

Immigration

Mr. Brewin: Everybody coming in as an immigrant should be fingerprinted.

Mr. Epp: Everyone?

Mr. Brewin: Yes, certainly. You should not choose among people. My friend, Mr. Epp, does not seem to grasp the point I am making.

Mr. Paproski: You mean, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. Would the hon. member please refer to hon. members of this House by riding, and not by name.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It would be "in-Eppt" not to do so.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House and to Your Honour for that faux pas. My point is, although the power to fingerprint applies to people coming to Canada from overseas, it apparently does not apply to those entering Canada from the United States or Great Britain. Such people are hardly ever fingerprinted. I object to certain groups being discriminated against. If you come from Asia, say, you would be fingerprinted. I do not think we should have one law for one group of immigrants and another for another group. Most of them become Canadians, and they should be treated fairly and equally.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the motion proposed by the hon. member would strike out the power to require people seeking an immigration privilege, or those who have been arrested or ordered removed from Canada under the immigration legislation, to identify themselves satisfactorily by means of photography or fingerprinting, as provided for in section 115(1)(n). I point out that clause 111(2)(a) was revised at the committee stage to state more precisely the classes of people who may be asked to submit to photography or fingerprinting.

● (1530)

For people seeking admission, authorization to work or to study, or an extension or change in their status as visitors, our intent is simply to ask them to provide us with photographs so that these can be attached to the document which grants them a privilege, to ensure that it is not used by someone else. If we have reason to suspect that they have misrepresented their identity or have a criminal conviction in their background, and only then, we may ask them to submit to fingerprinting.

For the second group, persons who have been arrested because they are considered dangerous to the public or likely to go into hiding, and persons who already have been ordered removed, we may ask the person to submit to photography or fingerprinting. The reason would be to verify identity when we have reason to believe the person is using an alias, to verify a criminal conviction when there are good grounds to believe one exists, to assist in controlling or deterring the person's return

[Mr. Epp.]

to Canada following removal, where he has a record of using aliases or returning illegally, or to facilitate procurement of travel documents for the person who is to be removed from Canada. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, members may be assured that this power is necessary for the proper carrying out of immigration officials' legal responsibilities, but that it will be used only when it is necessary, and not indiscriminately.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I declare the motion lost. Motion No. 48 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When his Honour, Mr. Speaker, grouped the various amendments now before us for debate he suggested that motions Nos. 49, 50, 51 and 52 could be grouped for debate. Then he said that a separate vote could be called on motions Nos. 49 and 51, but that a vote on motion No. 50 would dispose of motion No. 52. I may say that I had a personal conversation with His Honour a few minutes ago about the point which I wish to raise, and he thought perhaps there was validity to it.

My friend, the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), feels that there is sufficient difference between motion No. 50 in the name of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), and motion No. 52 in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood, that although they could be grouped for debate they should be voted upon separately. I also make the point that motions Nos. 49 and 51 deal with quite different subjects than either motion No. 50 or motion No. 52. I would like to suggest, therefore, that motions Nos. 49 and 51 be dealt with separately, and that motions Nos. 50 and 52 be grouped for debate but be voted on separately. I think that makes more sense, in terms of the substance of the motions.

I see no other problems of this kind. As I have said, I think perhaps the initial reason for grouping them was that they are all amendments to clause 115 of the bill, but they amend it in different areas and in different respects. My suggestion is that motions Nos. 49 and 51 be debated and voted on separately, if there is any debate on them, and that motions Nos. 50 and 52 be grouped for debate but voted on separately.