

to understand the answer given by the Parliamentary Secretary. It is a legitimate request because in the end the person can, if he or she wants help, at least show the grounds on which he or she was refused.

Therefore, the amendment ought to carry and not be rejected because it is so fundamental, simple, and reasonable. If the cause of refugees is close to the heart of the Government, as is being claimed, then it has an opportunity to prove that it wants to facilitate the system in its fairness as well. We cannot have a fair system if it is only based upon oral or verbal communications. There must be a little piece of paper on which the decision is recorded so that the life of the individual involved can be examined as to whether or not there should be a subsequent step by way of a decision which is not only communicated by word of mouth.

If anyone in this room were a potential refugee, I do not think he or she would want to be put in a position of having to face a decision which is only communicated by word of mouth and not on a piece of paper. That is not good enough, and that is why the amendment is sensible and desirable.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, two of the four clauses would require Canadian taxpayers to have typed up a transcript which would never be used for anything. This amendment would require us to give typewritten reasons for people to go forward to a *de novo* hearing. There is no place for such a transcript in that hearing. There is no need for it; it is an expenditure that is not worth-while.

The other two clauses would require the taxpayers of the country to have typed up reasons, which have been given orally or verbally in the presence of counsel and everyone else, and with cassettes being available, for abusers of the system. There is a certain direct cost involved in that, but there is even a larger cost in Canadian taxpayers continuing to support abusers over a longer period of time.

Surely the Chamber has come to the conclusion that abusers should be removed speedily. Every group that appeared before us testified to that effect. If there is any evidence that a person might have a credible claim, we put an amendment where the Crown does not even contest the issue of credibility. It can simply be asserted that it is credible, and it goes forward to a *de novo* hearing.

Why would we want taxpayers to pay for the typing up of a transcript which in half the cases—and hopefully it will be 90 per cent of the cases ultimately after we have removed the abuse—will never be used? Why would we go to the expense of keeping people in the country for an extra week or two weeks when there is no credibility to the claim, when a decision has been made and there is no evidence of any kind that is credible or trustworthy which might indeed enable us to classify them as refugees?

That is what this amendment deals with, and I urge Hon. Members to reject it.

Immigration Act, 1976

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, at times one gets the impression that the Government is committed to an almost infantile level of negativism. In rejection of a very simple amendment it gives bumbling, inarticulate, inexplicable, and incomprehensible reasons—"My God, somebody might have to type up something!"

Earlier I heard my colleague say that he hoped the Government would not suggest that the amendment would cause the appearance of a backlog of thousands of illegitimate refugees. What we hear is reasoning which demonstrates that the procedure the Government would adopt in lieu of written reasons would in fact cause precisely that kind of delay.

Then we have the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) who is worried about somebody having to type; about the fantastic cost of typing up reasons which, by the way, would perhaps cost less than a whole tape; and about according to illegitimate refugees some special privileges in the context of a procedure in which he has utter trust, in spite of the fact that we assert that the pre-screening process, in and of itself, does not serve to establish what it claims will be established.

My colleague indicated that it was a method of imposing some means of discipline, of articulating, and of justifying reasons, and that it was necessary for people, in terms of the slight appeal procedures provided them, to have a clear statement for either himself, herself, or the person's lawyer.

This is elementary. What is wrong with the Government that it has such a total commitment to unfairness? What is the source of its congenital negativism? Surely it is a simple amendment which ought to be entertained with enthusiasm, if not with understanding.

I urge upon the other side to attempt to be just a little more understanding of what is being asked for here and the situation being created by this legislation.

I was just reminded of the utterances of Mr. Clyne whose point of view, if adopted by the country, may require me to seek refugee status someplace else. If I had to face that kind of set of requirements to gain admission, in those circumstances I think I would be frightened.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 40, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say *yea*.