

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

*Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs*

## **Report on a visit to closed detention centres for asylum seekers and immigrants in Belgium by a delegation from the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE)**

**Rapporteur: Mr Giusto Catania**

### **I. Introduction – structure of the visit**

A delegation of four MEPs (see list of participants attached – Annex 1) visited three closed detention centres for asylum seekers and illegal immigrants in Belgium (see attached programme – Annex 2).

The aim of the visit was primarily to gather information as to how asylum seekers and migrants are accommodated in Belgium's closed detention centres and to report on the implementation of European regulations and directives on asylum such as:

- Council Directive 2003/9/EC of 27 January 2003 laying down minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers in Member States<sup>1</sup> (Reception Directive),
- Council Directive 2005/85/EC of 1 December 2005 on minimum standards on procedures in Member States for granting and withdrawing refugee status<sup>2</sup> (Procedures Directive),
- Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003 of 18 February 2003 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an asylum application lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national<sup>3</sup> (Dublin II Regulation).

In addition, the visit was an opportunity to exchange views with civil society and to meet the authorities.

This visit follows other similar trips on the part of the LIBE Committee to Italy, Spain, France, Malta and Greece.

Before visiting the centres, the delegation received a substantial amount of information from various organisations and NGOs, to whom the delegation would like to express its sincere

<sup>1</sup> Official Journal L 031 of 06/02/2003 pp. 0018-0025.

<sup>2</sup> Official Journal L 326 of 13/12/2005 pp. 0013-0034.

<sup>3</sup> Official Journal L 050 of 25/02/2003 pp. 0001-0010.

gratitude. These include, in particular, the Coordination et Initiatives pour et avec les Réfugiés et Étrangers (Coordination and Initiatives for and with Refugees and Aliens, CIRE), the Centre pour l'égalité des chances et pour la lutte contre le racisme (Centre for Equal Opportunities and Combating Racism), Médecins Sans Frontières, Aide aux Personnes Déplacées asbl (Aid to Displaced Persons) and UNHCR (the UN High Commission for Refugees).

The delegation also held a meeting on 10 October 2007 with a large number of representatives from organisations and NGOs active in the field of immigration and asylum in Belgium (see attached list – Annex 3), and the delegation would like to thank them for their cooperation and time.

The delegation visited three detention centres for immigrants and asylum seekers: the 'INAD', '127' and '127 bis' centres, which form three of the six closed detention centres in Belgium<sup>4</sup>.

The MEPs' visit attracted the attention of the Belgian media. Belgian journalists and some reporters from the Euronews channel wanted to accompany the delegation inside the centres. However, neither access to journalists nor the taking of photographs inside the centres was authorised by the Office des étrangers (Aliens Department), which is responsible for running the three centres. It considered this decision to be more respectful of the detainees' privacy.

It was therefore agreed with the journalists (particularly the Belga press agency, a team from Euronews and RTBF Radio) that they could instead wait for the delegation at the exit to the '127' centre.

A press conference was held at the European Parliament on 18 October 2007.

After the visit, the delegation wanted to meet the Minister for the Interior, Mr Patrick Dewael, who is responsible for asylum and immigration policy. A proposal was made to him in this regard but the Minister considered it preferable that such a meeting be held with his successor, given that he was only temporarily in post.

## **II. Background**

### **A. Categories of people who may be held in closed detention centres in Belgium**

Various categories of people are accommodated in closed detention centres in Belgium:

- **people having requested asylum in Belgium** (for details see below).
- **people having requested asylum in another EU country** – when a person requests asylum in another EU country or reaches Belgian territory via that country, the authorities request the latter to take responsibility for the person in question.

---

<sup>4</sup> The others are the Centre pour immigrés irréguliers de Vottem (Vottem Centre for Illegal Immigrants, CIV), the Centre pour immigrés irréguliers de Merksplas (Merksplas Centre for Illegal Immigrants, CIM) and the Centre pour immigrés irréguliers de Bruges (Bruges Centre for Illegal Immigrants, CIB).

Whilst awaiting their return to that country, the person is held in a closed detention centre in Belgium.

