

refer to the public record to know just exactly what this committee had to say. The report says:

Urea Formaldehyde (UF) foam is prepared on site from the mixture of urea formaldehyde resin, an acidic hardening agent (usually phosphoric acid) and a propellant (usually compressed air). The fresh UF foam contains approximately 75 per cent water by weight. During the curing process of UFFI following installation, formaldehyde gas is released.

● (2140)

The release of formaldehyde from the foam is a complicated and poorly understood process. Most experts agree that there are continual forward chemical reactions occurring. Formaldehyde molecules may cling to the surface of the foam and cause a vapor pressure in the foam. The presence of the formaldehyde also encourages the forward reaction and retards the reverse reaction (breakdown). Air passing through the foam can sweep the formaldehyde from the foam. Increases in temperature and humidity and the presence of greater amounts of acid in the foam can accelerate the breakdown.

Installation:

It would appear that the UFFI gassing problems referred to this committee could indeed relate at least in part, perhaps in large part, to improper installation, improper vapor barriers in foamed houses etc. There is evidence that under controlled conditions the material (UFFI) shrinks and is essentially not a defined and stable product.

Health hazards are associated with living in urea formaldehyde foam insulated homes. This is really the most important point because we are talking about applying a piece of legislation and passing it through the House. We can see the headlines across the country "UFFI bill passes through House of Commons." Everybody can wave their hands in joy. They have access to funds and they can take out the insulation. But this is a great misconception. People who have UFFI in their homes and want to take it out will know that this bill is a sham. It is the general public and the taxpayers who will think that the government created a problem. The government funded the program and supported it, and somehow or other the government has come up with a solution.

It is our job in the opposition, at least of those of us in the New Democratic Party who take the job of opposition at this point seriously, to make it clear to the general public that what is being proposed in Bill C-109 is not a solution. It is a shell game. It affects only a very small portion of the population and only the wealthiest portion of those who have been stuck with this terrible problem.

The report continues:

Potential and real health problems resulting from exposure to formaldehyde include eye, nose and throat irritation, cough, headache, dizziness and in very high concentrations bronchopneumonia and pulmonary edema. Generally the degree of reactivity depends on formaldehyde concentration and duration of exposure. Prolonged or repeated exposure in those who are predisposed to asthma (airways irritability) may produce asthma or worsen an already existing asthmatic state. Indeed the potential to cause life threatening status asthmaticus exists. Contact with UFFI may cause skin irritation or ultimate sensitization to formaldehyde.

Before going on, I would like to congratulate the home owners across Canada who have organized and worked very hard to try to get all parties in the House to respond to the serious problems they have faced. To all of the UFFI home owners in every province these people have worked their guts out for years, and I would like to thank each of the following:

#### *Urea Formaldehyde Insulation Act*

Dr. Penny Tilby, Vancouver, B.C.; Fred Palen and Robert Gahan, Calgary, Alberta; Glen Markowski, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Ed Smee, William Tell and Henry Wakeley, Ontario; Nicole Lamer, Pierre Bergeron, Len Coccolico, Quebec; Carl Wentzell, Garnet Wales and Dan Williams, Newfoundland. These are the real and only heroes of this continuing battle. I am confident that they will continue in the battle to get appropriate legislation and appropriate compensation. The report continues as follows:

Formaldehyde is principally an irritant, but by combining with human proteins it may produce an immunoreactive hapten protein complex resulting in antibody formation (allergy). To this property, as well as to chemical irritation, are attributed many of the problems of dermatitis and respiratory tract reactivity with bronchospasm.

I do not think I need to go on at too great a length in relation to the terrible problems that have arisen across Canada. But I would like to touch briefly on the detailed evidence of carcinogenicity or cancer that was found in the studies on animals by Doctor L. Golberg and Doctor J. Clary. This same evidence was presented at the Third Chemical Industry Institute of Toxicology Conference on Formaldehyde Toxicity in November, 1980 held at Raleigh, North Carolina.

A risk assessment was undertaken and it is clear to the general public and to any member of this House who wants to read the report of the mutagenicity, the teratogenicity, the epidemiology and the other health considerations that we are dealing with a very serious chemical problem and to try to sweep it under the rug to allow just a fraction of home owners to remove this kind of insulation is not the way to deal with the problem. We have to go to the very root of the problem and remove all this insulation from all the homes where it is going to cause problems.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. It being 9.45 p.m., pursuant to order made Monday, July 26, 1982, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the bill now before the House.

[*Translation*]

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. Members:** On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon—Mr. Francis in the chair.

[*English*]

**The Chairman:** The House in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-109, an act to provide for payments to persons in respect of dwellings insulated with urea formaldehyde foam insulation.

Shall Clause 2 carry?

**Some hon. Members:** On division.

Clause 2 agreed to.

**The Chairman:** Shall Clause 3 carry?

**Some hon. Members:** On division.

Clause 3 agreed to.

**The Chairman:** Shall Clause 4 carry?