

Oral Questions

They and their child will be persecuted in China because they were refused permission by the government to reproduce.

[*Translation*]

Will this government abandon its policy of deporting Chinese nationals who are seeking to have, and to protect the lives of, their children?

Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Halifax, being an experienced lawyer as she is, would know that the process involved means that the decisions are taken by immigration adjudicators and then the Immigration Refugee Board, both independent bodies.

As far as the deportation to China is concerned, the hon. member should know that the Minister of Employment and Immigration has suspended all deportations and the suspension remains in effect as of now.

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Madam Speaker, that sounds very comforting, but it is not very comforting to the Siu family when they are being told that once their child is born they will have to return. We know that children in China who are unregistered are being refused food and medicine. A little compassion goes a long way, maybe as far as experience.

My supplementary question is for the same minister.

[*Translation*]

Why does the government refuse the Siu family the basic right to give birth to their child in safety? Why does the government insist on putting the future of this child and its parents in danger?

Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, with her experience as a lawyer, the hon. member, as I said earlier, should know that all cases where the Immigration and Refugee Board orders someone deported, for example,

[*English*]

—must be reviewed on compassionate and humanitarian grounds. This case will be reviewed like all others.

CONSUMERS

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and concerns the appointment of Nicolas Murray, chairman of the board of the Consumers Association of Canada, to the position of president of the government's GST information office.

Why has the minister undermined the credibility of the consumer protection agency by offering a patronage position to Mr. Murray behind the back, and I repeat behind the back, of the executive of the Consumers Association of Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, of course I do not accept the premise of the hon. member's question, but I want to inform him and the House that last evening there was a full board meeting of the Consumers' Association of Canada. At that meeting, Mr. Murray, in the interest of consumers across Canada, offered his resignation which the Consumers' Association accepted with regret. A Consumers' Association press release of this morning reads, in part:

This move allows Mr. Murray to assume his new position as chairman of the new consumer information office unencumbered. CAC is pleased with the appointment of Mr. Murray, an outstanding consumer information communicator. CAC feels it is important to have Mr. Murray's agency report directly to the public through Parliament.

Which of course he will.

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester): Madam Speaker, this very instant I have received the same communiqué. There is one sentence which the minister left out, that is:

The CAC board has accepted the offer of Mr. Nickolas Murray to resign from his position as president of CAC.

My question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the present non-informed or non-informative minister. The roughest guesstimate one can extract from the minister's non-informed declarations is that of the \$19 million budget provided to the