

under the tree. The Tories want to help. We say there is nothing in that package for 70 per cent of the people who need help from the UFFI program. I hope the government will listen to our concerns and take some positive action.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Dubois (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, may I say first of all, that I am very happy to have the opportunity this afternoon of speaking to Bill C-109. I should also like to congratulate you on your appointment as Deputy Chairman of Committee of the Whole, and your colleague, the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) on his appointment as Assistant Deputy Chairman on this first day in your new duties respectively.

Mr. Speaker, after those few words of congratulations, I must say that I found the speech of the hon. member opposite rather surprising. I thought the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) quite appropriate with regard to some of the comments made by the representative of the NDP about the bill now before the House, when he pointed out that unanimous consent was given by the House to pass the bill at all stages and refer it to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. Moreover, when my hon. colleague for Laval (Mr. Roy) spoke after our colleague of the NDP, the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo), saying that after that stage, study of the bill would be completed, to my mind the order of reference passed yesterday by the House, that is on July 26, as reported on page 19701 of *Hansard*, should have been referred to in order to ascertain what would happen to the bill. All that leads me to point out to the House that the bill having been introduced in April, 1982, I wonder why my colleagues of the New Democratic Party should now claim that we want to rush this bill through, that it is not complete, and that it should be discussed further. I wonder about it all the more that when on July 7, I personally proposed a motion, under Standing Order 43, suggesting that the House consider passing the bill through all stages, they refused unanimous consent, thus rejecting the motion as reported on pages 19084-5 of *Hansard*. Some of the comments made by the Progressive Conservative House leader dealt with the situation of the committee empowered to deal with certain aspects of the matter as a result of passage of the motion yesterday.

● (1750)

This motion was rejected by the New Democratic Party. The same thing occurred on July 8 when I introduced another motion under Standing Order 43 to have the bill go through all stages. A surprising development took place on that same day when the New Democratic Party also introduced a motion under Standing Order 43. They were really on the defensive concerning this bill, I imagine in view of the comments which had been made and the fact that certain English newspapers

had even said that they were responsible for delaying this bill. However today when they take this kind of holier-than-thou attitude, we should point out to them that had they agreed at the time, they would have had more time to discuss this bill in the House and they could have shown more foresight as concerns this bill since we are about to adjourn.

I am therefore very glad that we are going through all the stages of Bill C-109 this evening and having the vote at 9.45 since I introduced motions under Standing Order 43 on July 7 and 8, and put some questions to the Minister on February 2 about the UFFI situation, and I also questioned the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) last week, on July 20, about the Lamoureux report. The Minister replied that the report, which will be in a more complete form at a later date because of the illness of one of the Board's members, maintained the ban on the use of UFFI.

Mr. Speaker, UFFI victims will certainly be very happy to learn that the bill will finally be passed this evening following their meetings with members on this side of the House and in most Quebec constituencies; later on these members met with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to make representations and recommendations. I would like to give the background of what has happened ever since the Canadian people and afterwards Parliament were made aware of this situation. Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, on December 23, 1981, the federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, announced a federal assistance program for Canadians who had their houses insulated with urea formaldehyde foam. This material was banned in Canada in December 1980 when it was discovered that it could cause health problems. What was important at that time was that the program included free tests, technical advice and nontaxable financial assistance—I believe that this is very important—up to an amount of \$5,000 to pay for the work to correct the problem.

The federal government therefore made this announcement on December 23, 1981. While I am explaining what followed to the Canadian people, and especially to Quebecers in my constituency of Lotbinière, I would like to point out that, because of the flexibility and understanding shown by the government in response to the representations made by Members of Parliament, especially those of the Quebec caucus, following their meetings with associations of UFFI victims, changes will be made to the regulations. That is why in my speech this afternoon, and later this evening—because I shall not be able to conclude my speech now in view of the time allotted to me—I would like to tell the House about the changes that will be made in the regulations, because it is mostly through them that the situation will be corrected. In December 1981, the national testing program of 2,400 houses in Canada showed that in nearly 9 out of 10 houses insulated with UFFI, the average level of formaldehyde gas was lower than the acceptable level of 0.1 part per million.