

*Urea Formaldehyde Insulation Act*

he had had the power to convince his cabinet colleagues that, given the government's initial inducement to use the product, they therefore had an equivalent responsibility to ensure that no one would suffer as a result of that inducement, he would have done those things by now. If he could not convince his cabinet colleagues over the course of the last year that more money should be found, that the federal government's responsibility was to ensure that that foam was taken out of each and every home where it was causing a problem and that it was, therefore, the government's responsibility to pursue the manufacturer and to recover from the manufacturer whatever was recoverable by way of liability, why should we believe he can convince his colleagues in the future?

If he could not convince the industry of its responsibility until now, why should we believe he can convince the industry between now and some date off in the future?

If he cannot convince the provinces on the basis of the evidence which is currently before us, then why should we believe that he will be able to convince them sometime between now and some obscure date in the future? I see the hon. member for London West (Mr. Burghardt) sitting and nodding his head in agreement, and I understand why.

**Mr. McCauley:** He is falling asleep.

**Mr. Deans:** I mean, that is the crux of it. I feel confident that if it were within the power of the minister to dig into his own personal treasury to hand out the necessary funds, he would do it. But we know that is not the case. If the minister has not been able to convince those other participants up to now, what is there in the offing which will bring about a sudden change of heart? What is there in the offing which will bring about a reversal of the opposition which is so strongly held by both the provinces and the industry?

**Mr. Ouellet:** Wait until Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Deans:** If the minister rises and suggests that he is just on the verge of getting those agreements, we can sit another week and off he can go and get them.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Deans:** If the minister is of a mind to rise and suggest to us that it is just a matter of time and the agreements will be signed, the provinces will participate and the industry will chip in, then why does the government not just simply go the full distance, provide the necessary funding, recover from those people who are just on the verge of providing assistance, put the money back into government coffers and ease the burden on every citizen across the country?

● (2040)

When one stops to think, it is almost unbelievable. The reason I rose to speak tonight, when I had no intention of rising and knowing that you are not able to rise, Mr. Speaker, is that my honest worry is that once the bill is passed, notwithstanding the committees, investigations and all the best intentions of the minister and his cabinet colleagues and all

others involved, by the time summer is over and winter sets in around 1982 or 1983, the government's commitment to people who still have UFFI in their homes and are suffering as a result of it will be less than it is today. It will have waned, the same as their commitment in other matters. That is my worry.

When I pass this provision for \$5,000—which is not in the bill but the avowed intention according to the minister's statement—that will be it. There will be no more. Whether the government's austerity program is right or wrong is not to be questioned here tonight, but we will probably talk about it on another day. That program will take over and there will be no assistance, and the government, in spite of the best intentions of the minister, will renege on its vague promise of other help. It will say that it has done the best it can. It would like to do more but it cannot because these are tough times for everyone and if you have to die because it did the wrong thing, well, that is tough.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, come on.

**Mr. Rossi:** You are in show business.

**Mr. Deans:** I am sorry that it bothers some Liberal backbenchers because I understand that Liberal backbenchers tend to get a little aggravated in July and August, but we on this side of the House take the work seriously. We do not care whether or not it is August.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Rossi:** You are in show business.

**Mr. Skelly:** Serious business.

**Mr. Deans:** If that member would care to identify himself and to suggest that publicly, I would demand that he deny it. He knows it to be totally untrue. To say such a thing from obscurity and anonymity of a backbench from where he will never go further is disgusting.

However, I will ignore it considering where it comes from. It does make me want to say a few words more, I will have you know. I had considered stopping at this point, but let me pose two or three more questions to the minister. They relate directly to the principle of the bill. The principle of this bill is to make sure that those who can afford to remove urea formaldehyde from their homes will get \$5,000 or less. Those who cannot afford to remove it will get nothing. That is the principle of the bill. It is not a principle which we can support.

I put to the Liberal backbenchers that many of their constituents for whom they are fighting so hard have an average income capacity which will make them unable to take advantage of this legislation because there is nothing in it for them. So do not sit there yapping about why we should get on with things. This is far too important a matter to pass in the blink of an eye.

Let me suggest to the minister that there are some problems with this bill. The minister talks about his leadership and his commitment. I want to ask him some questions which were related to us. They are very relevant to how this matter will