board member. Guyana is a country that produces refugees. That is an evidentiary fact which must be entered on the record and must be taken into account by the adjudicator and the refugee board member. When it is evident that people are coming from a refugee-producing country, their cases must go before the board. That is what the Bill provides.

It is time we stopped dealing with the mythology surrounding this Bill and started dealing with its reality. As a group, these amendments eliminate the possibility for fast determination of bogus claimants. There is not a church group, human rights activist or any Canadian with any credibility who appeared before the committee who did not urge fast removal of bogus claimants. We will eat up all of our resources and all of the good will that exists in Canada toward bogus claimants if we cannot remove them quickly. Removing them quickly is the only way to stop others from arriving.

Some of these amendments try to get rid of the notion of eligibility. Eligibility is determined by an adjudicator and a refugee board member. What are the criteria of eligibility?

First is the question of whether or not the refugee needs the protection of Canada. Those who are already Convention refugees or who have come from a safe third country are not eligible. No one can guarantee absolute safety for every individual in every country we will put on that list, but there will not be many countries that will be unsafe. I suggest that most of the countries on the list will be European, and I suggest that people are as safe there as they would be here.

We do not want to see the constant movement of claimants from country to country. Some claimants have claims existing in three or four western countries all at the same time. The resources of three or four countries are going to a single individual. Are these people, the ones who are already in western European countries like Sweden, Denmark, Holland, France and Britain the most likely to be in need of Canada's protection? No, they are a low priority. The person from Guyana, from El Salvador, from the Middle East or from Asia is the person who needs our help. Therefore, the first eligibility criterion is whether or not the claimants need our help. If they are from a country on the list or if their cases have been determined, they do not need our help.

The next criterion relates to repeat claims or to going past the time when a claim ought to be made. That is a Canadian determination. Those who have already been found not to be refugees or chose not to claim are not eligible. Can we have an endless chain as proposed by these amendments? Should we let a claimant make another claim every time we try to remove him? There would be 10 hearings, 20 hearings, 40 hearings, an infinite number of hearings. That is absolutely absurd and is unfair to legitimate claimants. There must be a moment when the claim is made, the determination is made and removal follows. Failure to remove would be an absolute catastrophe for the system.

What is the third criterion? The Standing Committee report of a year ago June said that it had grave doubts about the protection offered to Canada by the Immigration Act and its processes. Therefore, the third eligibility criterion is security. In a case where there are security questions, instead of going to the board, it would go directly to a federal court judge who would determine whether or not the person is a danger to Canada.

We cannot be the patsies of the world. It is time we toughened the immigration laws and took away the loophole that creates a wide-open door to potential terrorism in Canada. I commend the Government for moving on this matter.

There is not one amendment in this grouping of nine that does not do serious damage to our ability to remove abusers. There is nothing in these provisions that does serious damage in any way, shape or form to legitimate refugee claimants. I believe that the parts of the Bill covered by these amendments should stay as they are.

Mr. David Berger (Laurier): Madam Speaker, it is very difficult to maintain one's composure when one hears the kind of comments made by the Hon. Member. Either he does not understand what has been said by all of the groups representing refugees and by all of the distinguished lawyers who appeared before the committee or he is purposely twisting the views of those groups.

He said that all of these groups are in favour of fast removal of abusers. Sure, they are in favour of that, but they are not in favour of a prescreening process which will not allow claimants full hearings on the merits, and he knows that. He knows about the flaws of this Bill. Nonetheless, he is trying to wrap himself in the flag.

Earlier today, the Hon. Member said that this is the most humanitarian and the best kind of refugee determination process in the world and that it will tell us who all the refugees are. I would like to refer the Hon. Member to the comments of Mr. Arthur Helton of the Lawyers' Committee for Human Rights. Mr. Helton is no slouch. He is an adjunct professor teaching immigration and asylum law at New York University School of Law, the North American co-ordinator of an exchange of legal practitioners under the auspices of the European Consultation on Refugees and Exiles, a practitioner in the United States and a student of other systems. He said that in other countries in Europe where the concept of a safe Third Country has been introduced, the determination is made on an individual basis. It is part and parcel of the process of determining whether a person is in need of protection. It is not an arbitrary decision made on the basis of whether or not a person comes from a country which is on a list prepared by Cabinet, a list subject to all the political considerations about which the standing committee has been warned.

Mr. Helton, when appearing before the committee, said the following:

> Virtually all the countries that utilize the first asylum principle regard it on an individual basis, and in making a determination decide whether or not to assess the intent or wishes of the individual. I would particularly cite Austria, France, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.