Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

of. Here were three men who had deserted the U.S. army and had come to Canada. The suggestion now is that they said, "Please take us across so that we can go to jail". The minister's letter to me does not make any such suggestion. In his letter the minister's suggestion is that these three men wanted to regularize their entry into Canada. How they could be so dumb as to regularize something that they knew was already regular, I do not understand.

The point is that as far as I am concerned, and as far as the information that I have is concerned, the behaviour of the officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—and perhaps the behaviour of some immigration officer; I do not know—was sheer, illegal kidnapping; it involved putting these men across the border without any semblance of authority or action taken pursuant to the law.

According to Doug Collins on the television program last night, he spoke to the United States officer, Baty, who arrested these men on the U.S. side. Officer Baty informed Mr. Collins that he had been telephoned and informed that three deserters were going to be available on the U.S. side of the border. Then he came there and took them from the RCMP officers. These are some of the facts as related to me and as related to the people of Canada on television last night.

I am not blaming the minister in this case. It is not a question of my saying that the Solicitor General is in any way responsible. He could not know what the officers did. But I do say that it is a false sense of loyalty for him to be satisfied with an inquiry made "inside the show", for him to be satisfied with information given him by people who, even if they were the absolute apostles of truth, would nevertheless be influenced by the fact that they had to justify actions which, unless they could do so, were obviously outside the law. This is not the kind of inquiry that will give him or give this Parliament the truth.

The only way to get the facts is to have a judge or some other disinterested person inquire into the case. The minister should want this independent inquiry; it should not be necessary for me to pressure him to seek it. He should want it for the sake of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. He should want it for his sake and for the sake of his department. If he is not ready to order such independent inquiry, I suggest he is either being misguided or he is so anxious to hide facts that would show his officers to be in the

wrong that he is prepared to jeopardize the reputation of the force.

I have heard on a number of occasions in the past about what appeared to be similar illegal action by officers who had taken people across the line from Canada to the United States and placed them in custody on the other side without the necessary deportation order. Before a deportation order can be issued legally, a special inquiry has to be held. People are entitled to be represented by counsel, and they are entitled to appeal from the deportation order if they wish to. None of this took place. Indeed, an inquiry made by Mr. Rosenbloom of the immigration department showed that there was no deportation order on record. There was no copy of such order at Huntingdon or anywhere else.

These three men who were in Canada legally suddenly found themselves under arrest on the other side. They did not cross the border voluntarily, because within an hour, I understand, of their arrest they kicked in the back of the truck or vehicle or paddy-wagon, or whatever it was they were held in, and escaped. Two of the men were recaptured. One of them, at least as of this afternoon, was still at large and seeking, I hope, to come back to this country. This kind of behaviour by officers of the Crown, acting in whatever capacity, cannot be tolerated in a democratic country and should not be condoned by the minister concerned. I am not suggesting that he is condoning it; I am suggesting that if he does not make the necessary independent inquiry he will be, in effect, objectively condoning it.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raised this question in the House of Commons this afternoon. I had anticipated he was going to raise it on Friday, but regrettably he was not here then. He had previously exchanged some correspondence with me, giving me certain information which I had investigated and replied to. He has given me certain additional information and participated in a television show last night which I did not see and, regrettably, I have not had the text of it delivered to me as yet. I told him this afternoon I would investigate this new material—I thought I made that very clear-before dealing with his point as to whether there is any need for a further inquiry of the nature he suggests.

The hon. member makes very many direct allegations. For instance, he says these men were deported from Canada. I do not know