

as the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Dubois) has finished his comments, will be willing to allow consideration of the bill now before the House, namely Bill C-109, to proceed from the second reading stage to consideration in Committee of the Whole. If that is what was worrying my hon. colleague from Hamilton-Wentworth, I can give him and his colleagues the assurance that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs will be available in Committee of the Whole in a few minutes, as soon as the member for Lotbinière has finished his remarks.

[English]

**Mr. Deans:** Mr. Speaker, I just want to raise one tiny point with regard to the notice of motion put forward by the government House leader. Having looked into the history of motions under Standing Order 75C, I believe this is the first time the House has ever voted to restrict hearings in committee.

**Mr. Pinard:** Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. colleague will agree with me that by inadvertence he did not read the report of 1971 when a motion was made while the House was sitting in Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the remarks of the government House leader, not with respect to the motion under Standing Order 75C and the notice thereon but with respect to the bill that is presently before the House, I must say that the Progressive Conservative Party has been ready for some time to deal with this matter at the committee stage. We are anxious to question the minister, as there are a lot of important matters that must be brought out at the committee stage. We regret very much—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** With all due respect to the hon. member, the minister has made a statement with the unanimous consent of the House. If there are further remarks relating to the statement the Chair is prepared to entertain them, and if not, the Chair will recognize the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Dubois).

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

### UREA FORMALDEHYDE INSULATION ACT

#### PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE TO HOME OWNERS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) that Bill C-109, to provide for payments to persons in respect of dwellings insulated with urea formaldehyde foam insulation, be read the second time and, in accordance with the provisions of the order made on Monday, July 26, 1982, be referred to a Committee of the Whole.

### *Urea Formaldehyde Insulation Act*

**Mr. Jean-Guy Dubois (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, when the House took recess at six o'clock, I was dealing with the program announced on December 31, 1981, and mentioned its main points. Following representations made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard), I shall cut short my comments so that we may proceed to third reading since there seems to be an agreement to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, following the announcement made on December 23, 1981, I had the opportunity, along with a number of members, to meet a group from my riding actually called the ACEF of the Bois-Franc area. It was made up of UFFI victims, people from the Victoriaville and Bois-Franc areas, from the Richmond riding and part of the Frontenac riding who had insulated their homes with that foam. Representations were made to the effect that the federal and provincial governments should appropriate funds and provide immediate assistance to UFFI victims associations. We were told that the provincial government should provide human and technical resources as well as medical and legal assistance to UFFI victims. At the meeting held in my riding on January 25, and attended by other federal and provincial Members of Parliament, among others the provincial member for Richmond, Yvon Vallières, those representatives made all kinds of recommendations about urea formaldehyde. Of course, we were then in a position to refer to the program which had been announced in December as well as to the provincial program.

Needless to say those federal and provincial programs were well received, some criticisms were levelled, while some tried to absolve the provincial government from any responsibility. It was then pointed out that the committee which had approved UFFI included members from the Quebec Order of Architects and representatives of Quebec Industrial Research centres. We were also told that the federal government was mostly responsible. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, following the representations that were made, I was asked as a lawyer whether it would be possible to take legal action and how to go about it. I told those people at the time: "Listen! If you want to sue the federal and provincial governments, go ahead! You ought to fight for your rights!" I think that it is a most legitimate right for them to fight for. They had mentioned the statute of limitation on all proceedings against the federal and provincial governments. They were wondering if the program we had announced on December 23, 1981, could jeopardize their right to take legal action against the Government of Canada and get more than the maximum \$5,000 made available to them.

● (2010)

Needless to say, the ACEF people in my own riding, represented mainly by Mr. Richard Leroux, also a representative of the UFFI victims of central Quebec, who works for the ACEF in Victoriaville. We were asked those questions and later on, on February 2, 1982, I directed a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) in connection