

suggest seriously to the minister that he reconsider his position concerning Clause 4(2)(b) and indicate whether some adequate adjustment could not be made in order to avoid putting ourselves in defiance of the UN convention of refugees and so as not to create an onerous situation with respect to the six months' imprisonment provision.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment would make three changes respecting reasons for refugees' loss of protection. It would exempt refugees from loss of protection because of a 19(1)(c) type offence, if the offence was of a political nature; it would exempt them from loss of protection for being likely to commit an indictable offence in Canada; and it would amend the standard for which refugees could lose protection because of offences committed in Canada.

It is my opinion that there is no need for the exemption for political offences. On the one hand it is unlikely that a truly political offence would be construed as an offence under Canadian law, as required by the provision respecting criminality. On the other hand it is doubtful that we should welcome a person who has committed a 19(1)(c) type offence—murder, arson, kidnapping, etc.—even if it was committed for political purposes.

The distinction proposed to be made between refugees likely to commit an indictable offence (19)(1)(d)(i) and those likely to participate in organized crime (19)(1)(d)(ii) is difficult to understand. The former are the more immediately dangerous and there would be greater justification for denying protection to them, but the motion proposes just the opposite. In practice, however, we believe that both classes are serious enough to warrant a denial of protection.

The hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) also wishes to change the standard of criminal offences committed in Canada for which a refugee would lose protection. During committee consideration of the bill, this standard was made identical to that for permanent residents, whether the refugee is a permanent resident or a visitor, that is, an offence for which the person actually received more than six months or was liable to five years or more. The hon. member would change this to a single standard of an actual sentence of two years or more. It is difficult to say whether this would mean raising or lowering the standard, since court sentencing practices vary so much. It would have the effect, however, of creating yet another standard in an area that is already complex.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is on motion No. 10 in the name of the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Immigration

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 10 (Mr. MacDonald (Egmont)) negatived on division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The House will now proceed to the consideration of motion No. 11.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal) moved:

Motion No. 11.

—That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 7

(a) by striking out line 29 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"7.(1) The Minister, after consultation with";

(b) by adding immediately after line 3 at page 8 the following new subclause;

"(2) The number announced by the Minister pursuant to subsection (1), shall in no way limit the number of refugees admitted to Canada."

He said: I intend to be very brief, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps, if the minister can clarify this clause, I shall not need to move my amendment, in which case I shall ask for unanimous consent to withdraw it.

I am sure the minister means that the quota is exclusive of refugees. That is the only interpretation a humane government or anyone else could reach. I think our Canadian history with regard to refugees has been particularly honourable. We think of the Hungarians, the Czechoslovaks, the Ugandans and the Chileans who came to Canada in special circumstances, and I would be very upset to think that these refugees were deducted from the quota enunciated in the clause I seek to amend. If the minister could assure me that they are not to be deducted, and that I am under a misapprehension, I would then ask for permission to withdraw. Otherwise I will pursue the amendment and ask hon. members to support it. I hope we are not playing a numbers game and that, if there are special circumstances, the refugees who are admitted are not deducted from the general total.

I should like to draw the minister's attention to a particularly poignant story which is much to the point in terms of the dilemma faced during the British mandate over Palestine. Refugees were assembled in terrible circumstances in Cyprus and special arrangements were made with Britain to try to relieve the refugee camps on Cyprus. With regard to the movement particularly of orphans of one-parent families and of young parents with children, the objective was to move this group out of the Cyprus refugee camps. The British government, to their eternal shame in my opinion, deducted this particular movement of refugees from the quotas into the mandated country. I hope that this occurrence will not happen in present day Israel. I hope there would not be a refugee deduction in a place like Lebanon. The minister should have credit for a very sympathetic movement of people from Leba-