

*Government Orders*

of procedure we do not use unless there are good and very sound reasons that it is required.

As a matter of fact, under the Privacy Act of Canada, which is a statute, a law of this Parliament, fingerprinting is considered to be a matter of personal privacy and must be treated in very restricted ways. Fingerprints are considered to be something that cannot be used in a loose fashion and cannot be used for any reason whatsoever. There are certain provisions in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms that put limits on the use of fingerprinting.

I understand that there are also international human rights treaties that Canada has signed that set out limits on the use of fingerprinting.

In the material that was distributed by the minister and his department there is an implication that refugees and immigrants are for the most part out to defraud the government. While there are some who are, there is no doubt about that, it is a bad rap against the great majority of our refugees and our immigrants.

Another good measure in the bill is the one that would extend visitors' visas from three to six months as a general rule. I have to inform the minister that a lot of people who should be getting visitors' visas these days are not getting them. These people's families are ending up in the offices of members of Parliament and we are not getting good explanations as to why visitors' visas are not given.

These are cases in which there has been a death in the family in Canada and a person who lives in India, for example, and has a business there, has a home there, has other members of his family there, applies for a visitor's visa to come to a funeral but is not given the visitor's visa. He has all that evidence that he will return, and a return ticket as well. I have many examples of this happening.

While I welcome the extension of the visitor's visa something must be done to make the granting of visitors' visas more fair.

One of the provisions in the bill that I think is bad and do not understand at all is the greater use of detention. We are not talking about detention for people charged with crimes. We are talking about detaining potential immigrants and refugee claimants because there may be some doubt with respect to their claims. We are afraid that they will disappear so we put them in detention.

Under the present law there must be a review of that placement in detention within 48 hours and then every seven days. Most of these refugees and immigrants, many of whom cannot speak English or French, are not able to organize themselves properly to get a review within the first 48 hours but a great number of them do manage it in the first seven-day review. A great number are released at that review after seven days.

In this legislation we are changing the seven-day review to a 30-day review. That will mean that a lot of people will be kept in detention for 30 days without good cause, and at a great additional cost.

There is one of those detention centres in my constituency. They are going to have to triple the size. If we are going to keep these people in for 30 days and only review their cases every 30 days there is going to be a lot of injustice at a great cost to the taxpayers of this country.

As well, the bill provides for a greater use of deportation orders, as opposed to exclusion orders and departure notices. Again, I do not understand why that is necessary. That is another thing which I have serious doubts about, especially some of the cases mentioned in the bill and in the material. I am asked to vote on such things as a greater use of deportation orders and I am not convinced. We will have to get evidence on that as well.

In the moments that remain I would like to discuss some serious matters that are not dealt with in the bill. Probably the most serious is that there is still no appeal on the merits for refugee applicants turned down by the board. There is an appeal in law, but even that appeal in law is more limited in this bill than in the present law.

For years now the practitioners in immigration, the churches, the NGOs, have pleaded for an appeal process. The minister referred to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. It has also recommended that we should have an internal review or appeal process.

An appeal process is necessary because no matter how good this refugee board is it is going to make mistakes. It is composed of human beings. There have been some terrible mistakes. There is inconsistency in the board's decisions and there is no appropriate review or appeal process. The result is that some people have been deported from this country to areas of conflict, where their lives are going to be in danger, where they are going to be put in prison, while other people in the very same situation are admitted. There is great imbalance.