

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

The customer-service centre concept is one which is being applied widely in Canada and south of the border. I am told that it is an effective and efficient way of doing business with the railways in this fast-moving age. I understand that the many employees who exercise their seniority rights for the new positions which are created by the plan consider the new jobs very attractive and challenging.

On the general question, I am sure the hon. member is aware of the assurance which was received from the Canadian Transport Commission. I made it clear at this hour on February 22 on a question by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) reiterated it during the question period a few days later. It is essential to this matter. The assurance which was received from the CTC was that any and every specific complaint that the CPR is not carrying out any of the undertakings given the commission and set out in the decision will be investigated promptly and remedial action will be taken wherever warranted.

One of the specific items raised by the hon. member was the effective date of implementation. There is no evidence of an effective date of implementation in any of the CTC's orders which I have seen. This is a decision which the railway must make, taking into account their collective agreement with their employees. As of the date of the initial decision on such applications, the employees must be given 90 days' notice.

Mr. Skoberg: Thirty days.

Mr. Duquet: My information is 90 days. The hon. member has made a number of points which I will be glad to refer to the Minister of Transport. In addition, I can inform him that Canadian Pacific Railway is aware of his representation to the Minister.

[Translation]

HOUSING—POINTE-GATINEAU—LA FERME DU BARON PROJECT—REQUEST THAT OWNERS BE COMPENSATED

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, on March 3 last, I tried to find out from the government what attitude it would adopt in the face of the justified discontent of the owners of the housing development La Ferme le Baron at Pointe-Gatineau.

Having had no reply, I return to the charge this evening to bring home to the government—if that is possible—what I consider to be the worst injustice towards low-income families.

In recent years, under the cover of the National Housing Act, the government has undertaken mass production of slums. I say slums because I visited the housing development La Ferme le Baron while it was being built, in April 1971, and I saw what kind of construction was going on. What is more, this is not the only housing project that offers those characteristics.

I was astonished by what I saw. It was the first time that I saw outside doors with running water inside. The newspaper *Le Droit* reported the matter recently after having pointed out the defects of those dwellings, namely

[Mr. Duquet.]

extreme humidity, lack of insulation, water back-flow in basements and nonstandard party walls.

The builder simply replied: They only have to improve their ventilation system. Well, it is as simple as that! The builder is not the only one to blame. What he did in Pointe-Gatineau others have done elsewhere with the approval of some officials of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

When some builders are asked to draw up low income housing projects, they are told: Provide as little as possible. Do not build any sidewalk or cement stoop. When the owner will be tired of walking in the mud, he will build one. Hang interior rather than exterior doors, he will never know the difference. Yet, when he does realize this, he will have to replace two doors which will cost him from \$300 to \$400.

Mr. Speaker, home purchasers in the Le Baron project have been cheated, with the complicity of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I ask that justice be rendered to the homeowners who believe that they were purchasing a house meeting the major house-building standards, not only in the Le Baron project, but elsewhere also. It is not logical to let houses be built without supervision. That opens the door to all kinds of abuse.

On all house construction sites, sponsored by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, qualified and responsible supervisors should be appointed to protect the purchasers.

The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andras) is doing a fairly good job of protecting consumers against faulty products and misleading publicity, but in the field of housing, the purchaser is left without protection. What are the government's intentions in this regard?

• (2210)

[English]

Mr. David Weatherhead (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) for bringing this important question to the attention of the House.

As hon. members may know, this housing project consists of approximately 575 single-storey units of which 51 are of conventional wood-frame construction and the balance of 525 in the form of quadrexes which involve a different system of building. Each quadrex contains four units, each of which shares two common party walls. The walls, floors and roofs are constructed of metal panel manufactured by ARMCO Canada Limited. The project, located in the northeast part of Pointe Gatineau, was one of the earliest proposals received in 1970 by CMHC under the \$200 million program. At that time, with its proposed sale price of \$10,900 the proposed 300 unit project was one of the first to raise hopes that a breakthrough into lower cost housing was possible.

Construction started in 1970 and was followed in 1971 by a further 147 units being financed by an approved lender and the remaining 128 units financed by CMHC. On December 24, 1971, half the roof and the front end of one of the quadrexes was torn off by wind. The builder, DuBarry Construction Limited, ensured that the needs of