

## S. O. 31

decided to eliminate universality—although the claw-back may be unfair and sneaky it is there.

\* \* \*

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 52

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member. If there is still time, I am sure the hon. member will rise later on in the day. I thank him for his courtesy in allowing me to interrupt.

Earlier today there were two applications, one by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the other by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, the hon. member for Oshawa, asking for an emergency debate later on today with respect to a court case which is presently adjourned to December 18.

• (1300 )

There have been suggestions by a witness in the case, and I have read the transcript very carefully, to the effect that political considerations may have played a part in whether charges were or were not laid. I point out that the examination of that particular witness is not complete and will continue again in December, presumably. That is the way the court left the matter.

The application before me is for an emergency debate. It is a very important one and I think all members on both sides of the House would want to accept that. At least for today I do not think that the application meets the requirements for an emergency debate and I so order.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could get a clarification from Your Honour. As you may have heard, my colleague for York Centre rose on a point of order some time ago and was trying to get an indication from the Speaker as to whether questions this afternoon would be permitted on the same topic for the same rule.

Am I to assume that refusal of the Speaker for the emergency debate also applies to the *sub judice* issue in relation to Question Period, or is that a separate ruling from Mr. Speaker that will come later?

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. I, of course, was notified that the hon. member for York Centre did raise this question.

I want hon. members to know that there are two issues here. The one I have just ruled on is that at least today we are not proceeding to set aside the business of the House for an emergency debate. The considerations that go into whether or not an emergency debate should be allowed are well known to hon. members. It should be a matter that the debate can effect one way or the other, and it should be something that cannot be dealt with in any other way. I have now ruled that at least for today there is to be no emergency debate.

There was a second question. The second question concerns my ruling of some days ago about the convention, which is just that, that reference not be made in this Chamber to proceedings in a criminal case while that case is continuing. The ruling I made was that it would not be appropriate to withdraw the convention and that the *sub judice* rule ought to apply. I think I indicated to the hon. member for York Centre that he may indeed want to argue that matter further at some other time. That is always a privilege of any member. But at the moment the ruling does stand.

It being one o'clock p.m. I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m.

At 1.07 the House took recess.

## AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[Translation]

## MINORITY LANGUAGE RIGHTS

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday Bill 8 of the Ontario Legislature came into effect. This law is a historic step in the evolution of our society.

From now on, Francophones in Ontario will be entitled to service in their mother tongue from Ontario government departments and agencies.