- **Community nationals** – it emerges from the centres’ annual reports, along with explanations received by the delegation, that Community nationals are held in closed detention centres in Belgium with a view to their deportation. According to statements made by an official from the Office des étrangers during the visit, such nationals may be detained by the police because they are suspected of having been involved in ‘petty crime’ or of having been ‘moonlighting’; they are then taken to a closed centre prior to deportation.<sup>5</sup>
- **people in Belgium illegally** – people picked up in Belgium who are not in possession of the required documents, people who have overstayed their permitted time in the country, people deemed to pose a threat to public order or national security or people exercising a self-employed or employed professional activity without the necessary authorisation may be issued with an order to leave the country along with a decision to return them to the border and hold them in custody to this effect.
- **people declared ‘inadmissible’**: on their arrival at the border they are refused entry. They are generally held at the ‘INAD’ centre.

## B. Length of detention

Whilst asylum procedures could, in the past, take several years, ending in the expulsion of families who were by then already integrated into Belgium, figures dating from 2006 that were presented to the delegation (when the old procedure was still in place) demonstrate that they were becoming faster.

Nevertheless, since the entry into force of the new law in June 2007, periods of time spent in detention have increased since the whole of the procedure, and not just that previously known as the admissibility phase, may now take place whilst in detention.

The length of detention is in principle limited to five months by the Law of 15 December 1980, with the possibility of extending this to eight months for reasons of public order or national security. In practice, however, detention has no limit in Belgium since a new time limit commences when a person appeals against his/her deportation. A duration of a year is exceptional.

In addition, the figures given by the Ministry of the Interior for lengths of detention only partly correspond to reality. This is because of the way in which detention times are calculated. The only figures provided by the Office des étrangers are average detention times by centre, and not average lengths by detainee. The total length of detention that a person has actually experienced is thus not accounted for because transfers between centres are not

---

<sup>5</sup> Under Belgian law, citizens of the Union or members of their families may be detained for the period strictly necessary for their deportation if they have not complied with an order to leave the territory within the time limit set. European Community aliens may be denied entry and residence only on grounds of public policy, national security or public health (Law of 25 April 2007 amending the Law of 15 December 1980 on access to the territory for, and residence, settlement and deportation of, aliens). In addition, those who are denied such permission are in every case people who are not registered with the municipal administration of the place where they are residing or have not applied for such registration.

included in the calculations, and there is a very high number of transfers between centres. By way of example, the 2006 report for the '127 bis' centre notes that *of the 2 228 people registered, 126 came from other centres: in 2006, 176 inmates were transferred to another detention centre.*

A detainee who has spent two months in the '127' centre, then three months in the '127 bis' centre and 24 hours at 'INAD' before deportation will thus appear in the statistics three times. For the administration, this person will not be someone who has spent more than five months in detention. Quite the contrary, in statistical terms it will refer to three individuals whose periods of detention will appear, by centre, as being two months, three months and 24 hours respectively. Paradoxically, this detainee – who will have spent five months in detention centres – will enable the administration to lower the statistics on lengths of detention considerably.

It is therefore important that the public authorities publish lengths of detention by detainee and not only by centre. This would appear to be technically possible, according to the Directorate-General of the Office des étrangers, and will be done as soon as possible.

### **C. Observations with regard to Belgium's asylum procedure**

Prior to June 2007 the procedure for requesting asylum took place in two stages: the Office des étrangers (OE) would consider the admissibility of the application and the Commissariat général aux réfugiés et aux apatrides (Commissioner-General's Office for Refugees and Stateless Persons, CGRA) would rule on the validity of the application.

Following numerous criticisms of the old procedure from the Council of Europe and civil society (delays in processing very long files, accusations of malfunctioning within the Office des étrangers, etc.) and following a ruling against Belgium in the European Court of Human Rights (Conka v. Belgium), a reform was promised for 2000.

In 2005 a planned reform was approved and a new law on aliens entered into force in full on 1 June 2007. Since then asylum applications have been dealt with according to the new asylum procedure.

