

Adjournment Debate

With regard to the future, Mr. Eddy is prohibited from visiting or working in Canada until such time as it is possible to seek relief from the prohibition against him. If, in the interim, there is good reason to admit him to Canada for short periods of time, I can authorize a minister's permit to facilitate this. My decision, of course, would be based on the circumstances prevailing at the specific time he would wish to come forward.

That is fair enough. Unfortunately it is a little late to do anything, as I first got in touch with the minister in a letter sent by hand on July 22, when the matter was pertinent.

I have received today, by coincidence, a letter from Mr. Eddy in which he gives me an up-to-date assessment of what has happened to him as a result of the delay in having this matter, which occurred on July 17, of this year, dealt with before now. His letter is lengthy. I shall quote briefly from the last part and indicate that I am willing to send it to the minister or to his parliamentary secretary, so that the entire document may be available to them. His letter says in part:

... My next statement should probably be better left unsaid, but I now, in my depressed state of mind, find that fairness is as difficult to obtain in Canada as it is here. Most people go to Canada to escape some of the hypocracies here, only to find myself chastised so intolerantly by that immigration executioner. I find myself again a victim to political misuse.

Perhaps the man is exaggerating, but the point involved here, Madam Speaker, is that despite my efforts to intercede for this man he has suffered irreparable damage because of the procedural delays involved. Had he had even a few days to instruct counsel adequately and prepare his defence, I am sure the minister could have made time available in which the man could post a bond or make such arrangements as would permit him to fulfil his contractual obligations.

It is probably too late to help this man now. To demonstrate what type of evidence was used against Mr. Eddy, that evidence forming the basis for his expulsion from this country, may I quote from the sworn statement of an American attorney who has been involved in the case. The circumstances set out by the attorney form the basis for Mr. Eddy's alleged unsuitability for remaining in Canada, even though he had come here for many years and posted a bond each time.

The sworn deposition I am about to refer to comes from Richard G. Taylor, of Miami, Florida, who writes as follows:

Pursuant to our conversation of this day, I am happy to give you a recapitulation in writing. Richard Eddy had occasion approximately 3 years ago to help provide entertainment in a raffle for a Chamber of Commerce men's meeting in Hollywood, Florida. This is a small municipality north of the city of Miami, Florida. Towards the latter part of the evening the Hollywood municipal police department, acting upon an alleged call of a person on the wanted list and being present, surrounded the place. The call turned out to be quite without merit. The police were a bit chagrined and thereafter and incidental to their unsubstantiated call, they arrested Richard Eddy and either one or two other girls for selling chances on prizes, originally, allegedly conducting a lottery and thereafter changed those charges to the principals of the Chamber of Commerce, and, due to the fact that the girls or girl had worn negligées they modified the charges to lewd and lascivious or pornographic of that type and nature.

Actually, the whole matter was totally out of proportion to reality and without any real merit. I disposed of the matters for Mr. Eddy on a nolo contendere basis paying some nominal fine which was much less

[Mr. MacKay.]

trouble and easier and accomplished a disposition for everyone involved.

I am utterly amazed that your country should have heard of the matter inasmuch as this did not in any way involve a state or federal offense. Again, I repeat that the matter was truthfully an unwarranted resultant disposition in a small municipality in southeast Florida.

He goes on to say he knows Mr. Eddy and can vouch for him. I see I am just about out of time, Madam Speaker. I have never met this man. It is the principle that is involved that concerns me.

To make the matter even more ironic, Mr. Eddy had an assistant who was with him at all relevant times when he was in Canada, who underwent the same experience and was treated in the same way, and yet this assistant was not disturbed and was allowed to remain in Canada. I think this says something for the thoroughness and consistency of the procedures used by the particular immigration officers in question.

I have other names and incidents involving people who have been treated in a high-handed way by immigration officers, and I trust the minister will be as good as his word and investigate seriously the attitude and the actions of those people in his department who exercise what amounts to a judicial function, and that he will provide people who are affected some of the traditional judicial safeguards.

I am satisfied on the basis of what I know about this case, and I have gone into it in considerable detail, that at no time was Mr. Eddy given adequate time to instruct counsel properly. The consequences have been very serious. I am sure this is the case with many other people as well, which is why I raise the matter at this time.

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to answer this question on behalf of my hon. friend, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Rompkey), who is absent on official business.

I was not aware that the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) was going to concentrate on a particular case. Therefore I am not able to respond with any details of the particular case. However, I wish to place on record the kind of deportation proceedings and procedures at the point where an immigration officer considers that, for one reason or another, a person should not be allowed to come into, or remain in, Canada. At this point he prepares a report, as required by the Immigration Act, in which he outlines the statutory prohibitions relevant to the case in question.

The person is informed of the contents of the report, given an appointment to appear at an inquiry, and told that he may be represented by counsel should he so desire. Counsel may be a lawyer, clergyman, or in fact any person whom the applicant feels may be of use. The special inquiry officer who conducts the inquiry is an immigration officer whose responsibility it is to inquire into and bring out all relevant facts in the case before him.

Before the fact finding portion of the inquiry begins, if the applicant does not have counsel with him, he is again