

*Urea Formaldehyde Insulation Act*

seems to be that, somehow or other, the Conservative Party is not opposed enough to the substance of this bill or the limitations in it. I must ask the hon. member why, then, if the hon. member is complaining about us having said that we would let this matter get through, did his party unanimously agree yesterday to finish this bill in all three stages tonight? I just do not understand where the hon. member is coming from.

**Mr. Manly:** The facts are very clear. The Tories have tried to push this legislation through for the last three or four weeks. The hon. member for Comox-Powell River has received a great deal of criticism because he kept insisting that this bill had serious inadequacies and that he was right, and we are still right. We are trying to point out some of the inadequacies of the bill and the fallacies of the Tory opposition.

**Mr. Fraser:** You agreed to finish the bill off tonight. Now, you cannot have it both ways.

**Mr. Manly:** If I could just continue with some of my comments, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that all three of these things that the Tories say they won as concessions are all very well, but they give absolutely nothing to the UFFI home owners.

● (1740)

UFFI home owners have been very concerned about this bill. It appears to promise something, but in fact gives them nothing. One of the major problems of the bill is that there is an income bias. The \$5,000 will be paid after the UFFI is removed.

As I mentioned already, the cost of removal will be four or five times greater than that. In homes in urban areas across Canada, it is estimated that the cost of the UFFI removal will be between \$22,000 and \$25,000. This means a great many low and middle-income people will not be able to have the insulation removed from their homes. Therefore, they will not qualify for the program. There is no help for those who need it the most.

Another concern is that more and more evidence is accumulating that UFFI creates long-term problems but that this is a short-term program. The moneys have to be spent by December 31, 1982. The idea of an ongoing committee is fine. It is said to be open ended and flexible, but there is no commitment. Our party would like to see some commitment in addition to flexibility.

I would like to place on record some questions from the president of the British Columbia UFFI home owner's action group, Penny Tilby. She is one of the members who met with the minister over the weekend. They ask that there be further government confirmation of some matters raised where there is diffusion, confusion, contradiction or mistrust. There is a great deal of that.

The minister agreed with the objective of UFFI home owners to hold compensation for removal of UFFI. He agreed to approach companies, provinces and other federal departments for additional assistance. In order to show proof of his

sincerity, will the minister amend the regulations now to state that the \$5,000 is the minimum and not the maximum? We would like some confirmation that what he said yesterday was not simply a slip of the tongue as it is recorded in *Hansard* but that it represents a real change in policy.

Second, the minister originally agreed with home owners that Part I formaldehyde gas or proven health problems is not a fair criterion for assistance to UFFI victims. The National Research Council states that there should be removal from all groups as a minimum. After agreeing, the minister went back on his agreement, has not done anything to back up his commitment, and did not change Draft 13. Will he maintain good faith with the advisory council and remove this criterion as he promised?

Third, the minister promised there would be help from other government resources to add to the UFFI assistance program. Will the minister back his personal commitment? For example, will CMHC come to the aid of these people? Will there be help from the Canadian Home Improvement Program to top up the \$5,000?

The minister said he would study the question of income bias. Home owners feel that simply to look into this question is not good enough. Will the minister make a commitment now to ensure universal access to the \$5,000 assistance so that lower-income Canadians will not be excluded? Will he (a) guarantee contracts for persons who cannot advance \$5,000, or (b) will he give the low-income person an interim loan of \$5,000?

There are some 1,300 members of the UFFI action group in B.C. On an initial questionnaire, some 10 per cent of the people have replied, and more replies are coming in every day. Of the 10 per cent who replied, 10 per cent said they would be able to scrape up or somehow raise the \$5,000 in order to have this money up front, and 71 per cent said they would not be able to. We are talking about a bill that at present will not meet the needs of 71 per cent of those it is supposed to help.

The Manitoba home owners said that 50 per cent of their home owners were on a fixed pension or low income. These people cannot afford this kind of help. It is absolutely essential that the minister make a commitment that he will remove income bias from this \$5,000 grant. It is not good enough that he look into the problem. We would like a definite commitment.

Fifth, with regard to the establishment of a committee on health and welfare to continue to study and recommend, the home owners ask whether the minister and the government will guarantee to pay the future medical costs of any proven UFFI-related disease.

These are some of our concerns about this bill which we share with UFFI home owners. With these inadequacies in the bill, we cannot support it. We would like some real commitment on the part of the minister. It is important that there be help for these people. The government has come forward with a package that looks good. It is a package that they can put