double those of renters.

Some of the difference in the wealth of senior homeowners vis-à-vis renters can be accounted for by demographic factors. The average renter was about two years older than the average homeowner and thus may have exhausted more savings.² Moreover, senior families in rental

Table 3: Mean family income and wealth by homeownership and age of major income recipient

	Renters	Owners		
		Total	No mortgage	With mortgage
65 and over				
Families	732,100	1,499,600	1,353,000	146,700
Income (\$)	23,000	40,900	40,400	44,900
Wealth (\$)	116,200	438,200	446,200	364,200
Under 65				
Families	4,097,100	5,862,100	2,021,500	3,840,600
Income (\$)	30,800	68,900	71,800	67,300
Wealth (\$)	47,100	357,500	572,700	244,200

Source: Survey of Financial Security, 1999

accommodation were smaller (1.3 people on average) than homeowning families (1.8 people). However, using either a per-person measure or an equivalency measure would still leave a sizeable gap in both income and wealth between renters and owners.³

Low-income renters and owners

Among senior families falling below the low-income cutoff, the incomes of renters and owners are very similar: \$12,000 and \$14,000 respectively. Since renter families were slightly smaller—1.1 compared with 1.4—they actually had higher incomes on a per-person basis. On the other hand, the low-income owners held nearly 10 times the wealth of renters. Even if home equity is taken out of the equation, low-income homeowners held almost five times as much in other assets as low-income renters. Moreover, among low-income senior families, the age factor is reversed: Owners were about 1.5 years older, on average, than renters.

Low-income families with a major income recipient under 65 often receive transfer payments and tax rebates. In 1999, their incomes were similar to senior low-income families—a little higher for owners, a little lower for renters. However, their families were larger, so income per person or equivalency-adjusted income would be substantially lower than for senior families. Although the wealth of younger low-income homeowners was three-quarters that of their senior counterparts, younger renters held less than half the wealth of senior renters. However, the age gap between renters and owners was much larger (9.8 years) among non-senior, low-income families, so the relative youth of renters was a major contributing factor to their lack of wealth.

Rent, mortgage payments and property taxes for low-income families

Among low-income families, renters paid close to half of their income to a landlord: 43% for senior families, 49% for families with a major income recipient under 65 (Table 4). The relative cost burden for homeowning low-income families depends critically on whether they still carry a mortgage. Those with no mortgage spent 12 to 13% of their income on property taxes. Those who carried a mortgage typically spend more than half of their income on the combination of mortgage and tax payments: 56% for senior families and 65% for families with a major income recipient under 65.

In fact, the relative burden faced by mortgage-paying, low-income families is even greater than this comparison suggests. For example, homeowners pay their utilities separately while most renters have theirs included in the rent. Similarly, homeowners pay higher insurance premiums than renters since they must cover the cost of the structure as well as the contents. Rough calculations indicate that these two expenditures would consume about 15 to 20% of a low-income homeowner's income, compared with less than 6% for renters.⁴

Overall then, low-income homeowners without mortgages spent about a third of their income on shelter costs compared with about half for low-income renters. Data suggest that low-income mortgagees could be spending upwards of three-quarters of their income on shelter costs, indicating that many are probably running down their savings to stay in their homes.

Table 4: Mortgages, property taxes and rent as a percentage of income by age of major income recipient*

	Renters	Owners	
		No mortgage	With mortgage
65 and over	732,100	1,350,700	144,400
Mortgage	14.3
Property taxes	...	4.3	3.7
Rent	29.2
Non low-income	558,700	1,282,500	137,500
Mortgage	14.0
Property taxes	...	4.2	3.6
Rent	27.0
Low-income	173,400	68,200	6,900
Mortgage	43.1
Property taxes	...	11.7	12.4
Rent	43.5
Under 65	4,097,100	2,021,500	3,840,600
Mortgage	14.3
Property taxes	...	2.8	2.6
Rent	20.2
Non low-income	2,589,200	1,867,600	3,632,100
Mortgage	13.7
Property taxes	...	2.7	2.5
Rent	16.1
Low-income	1,508,000	153,900	208,500
Mortgage	54.8
Property taxes	...	13.2	9.5
Rent	48.7

Source: Survey of Financial Security, 1999

* Excludes homeownership families that did not report property tax.

Conclusion

In 1999, about 9 in 10 senior homeowners had completely paid off their mortgage. Their mortgage-free status and home equity resulted in relatively low housing costs (including property taxes) and greater wealth than enjoyed by senior renters or younger homeowners.

Among low-income families, mortgage-free homeowners were also relatively advantaged compared with renters, and particularly so compared with homeowners still carrying mortgages. However, less than 10,000 senior low-income families carried mortgages, com-

pared with more than 200,000 low-income families with a major income recipient under 65. These numbers, in turn, pale in comparison with the throng of low-income renters—more than 1.5 million families. These families—senior or younger—spend about half of their income on shelter costs.

What these data do not reflect is the surge in housing prices since 1999. Between the first quarters of 1999 and 2004, new house prices increased by over 18%, and resale prices by one-third.⁵ Since property taxes are calculated as a percentage of the value of the house, property taxes probably rose by a similar amount, assuming a constant tax rate. In contrast, the consumer price index was up by less than 13% in the same period. So property taxes have probably become somewhat more burdensome for those on fixed incomes.

On the other hand, with an average property tax rate of 1.22%, homeowner equity has gone up by \$1,000 for every \$12 increase in the tax bill. This increased wealth presents some options to the homeowner—for example, selling and moving to a less expensive house or condominium or into rental accommodation. Reverse mortgages and equity-secured lines of credit are also available to provide income for those wishing to remain in their home.

A number of proposals regarding municipal financing are currently under consideration in different jurisdictions, but unless they result in wholesale changes to the property tax structure, the distribution of the shelter cost burden is unlikely to change significantly.

Perspectives

Notes

- 1 Ability to pay implies that those who pay more income tax have higher incomes. Families with very low incomes are exempted from paying any at all. Other concepts underlying income tax include equity, allocation, efficiency, and redistribution (Boadway and Kitchen 1999).
- 2 However, Williams (2003) has demonstrated that most seniors continue to save well past age 65.
- 3 Equivalency scales recognize economies of scale relating to shared household expenses. The scales vary and their application to wealth is not well-developed, so their application was judged to be beyond the scope of this article.

4 The Survey of Financial Security collected information on utilities and insurance payments, but non-response was relatively high, making detailed estimates unreliable.

5 Resale price increases are based on Bank of Canada published figures using the Royal LePage resale price index.

■ References

Boadway, Robin W. and Harry M. Kitchen. 1999. *Canadian Tax Policy*. 3rd edition. Canadian Tax Paper no. 103. Toronto: Canadian Tax Foundation.

Chawla, Raj K. and Ted Wannell. 2003. "Property taxes." *Perspectives on Labour and Income* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 75-001-XIE). July 2003 online edition.

Maslove, Allan M. 1973. *The pattern of taxation in Canada*. Ottawa: Economic Council of Canada.

Ontario Fair Tax Commission (OFTC). 1993. *Fair taxation in a changing world*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Statistics Canada, 2003. *Public Sector Statistics, 2001-2002*. Catalogue no. 68-213-XIE. Ottawa.

---. 1998. *Income in Canada*. Catalogue no. 75-202-XPE. Ottawa.

Williams, Cara. 2003. "Finances in the golden years." *Perspectives on Labour and Income* (Statistics Catalogue no. 75-001-XIE). November 2003 online edition.