assume the Hon. Member for Calgary West refers to. Subclause (7) on page 16 reads:

> If the Minister is of the opinion that the claimant has a credible basis for the claim and informs the adjudicator and the Member of the Refugee Division of that opinion, the adjudicator and the member shall determine that the claimant has a credible basis for the claim.

This is another prescreening. We will have an occasion to speak about that later, Madam Speaker, but I want to point out now that the Government is protecting itself massively against a person who may be a genuine refugee who wants to state his case in the place where the decision will be made. He has to pass through a series of areas. The inquiry is the main barrier, but now we are told there will be another screening before the inquiry. The Government has all these chances to stop a refugee, but it gives him only one chance to say the word that could be a matter of life and death, freedom or imprisonment if he is a genuine refugee.

We have heard a lot of nonsense about how many people are not genuine refugees. I call it nonsense because the figures have been inflated and distorted, sometimes by those who know better. Our committee found two years ago that a majority of the people who had been examined turned out to be either *bona fide* refugees or worthy of having the humanitarian programs of our Government and country applied on their behalf. That was a system unfair to the refugee claimant, according to the decision of our Supreme Court, because most of the claimants had not had an oral hearing before those who would make the decision about them. Even by an unfair test, over half of the claimants had been found to be either *bona fide* refugees or to be worthy of humanitarian protection even though they were not exactly refugees. We should not be so hasty to cut them off. We should not be so hasty to cut them off at the very first chance they have to make their case.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Madam Speaker, it is quite a trick to deal with nine amendments in 10 minutes, which is the consequence of the grouping. I would like to commend the Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais) for his diligence on the committee over many months. I think the committee report was presented in November, 1985. Perhaps it is time that he reread it. I think some of the things he said earlier this day about that report are not accurate. Bill C-55 is absolutely remarkable in the degree to which it is a faithful reproduction of committee recommendations.

Regarding the whole issue of review, the committee recommended a two-person oral hearing with the benefit of the claim going to the claimant with leave to appeal to the Federal Court of Canada. That is exactly what Bill C-55 does. The basic principle of benefit to the claimant runs throughout the Bill. Provision of counsel which the committee recommended runs throughout the Bill. The presence of a refugee board member at every stage of the proceedings, not just the refugee claim, but the issue of removal and departure, is guaranteed by the Bill. The notion of a safe Third Country was deliberately included, not with that language, in our committee report and approved by all three Parties.

It is a little disturbing to listen to statements in this House and statements made in the press about how discrepant this Bill is from what the committee recommended. It is not, and the Bill goes beyond what the committee recommended in its fairness to legitimate refugees. It goes beyond any sense of speed for removal of abusers. There is absolutely no disagreement in Canada that maximum speed for the removal of abusers is not only justified but desirable. I commend the drafters for finding something faster, a series of ways dealing with the situation, than committee members could find. The Bill is very faithful to the principles of the committee report.

I have tried to look at these nine amendments and ask myself, how do we deal with them in what probably now is seven minutes instead of 10? There are absurdities. The motion from the Hon. Member for La Prairie and the motion from the Liberal Party of Canada create the following absurdities which exist in the current law. There is no end for the abuser. There has to be a point at which a claim is made and when that point is passed the person has the opportunity to claim to be a refugee so one can get on to other things. When opposition Members ask us to accept an amendment in this Chamber that provides no such point, an absurdity is created. It becomes impossible to remove someone from this country.

There are about 1,000 people a month who are discovered by immigration enforcement officers to have broken the Immigration Act, to be living and working here illegally, or whatever. The current system has no such point. Three-quarters of these people, 750 a month, are already inside this country legally or illegally, and the minute they face the inquiry for removal they claim to be refugees and five years later maybe we can kick them out. That has to stop, Madam Speaker. When an inquiry for removal begins, every single human being appearing before that inquiry has the right to a taxpayer-paid barrister and solicitor. They have counsel. The question is very simple. Are you a refugee? Yes or no. Counsel can act for the claimant and say yes. That is how simple it is.

• (1350)

We hear of all sorts of examples of frightened human beings. That becomes apparent during an inquiry. The inquiries are not simply an hour and a half long. Seldom will an inquiry on the issue of a removal be anything short of three days. Very commonly they will last at least a week and in some cases three or four weeks.

Bill C-84 allows for detention for 28 days without review by adjudicators for undocumented arrivals. Some 10,000 of them had to be referred to the RCMP for help this year. After all, an inquiry cannot be started until the identity of the person involved is known.

These fears are false. It is true that frightened people arrive in Canada. It is true that frightened people may arrive in Canada from Guyana. This law requires the past history of nationals of a particular country and its refugee claimants to be taken into consideration by the adjudicator and the refugee