

fact, from hand to mouth, and I think one can be sure that very little goes into the mouth. They must consider each small expenditure they make for bus tickets and postage stamps and so on very, very carefully.

We feel very strongly that accommodation for elderly people must be provided at rents lower than those presently charged in limited dividend projects. It is our feeling that this can probably be best achieved by greater use of the public housing section of the National Housing Act—section 35, which until recent amendments was section 36.

Other parts of our brief, as you will have read, deal with greater assistance to limited dividend projects, and this also, we hope, would bring the rents down. But, I think that greater use of the public housing section of the act would be an immediate answer to the provision of housing for those people whose income is extremely limited and who are just not able to live in limited dividend projects.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Palef?

Mr. HART: Mr. Palef will not speak now, but will join in the question period.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Palef is being given the task of answering the difficult questions.

Mr. Gitterman, with respect to the suggestion that there be established a department of housing, I would point out that the Government now has that under consideration. While what you have said about the department being bounced around from year to year is very true, I do point out that it is a matter of serious concern for the Government, particularly in the light of the present amendments which are quite far reaching. That matter is under serious and active consideration.

Senator Grosart, would you like to start off the questioning?

Senator GROSART: I did a great deal of talking the last time the committee met. I suggest you start with some other honourable senator.

The CHAIRMAN: May I say one thing more? You spoke of shared accommodation, Mr. Gitterman. Under the new amendments that is not prohibited, or denied. As I understand them, they deal with shared accommodation.

Mr. GITTERMAN: Originally the people at C.M.H.C. appreciated this problem and would like to have seen provision for shared accommodation, but the regulations did not permit it at that time; and therefore provision was made in the amendments for this to be changed.

The CHAIRMAN: In discussing the bill in the house that was one of the matters discussed and I think it was made quite clear that the regulations would be changed under the new act.

Mr. DAVIS: I am not clear what you mean by "shared accommodation". Obviously there is shared accommodation now. Has it not been that they have a living room and a double bedroom? You want to abolish the living room and have two bedrooms?

Miss TOWNSHEND: Two bed sitting rooms.

Mr. DAVIS: So that two persons not related could live in that apartment?

Mr. GITTERMAN: I think the point is that the unit of accommodation is for a family of husband and wife. I believe they must be related or they cannot share that accommodation as a unit. With the provision of a living room and a bedroom, there is one sleeping room; and in a case like that two people may not want to sleep in the one room, particularly if they are strangers. But with a living room and a bedroom so designed that each can be used as a bedroom, the two can share and each has his own room with kitchen and bathroom and dining facilities.