The two stages (admissibility and substantive) for examining asylum requests have been abolished. The Office des étrangers is no longer authorised to examine the admissibility of asylum applications but is still responsible for taking a decision with regard to residence status, detention in a closed centre and expulsion of the asylum seeker.

#### **Asylum bodies**

1. **The Office des étrangers (OE)** reports to the Ministry of the Interior and is the body responsible for entry into national territory, residence, settlement, holding aliens in detention centres and removal of aliens in general.
2. **The Commissariat General aux Réfugiés et aux Apatrides (CGRA)** examines asylum applications.
3. **The Conseil du Contentieux des étrangers (Council for Alien Disputes, CCE)** has the power to confirm or reverse the decisions of the CGRA.

4. **The Conseil d'État (State Council)** merely monitors the legality of the procedure, without being able to take a decision in place of the asylum body being challenged.

### Stages in the asylum procedure

1. **Request for asylum:** aliens make their request for asylum to the Office des étrangers. If they are entering Belgium without the necessary papers, they must make their request either at the border or within 8 working days.
2. The OE registers the request and conducts an **interview of the person**, which is limited to their identity, origin and route. The OE gives the asylum seeker a **questionnaire** to fill in giving the reasons why they are seeking asylum and what possibilities there are of returning to the country from which they have fled. This declaration is signed by the asylum seeker and then passed on to the CGRA with the complete file.
3. The OE establishes **which Member State of the European Union is responsible for examining the application**, in line with the Dublin II Regulation, and examines **multiple asylum applications**.
4. **Examination of the asylum application: the Commissariat général aux réfugiés et aux apatrides (CGRA)** has the authority to recognise or refuse refugee status and to grant or refuse subsidiary protection status.
5. **Lodging an appeal with the Conseil du contentieux des étrangers (CCE) against a CGRA decision:** the Conseil du contentieux des étrangers has the authority to confirm or reverse the decisions of the CGRA. Appeals to the CCE must be lodged within a period of 15 days following notification of the CGRA's decision. The lodging of an appeal suspends execution of the contested decision.
6. The decisions of the CCE are only open to an appeal against their legality ('cassation administrative') before the **Conseil d'État**.

If a person arrives in Belgium with all the necessary documents and makes a request for asylum then they may remain in an 'open centre' whilst their request is being considered. Open centres are run by FEDASIL, the federal reception agency, which was established in 2002. Most asylum seekers within the country are referred to the open centres, where 15 807 places are available<sup>6</sup>. In contrast, other asylum seekers are held in the country's closed centres (with the exception of the 'INAD' centre).

These closed detention centres may house the following asylum seekers:

- people who request asylum at the border: they may be held throughout the duration of the procedure for examining their asylum request;
- asylum seekers who made their request on Belgian soil and have had it rejected (including those who have submitted an appeal to the Conseil d'État), even if they spent the whole of the asylum procedure in an open centre;

---

<sup>6</sup> Source: FEDASIL, <http://www.fedasil.be/home/table1/>

- people who made their request for asylum in a closed centre: these people are initially detained for being in the country illegally. Once in the closed centre, they make a request for asylum and remain there throughout the procedure.
- people having requested asylum in another country of the EU ('Dublin' cases) or people making a second application in Belgium.

### **III. Meeting with NGOs**

For NGOs the practice of the administrative detention of aliens in Belgium raises serious problems in terms of respect for basic rights and human dignity. They stress that, according to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, liberty must be the rule and detention the exception. Since the asylum procedure was reformed, however, the possibilities of detention have clearly increased<sup>7</sup>. Moreover, periods of detention have also increased because now the whole procedure, and not just that which was previously known as the admissibility phase, may be spent in a closed centre<sup>8</sup>.

During the meeting with the MEPs, the NGOs highlighted a number of problems:

#### **1. Child detention**

The NGOs noted that the number of children detained in closed centres had reached extremely worrying levels in recent years. Whilst 152 children were detained in 2004, this had risen to 627 in 2006. Moreover, the actual figure is higher as it does not take the Vottem centre into account, where children were held from March to June 2006, nor the '127' centre where children were, and still are, held.

