

However, cooked food is eaten every day, and food is cooked for health reasons, because this rids the food we will eat of micro-organisms that can cause problems in the area of public health.

If we were to have a research program on the combined effects of food additives, we would have to ask ourselves several questions, like: Where do we start? What combinations of additives must be considered? How should these combinations be studied? Perhaps some other benefits that the consumer might derive should be considered as well. And last but not least, what would such a study cost?

It must certainly not be concluded, Mr. Speaker, that such studies are not important in cases that can be easily identified and where the danger is known. However, there would be little interest in beginning an intensive research program to study all possible reactions.

Furthermore, it is not obvious that the reaction products would necessarily be toxic.

They might very well be quite harmless and be handled by the body almost like other food components such as proteins and complex carbohydrates that make up the food we eat every day and which the human body metabolizes without difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, food safety research is a very costly exercise requiring highly specialized scientific personnel and complex equipment worth hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Before beginning such a research program, a thorough analysis of the need and cost-effectiveness must be done to ensure that scarce funds are well spent.

Research on the food supply is and must be based—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member, but his time is up.

The period for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), this item is dropped from the Order Paper.

### *Adjournment Debate*

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

• (1800 )

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

### IMMIGRATION—BACKLOG IN REFUGEE DETERMINATION SYSTEM

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, this government, through neglect of duty and abuse of staff, is building up a brand new refugee backlog crisis which may end in further injustice to refugees.

On May 9 of this year in Question Period I pointed out to the minister that her new system of refugee determination started on January 1, 1989 was breaking down. Of 2,806 cases opened in four months only 1,008 had received final decisions. The minister answered that the problem was just a matter of start-up troubles. She claimed she would, and I quote:

—continue to ensure that there are enough resources available so the system will work well—

It seems she did not provide the resources. According to the report of the Immigration and Refugee Board for September 11, 1989, of 7,203 cases opened, only 3,243 cases received final decisions—only 45 per cent. The rest, 3,691 cases, are deferred at one stage or another. The pipeline is filling up fast.

There was a time when 2,000 or 3,000 cases was a dreadful backlog. We now have about 100,000 cases in the old backlog, mostly built up since 1984. How many more thousands will this government add in a new backlog?

There is a very plain reason for much of this breakdown—understaffing of the clerical work. This was an important part of the origin of the old backlog, understaffing of the clerical work. It then took three to six months to type a transcript of a hearing under oath and send it to the old refugee status advisory committee. So the backlog was launched. As it snowballed, the racketeers found the delays very profitable for bringing in bogus refugees just to benefit by even a couple of years of work in Canada before they would be sent away.