

Now we come to Motion No. 34 suggested by the Hon. Member for La Prairie. That motion lays an obligation on the Crown, the adjudicator and a refugee board member to make sure that entered into the record before making a decision on credibility are the facts of the refugee board's hearings. If we find that 10 per cent of the people who make a claim from a certain country are refugees or 80 per cent, 2 per cent or 90 per cent, that percentage must be entered on the record before a decision is made, and one must conclude that the requirement to put that on the record is in the interest of the true refugees. We have had close to 8,000 claimants from three countries which do not produce refugees, 3,500 from Portugal. That fact should be on the record to deter abuse. We do have refugees from Guatemala, El Salvador and Afghanistan. That factor should be on the record to protect the legitimate refugees and to make sure that their claims go forward to a full oral hearing.

The presentation of that evidence lies at the heart of the ability of the adjudicator and the refugee board member to discriminate between those who might be refugees and those who clearly abuse the system. The thrust of the amendments with which we have dealt up to this point are to provide bonuses to abusers. Nothing that has been suggested has very much to do with the protection of legitimate refugees. It enables people to abuse the system better over a long period of time. I recommend that the House vote against all three amendments.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Madam Speaker, I had the pleasure of listening to the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) which provoked me not only to speak at this point but also to research just what the Member had contributed in the past toward committee reports and other such reports on issues involving refugees. I came across Issue No. 46 of the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration, minutes and proceedings of evidence before the standing committee, and I have here the fifth report which is included in that document in which there are four recommendations.

It is my duty to bring to your attention, Madam Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Calgary West just happened to be the Chairman of the committee at that time. Today we hear the harsh criticism by that member on the beliefs of the Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais), who just happened to take away the job of chairman of the committee from the Member for Calgary West. I am sure though that that has nothing to do with the criticism we are hearing today. Having said that it has nothing to do with it—and you would not want me to suspect otherwise, I never would in any case being the non-partisan individual that I am—I want to put on the record some of the recommendations from the fifth report of the standing committee. First:

1. It is the Committee's strongly-held conviction that Canadians do not want people sent back to countries where they may be persecuted.

#### *Immigration Act, 1976*

Remember who was chairing that committee, Madam Speaker. It was the Member for Calgary West. As far as I can see, that was a unanimous report. The Member for Calgary West certainly did not vote against that recommendation. Let me come to recommendation No. 2 which reads:

2. Every person in Canada who wishes to claim that he or she is a Convention refugee should have an unqualified—

Note the word "unqualified".

—right of access to a formal process that will adjudicate the claim.

It goes on:

3. All Convention refugee claimants should have their case decided at a non-adversarial oral hearing.
4. The decision-maker in the formal process shall have the power, in addition to declaring an individual to be a Convention refugee, to recommend to the Minister that specific individuals who are not within the strict definition of Convention refugee, nevertheless should be considered for landing on compassionate and humanitarian grounds.

Obviously the Member for La Prairie was inspired by the excellent chairmanship provided at the time the fifth report was tabled in this House. As a matter of fact, I would say the Member for Calgary West was the mentor of the Member for La Prairie, who brought these excellent recommendations to us today by way of his amendment.

But what has happened to change the heart and mind of the Member for Calgary West, who himself had such excellent views in the past as we see reflected today in the motion of the junior Member of the House, the new Member for La Prairie, who listened attentively to his former Chairman and learned all those things so well, so well that he brought them to the attention of this House by way of a recommendation? I wonder about that. However, I believe that it has nothing to do with the fact that the Hon. Member for La Prairie took away the job of the Hon. Member for Calgary West when he took over as Chairman. I would never suspect that. Far be it from me to even suggest something like that. I know that the Hon. Member for La Prairie's name was taken in vain today on several occasions by the Hon. Member for Calgary West, obviously for reasons other than the unlikely one I have suggested.

● (1630)

I want to congratulate the Hon. Member for Calgary West for the views he held when this report was tabled in the House some time ago. I cannot help but wonder what caused him to change his mind and his convictions.

I am glad that someone still believes those strongly held views formerly held by the Hon. Member for Calgary West. That person is the Hon. Member for La Prairie who was inspired by the positive views the Hon. Member for Calgary West held in the past. I hope that some day, the Hon. Member for Calgary West, under the excellent chairmanship of the Hon. Member for La Prairie, can once again relearn what he knew so well from the person to whom he taught it in the first place.