

*Urea Formaldehyde Insulation Act*

**Mr. Pelletier:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deans:** I am having trouble tonight. What is the matter with you people.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Pelletier) rises on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pelletier:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Pelletier) on a point of order.

**Mr. Pelletier:** Mr. Speaker, did I understand correctly what you said earlier? You allow us to wear T-shirts in this House? Did I understand you correctly?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Yes. The hon. member understood correctly.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deans:** I seem to be having some difficulty. Just remember, though, that if one happens to be male, one must wear a tie with one's T-shirt.

I want to ask the minister what, if any, provisions we will have in the regulations, or what kind of amendment the minister is prepared to provide which will ensure that those people who have expended their financial resources in the installation of urea formaldehyde foam in the first place will have some additional funding made available to them to cover the difference between the \$5,000 grant and the full cost of removal. I do not have to remind the minister, I am sure, that the full cost of removal, at least in metropolitan areas in Toronto—and I suspect it is probably equally true in most metropolitan areas across the country—ranges in the order of some \$20,000. That is in large areas. In a brick home—

**Mr. Burghardt:** That's not true.

**Mr. Deans:** The hon. member for London West (Mr. Burghardt) says I am wrong. Well, I have been wrong before and I am therefore open to be questioned on that. But the information I have, and I think it is shared by the minister, is that total removal of the insulation from a brick home costs up to \$20,000. In fact, I may be wrong on the low side. It may, in fact, cost far more. However, we will not quarrel about that. Even if it costs \$10,000, for someone with no money the difference between having an encumbrance of \$10,000 and an encumbrance of \$20,000 is hardly worth quibbling about tonight, especially when one cannot get a mortgage on one's home because one does not have the income to pay for it.

What I am worried about is not the numbers so much as the principle, because it is to the principle that I am speaking. Therefore, I think it important that we address that principle. There are certain problems which must be addressed, not in private consultation, not in letters and not simply by a nod of the head and a wink of the eye. There are issues which are not directly related to the removal of the urea formaldehyde foam insulation. I know a family extremely well, with whom I have met to discuss this problem. There seems to be no doubt but

that urea formaldehyde foam insulation has seriously affected the health of the woman in that household. I use the words "seems to be" because I am not a medical doctor, I do not pretend to be one, and never have. What do we do? What are the provisions to assist those who might suffer acute or long-term health problems which may well be, and which some people claim are, directly related to urea formaldehyde foam insulation? I am being tentative because I am not positive, but there are those who claim there are health problems which are directly related to the use of this particular product.

What about assistance for those whose homes have been structurally damaged as a result of the UFFI? I think that hon. members recognize there is a distinct possibility of structural damage. What about property value losses? I know that the hon. member for London West and other hon. members are aware there are any number of appeals pending and some which have been won concerning property taxes and relief from property taxes. But one must bear in mind that the reason this relief is to be given and therefore paid for by the other property taxpayers in the municipality is that the federal government approved the use of urea formaldehyde foam insulation and encouraged people to take advantage of it. Then, of course, there is a whole range of health questions. I will not go into detail on all the questions, but they are vitally important.

**Mr. Skelly:** Someone over there wants you to go into detail. I think they said, "Bravo".

**Mr. Deans:** No, I do not want to abuse the time of the House. However, I do want to say there is a wide range of health-related problems. Where does the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) fit in? Where is the tie in? What is the responsibility of the Ministry of National Health and Welfare? To what extent will the ministry assume financial responsibility for those problems? Let me say to the minister that I can remember, some years ago, battling a case involving asbestosis which was directly related to the operations at Johns-Manville. I remember the battle we had trying to convince people that there was indeed a health hazard in the early years. I have been at this business a long time. In the early years, we had a very serious problem trying to convince doctors and others of the seriousness of the fibers or particles which were in the air within the Johns-Manville plants in the manufacture of asbestos. I know of people who died from lung disease and who could not prove, while they were alive, that they were suffering from a disability which resulted from their employment, and who received no compensation.

I want to say to members in the House: do not cast aside the potential of serious health problems resulting from the continued use of and exposure to urea formaldehyde foam insulation. Do not be as people were ten and 15 years ago when they were blind to the seriousness of the difficulty. For God's sake, do not come back ten years from now and tell us it is very, very unfortunate that we did not know. That is the whole problem.