

*Oral Questions*

who do not share her political convictions and who believe in Canada.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

\* \* \*

• (1445)

[English]

**IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE BOARD**

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the chair of the Immigration and Refugee Board admitted yesterday that public works had installed one or more surveillance cameras in the ceiling panels at the Montreal office of the IRB.

Yesterday she said, and the minister repeated it, that it was part of an RCMP investigation. However the RCMP denied installing the cameras.

I have a question for the immigration minister. If the RCMP did not authorize the camera installation, did the minister himself or the chair of the IRB? Or, if neither one of them, who did?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a formal complaint was registered with the IRB. The chair of the IRB subsequently consulted both public works security that has responsibility for the building and the RCMP for a normal police investigation. The monitoring device was approved.

The criminal investigation is ongoing and I think it would be inadvisable to comment any further.

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minister said that the cameras were part of an RCMP investigation. The director general of the IRB said that the cameras were installed to investigate improper relationships between staff and somebody interested in IRB's business.

That could mean that someone on the outside was influencing refugee decisions or there was an attempt to restrict information flow from the IRB.

What was the specific nature of the investigation that required the installation of the cameras to watch someone for four months?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. critic used to be a police officer. I thought he would appreciate some of the finer details involved in any criminal investigation. Suffice it to say that a public servant is being investigated. It is not a board member appointed by the government. It is not an RHO official. It is not to spy on any officials in terms of how they do their business.

Proper consultations have taken place. It is a criminal investigation. I do not wish to second guess the professional police authorities and will allow the investigation to continue as it should.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION**

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for—

**Mr. Young:** Welcome to Hull.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mrs. Tremblay:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Last week, Bloc members questioned the heritage minister about the CBC's prospects for the next three years. In responding to each question, the minister refused to confirm the budgets disclosed to Mr. Manera by his deputy minister, Mr. Rochon.

Now that the CBC has an acting president and that the minister has had the time to make inquiries, can he confirm the extent of the cuts that his government intends to impose on the CBC over the next three years?

**Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, all the figures are in the budget and they are for one year. I said so before and I am pleased to repeat it. I hope that our colleague will understand the message.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Canadian Heritage confirm that the extent of the cuts he intends to impose on the CBC is such that they will again bring about the closure of regional stations?

**Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot, of course, confirm the impact of figures I did not put forward.

\* \* \*

[English]

**JUSTICE**

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday, in response to a question about a court decision regarding the legality of orders in council used to prohibit firearms, the justice minister twice stated that the Alberta court decision was wrong. That was the Simmermon case. Other ministers have repeatedly told the House that they cannot comment on cases before the courts.

• (1450)

Why is he commenting? Is he trying to influence the courts in the matter?