

judged to need the protection of Canada, and the board rules that those people should be granted refugee status in this country.

That tells us, in the first instance, that the oral hearing, the chance to tell one's story, is important. It is not just a theory; it is a reality, a demonstrable reality, in the Canadian mosaic.

It also tells us, Mr. Speaker, that 92 per cent of those appealing denial on the basis of a paper review are found not to need the protection of Canada by a three member panel in an oral hearing. It tells us, clearly, that there are abusers. There are those who seek to use the court processes in this country to advance their own selfish ends, regardless of the difficulties that that may cause for legitimate refugees, those who care about them and those who serve them.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, when a poll is done on Bill C-55, there is such overwhelming endorsement of it. The average Canadian does not know what is contained in the 62 pages of the Bill. The average Canadian does not have the background, the experience, the training to determine whether the fine print will get the job done or not. What the average Canadian is responding to, Mr. Speaker, is the notion that those who need the protection of this country will be found to be *bona fide* refugees and will be granted that protection, and that those who abuse the system will not be granted that special privilege and will in fact be deported.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that that is what Canadians want. The only issue for the House in relation to Bill C-55 is whether or not these proposed amendments to the immigration law of Canada have enough going for them that they are worth detailed study and examination by committee to ensure that what Canadians want will indeed come about.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply disappointed to hear the speaker on behalf of the Liberal Party immediately move what we refer to as the sixth month hoist. He did that before hearing the lead-off speaker for the New Democratic Party or a second speaker on behalf of the government side. To move the six month hoist is to assume that the Bill is unsalvageable and would make no contribution to the lives of refugees or to Canadian society.

Mr. Speaker, the kindest thing I can say about that action is that it is premature. I move from words like "premature" to "poorly thought out", "ill-conceived", "unwise", and "damaging".

**Mr. Berger:** It is the same reaction that we have seen on the part of all of the groups across the country.

**Mr. Hawkes:** The Hon. Member for Laurier (Mr. Berger) says that it is the same reaction on the part of all of the groups across the country.

**Mr. Berger:** Yes. The store-front lawyers.

**Mr. Hawkes:** That, Mr. Speaker, is an example of the kind of rhetoric we have come to expect over the past eight years.

### *Business of the House*

It is not the reaction of all of the groups in the country; it is not the reaction of all of the people of the country. It is not my reaction, to start with. I can talk about what I believe and what I think.

Mr. Speaker, Bill C-55, I believe, has the potential to achieve what Canadians want, that being the protection of those who need this country's protection in as fail-safe a manner as is possible in any system that requires human decision making, while at the same time bringing about a significant reduction in the potential for abuse of the system.

Had the previous Government tackled this problem when it first arose five or six years ago and not left it to this Government to provide the oral hearing—which it did by way of a prior piece of legislation—we would not now be dealing with something of this complexity in an environment where there are thousands, and even perhaps tens of thousands, of abusers. Had the Liberal Party shown as much concern in the early 1980s as they would profess to have today, we would not be engaged in this debate.

**Mr. Berger:** In 1980, there were 1,800 in-land claimants. In 1983, there were 6,100.

**Mr. Hawkes:** What are the problems with this Bill, Mr. Speaker? Part of the problem, insofar as the small print is concerned, is that we have not had the opportunity to hear witnesses and to examine those witnesses on the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I see that it is time for Private Members' Hour. I believe I have some time left and that I shall be recognized following Private Members' Hour.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Yes.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C-65, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Government of Canada for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1988.

\* \* \*

● (1800)

[English]

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the Parties and the House Leaders, and I think Your