

supplement my income, for mortgage, utilities, taxes, repairs and general upkeep. Without the rental income, I could never afford to keep the house.

In August, 1980, I paid off the mortgage—the accomplishment of a lifetime! The increased market value seemed a Godsend; compensation for the previous sacrifice. I was assured of security until I became a senior citizen in 1988, and even after. I could hardly believe it was mine and I had finally accomplished my objective.

I have never applied for any assistance such as UIC or welfare, nor did I have a grant for the insulation. It is absolutely contrary to my upbringing, however, as a result of having my house insulated, and in view of my personal circumstances, I am asking now:

1. The federal government is offering up to \$5,000 if the house test indicates gas over .1 PPM and if you can prove medical problems therefrom.

I had skin irritation, kidney (edema) and respiratory conditions previously—the symptoms with thyroid and arthritis are interrelated, thus I cannot prove the UFFI has caused them; however, having had a very bad winter, who is to say it has not greatly increased or aggravated my problems. But, on the surface it would appear I would not qualify for even a portion of the grant.

● (1730)

2. It has been suggested that people with medical problems move. Where to? How can I rent, plus live on \$278 a month, and plus my rental income?

3. If I stay in the house, and continue to rent the suite, could I be held responsible if a tenant should have medical problems?

4. I understand estimates to completely remove the UFFI treatment of the 2 *SA & 4d, and restore the walls, perhaps change electrical wiring and boxes if they have been affected, range from \$14,000 - 25,000.

I do not have the money for this, nor would I be able to obtain a loan at my income level.

5. It has been well publicized that the Research Council advised against the use of UFFI—then why would the representatives of the people approve its use; and having done so, not accept full responsibility for the results?

6. Once approved federally, companies have to be licensed and/or approved provincially and municipally; then why are the people not protected from false advertising and misrepresentation?

A Rapco Foam brochure given to me in April, 1978 indicates an R Value of 4.35 per inch in summer; 4.80 in winter, “stays dry”, “repels moisture;” another indicates its chemically stable and another indicates an R Value of 18.12 (foam only) in a 3½ inch wall cavity.

However, an Energy, Mines and Resources booklet, dated August, 1976 “Keeping The Heat In” contradicts most of the information still being advertised in 1978. The foam had then been derrated by 40% to account for shrinkage; the R Value being 2.5 per inch and, “But may only be applied to walls with no insulation whatsoever”.

Rapco was aware my house had some fiber glass insulation.

7. As a bonus, my bathtub was insulated! Recently, I learned UFFI contains corrosive substances, attacks mortar and metal and promotes wood rot. Is my bathtub being corroded? Are the two *SA & fours and joists with wood rot?

8. There is also a question of the toxic effects on NA/SO *in3’ recommended for treating wood cavities. The sodium herein could be harmful to edema patients.

I know of one man who said he would never use this on his house as it would be as dangerous as UFFI.

How can any level of government which has approved and/or licensed use of such material and allowed advertising which has been contradicted in 1976 to be distributed in 1978, not be liable to those of us who felt responsible enough to respond to conservation pressures being requested by our government, federally and provincially? How can a \$5,000 grant, at most, compensate for 30 years of struggling and erasing the future security of the citizens who respond to the needs of the country? My home was the only asset of real value I've been able to acquire in my lifetime. I await your response as to the amount of assistance your level of government or party would assume in this regard:

—financially, to restore our property to proper market value; obviously \$5,000 is completely inadequate.

Urea Formaldehyde Insulation Act

—Are you prepared to support these home owners in obtaining justice where it is due? Or would you preferably overlook the situation because it happened to someone else?

As children, our parents raised us to be honest, independent and compassionate, to respect the rights of others, respect the law, police, and our country (my only brother was killed overseas in the RCAF, I served in the CWAC). In turn I try to teach my children similarly.

But the many changes in our country in the last few years frighten me; perhaps it is time to realize our greatest fear is the justice, or lack of it, from within.

That letter was signed, “A very disturbed citizen”. In it, the widow asked what the different parties were prepared to do on behalf of the UFFI home owners. I am pleased that the critic for our party did not cave in and want to rush this matter through when the provisions are completely inadequate. The position of the Conservative Party, however, falls far short of what is required. It is outlined in a memo distributed by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Scott). It begins by describing the remedial relief to home owners with UFFI as “woefully inadequate”. That is very true. “Woefully inadequate” means that it is inadequate to the point of being filled with woe for the people who are supposed to benefit from it. The Conservative Party realizes this, yet continues to support it. It is filled with woe for the people who are supposed to be benefiting from it because there is nothing in it for a great many of them. Realizing that it was woefully inadequate but that there were possibly some PR advantages, the Conservative Party agreed to give it speedy passage and minimal opposition.

The Conservatives have attacked the hon. member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) for trying to hold up the bill and get a decent deal on the matter. In return for giving speedy passage—and every sweetheart deal has two sides—the Conservatives said that they wanted the government to table the regulations which will administer the program. That is very well and good. Second, they requested that a special subcommittee of Parliament be struck immediately after Bill C-109 was passed. My understanding is that the New Democrats had already won that concession, and then the Tories added an amendment which only further explains the concession that the committee be empowered to recommend amendments to Bill C-109 and its regulations and that expert testimony be heard into the whole subject matter of UFFI.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder whether the hon. member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands will permit me to ask him a question.

Mr. Manly: I would be very happy to attempt to answer a question at the end of my speech, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I think he should allow a question at this point.

Mr. Manly: Very well, then. If the hon. member wishes to ask a question, I will attempt to answer it now.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member rose in the House to make a speech about the bill. Instead, I have heard nothing but complaints about so-called alleged positions taken by the Progressive Conservative Party. The complaint