

## EFFECT OF BUDGET CUTS TO THE CBC

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, as these savage cuts to the CBC will affect services to the regions, services to English and French language minorities, service in terms of the Canadianization of our airwaves and services to ensure that the French language stations have equivalent production funds, isn't this Minister ashamed of the cuts that he has allowed to CBC? Doesn't he recognize the seriousness of the devastation to the Canadian network? Aren't you ashamed of yourself, Mr. Minister?

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

[Translation]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Communications I can tell my colleague that I am particularly proud to have managed to increase my department's budget for cultural endeavours, with the co-operation of the Prime Minister and my Cabinet colleagues.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Trinity—Spadina, a single question, please.

\* \* \*

## IMMIGRATION

## BACKLOG IN REFUGEE DETERMINATION SYSTEM

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. As she knows, her officials' report shows that in the new refugee determination system a new backlog is growing. This is equal to about half the number of the 4,500 new refugee claimants who came in this year. About 1,700 have not started on their preliminary hearing and there are more than 900 others who have not finished their formal hearing. Will the Minister admit that the new system will break down if she continues with a double hearing in which 93 per cent of those who go to the first hearing are sent on to the second hearing?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, no, I would not admit such a thing. There are a couple of points I would like to make in connection with this.

First, when the new system was established it took a while to make it operational. We were not fully staffed or

## S.O. 52

trained at the beginning but we certainly are now. We have put more people to work in the system. The Immigration Refugee Board and the Department of Immigration are working together to make the system as effective as possible.

Let me say as well that the first hearing is an important stage in the process. We have only had the system running for about three and a half months and I think all Members of the House should be proud of the fact that it is working well, with credibility and compassion. We will continue to ensure that there are enough resources available so the system will work well.

\* \* \*

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 52

## SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** Before proceeding to Orders of the Day, I wish to give a ruling as a consequence of argument of Thursday, April 6, by way of an application for an emergency debate under Standing Order 52. At that time, the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Lewis) raised a point of order concerning guidelines that exist for the statement which can be made in support of such an application. For the benefit of Hon. Members, I will read Standing Orders 52(2) and 52(3). Standing Order 52(2) reads:

A Member wishing to move, "That this House do now adjourn"—

Because that is what is moved when one wants an emergency debate.

—under the provisions of this Standing Order shall give to the Speaker, at least one hour prior to raising it in the House, a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed.

Standing Order 52(3) reads:

When requesting leave to propose such a motion, the Member shall rise in his or her place and present without argument the statement referred to in section (2) of this Standing Order.

A strict interpretation of these two subsections could lead one to suppose that the written application was to be read to the House by the Member requesting leave for an emergency debate and that the Member would not be allowed to deviate from this prepared text. This interpretation is in general the correct one, as I said on September 30, 1987 in response to a very similar point of order raised by the then Hon. Minister of Justice. That point of order and my response to it may be found on page 9498 of the *Debates*. It is also interesting to note that this interpretation is supported by the annotated Standing Orders at page 175.