

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the minister can achieve the same result, so far as people who are not members of the criminal element are concerned, by requiring a visitor's visa or something of that nature. Is that not so?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is suggesting that all visitors to Canada must have a visitor's visa obtained abroad, then he is opening up a whole new range of policy, program and techniques to which I was alluding when I replied to my hon. friend from Timiskaming. I personally would not at this stage be favourably disposed to exercise that option, but I will not rule it out in terms of a more profound examination of the subject that we will be having shortly when the green paper is forthcoming. I would rather hope that I could convince my hon. friend at that time that, while a visitor's visa sounds like an easy method of control, the trade-offs will be quite difficult to accept. I do not see this as a substitute, certainly not for now anyway; but we can examine it in more detail when we take a look at the green paper and at the government's position on the new immigration act in total.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister said there were 128 situations where the bill could apply. I assume there is some deficiency in the Criminal Code, or at least in the present Immigration Act, which has led the minister to bring forward this amendment. I am curious to know the advice the minister received regarding the existing provisions and why he feels that there is a deficiency in the existing law. If that was the advice he received, how many of these particular instances to which he refers, in approximate figures if he has not the exact figures, were not successfully prosecuted in the eyes of the government?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Chairman, I did try to deal with that in my opening remarks. I noted that the immigration critic of the hon. member's party agreed that the current law is inadequate to permit successful prosecution under the act, which was the advice the legal officers of the Crown gave me and gave my predecessors for a considerable number of years. I also noted that the hon. member for Broadview agreed that the wording of the present act does leave a loophole, which mainly lies in the fact that under the present act the onus is upon the officer. The wording is "shall not be admitted".

Provided the returning deportee does not state an untruth, does not lie, about the condition of his or her re-entry, then I am told that no prosecution would really stand up. Of course our difficulty is that there are 70 million crossings a year. If we could take the time to set up a system whereby everyone who crossed the border was asked, "Are you a returning deportee, or have you been deported from this country?" and if the answer was no when in fact the contrary was the case, then we could prosecute. However, as I have said, there were 128 instances last year out of a total of 70 million crossings. That is the number, so far as we know. I am not going to boast to the hon. member that I can be absolutely sure that that is the total number, but that is the number we identified. However, there is a lot of room for error within that figure of 70 million. There is a lot of movement within that 70 million and a lot of room for error. We know this,

Adjournment Debate

and in almost every case these were people the like of whom we would all prefer not to have back in Canada.

● (2230)

Clause 1 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Andras moved that the bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): By leave, now.

Mr. Andras moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—ROLE OF ISRAEL IN DECIDING ATTENDANCE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PALESTINIAN LIBERATION ORGANIZATION AT GENEVA CONFERENCE—POSITION OF CANADA

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, the minister's reply to my question of November 26 in effect underscored and restated his UN declaration regarding the role of Israel in determining the makeup of the Palestinian delegation at the Geneva conference. At New York the minister stated that Israel was an essential party in deciding the question. An earlier version of the text used the word "principal", but apparently this was not considered sufficiently strong and the word "essential" was inserted.

For a long time the minister and his predecessors have said that Canada recognized the right of the Palestinians to be represented at Geneva. The minister referred to this again in his UN speech, although in somewhat muted tones. It is now clear to the world that the Palestinian question, the fate of the Palestinian people, is at the heart of the continuing Middle East crisis. It is also clear that the Palestinians must be heard. They must be given an opportunity to present their case. This they received at the United Nations, and a considerable body of world opinion believes they should be at Geneva. No sensitive, compassionate person can be deaf or blind to the fate of one and a half million people living out a hopeless, sorrowful existence in squalid refugee camps.

In light of Canada's expressed belief that the Palestinians should be at Geneva, I asked the minister how he envisaged their representation coming about. All the Arab