They noted that the psychological after-effects on a child detained in this way have been proven on a number of occasions: by a study of the Université Libre de Bruxelles in 1999 and a study commissioned by the Ministry of the Interior, which clearly states that: *'holding families with children is, from the point of view of the rights of the child and their well-being, unacceptable under current circumstances. The detention of children is currently applied in rather an arbitrary manner and not as an exceptional last resort. For some groups, detention is automatic, particularly for families who fall within the scope of the Dublin Convention. In this context, detention has effectively become automatic, and consequently trivialised'*.<sup>9</sup>

These studies have again been confirmed in recent months by other reports, including that of the Flemish Commission on children's rights<sup>10</sup> and Médecins Sans Frontières<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Article 74/6(1a) of the Law of 15 December 1980 on entering the country, residence, establishment and removal of aliens. No fewer than 15 situations warrant the detention of asylum seekers once they have made an application.

<sup>8</sup> Article 74/6(2) of the Law of 15 December 1980 on entering the country, residence, establishment and removal of aliens. Whilst previously the period of detention during the procedure could not exceed two months, now in some cases an asylum seeker may spend up to 3 months and 15 days in detention, without having received an enforceable decision.

<sup>9</sup> Study on the alternatives to detaining families with children in closed detention centres prior to their removal.

Part 2: Vision and recommendations:

[http://corporate.skynet.be/mensenruimte/SumResearch/downloads/News/CentreAlternative/deel\\_2\\_visie\\_FR.pdf](http://corporate.skynet.be/mensenruimte/SumResearch/downloads/News/CentreAlternative/deel_2_visie_FR.pdf) p.19.

<sup>10</sup> Kinderrechtencommissariaat, *'Heen en retour: Kinderrechten op de Vlucht'*.

<sup>11</sup> Médecins sans Frontières, *'Le coût humain de la détention'*.

## **2. Length of detention**

According to the NGOs, despite the law establishing a maximum detention period of five months, the time spent in detention in Belgium is sometimes, in fact, far longer. Some people have already spent more than one year, continuously, in different closed detention centres. The psychological effects of such long periods of detention are devastating.

## **3. Legal insecurity**

Many detainees state that they are confused about the different procedures. During their visits the NGOs observe shortcomings in terms of the information given to the detainees, legal assistance and certain procedures.

There are no interpreters in the centres. They sometimes use the services of telephone interpreters but sometimes detainees translate for one another, with all the difficulties inherent in translating administrative or legal texts.

Reasons for this legal insecurity include:

- The lack of independence of the centres' social services: their staff are civil servants working for the Ministry of the Interior whose task it is to inform detainees but also to *'prepare for their possible expulsion'*<sup>12</sup>.
- Shortcomings in the information provided to migrants: information brochures that are provided to detainees on the procedures are not updated (several months after its entry into force there is no brochure available on the new asylum procedure in various languages) and information on the available methods of appeal is not always given to detainees. These observations are also confirmed by UNHCR.
- Problems relating to legal aid.

The detainee has the right to an appeal procedure that suspends his or her obligation to leave the country. This is only truly suspensive if it is made within 24 hours of being placed in detention. In some centres, however (including '127 bis'), the appointment of a *pro deo* lawyer may take three to four days or more, automatically depriving the detainee of the benefit of an extremely important suspensive appeal procedure. Such a short deadline also raises issues with regard to the question of its effectiveness (Article 13 of the ECHR).

## **4. The arrest of asylum seekers**

The NGOs see how the people are sometimes arrested. The asylum seeker is called in with his/her family members for a minor administrative reason: to complete the file, etc. When they arrive at the Office des étrangers, the person is arrested and taken to a closed detention centre, *although the request to attend gives no indication of this possibility*.

This practice on the part of the Belgian authorities has already been prohibited by the European Court of Human Rights in the Conka case<sup>13</sup>. The Court stated that *'a conscious decision by the authorities to facilitate or improve the effectiveness of a planned operation for the expulsion of aliens, even those in an illegal situation, by misleading them about the purpose of a notice so as to make it easier to deprive them of their liberty is not compatible*

---

<sup>12</sup> Article 68 of the Royal Decree of 2 August 2002 establishing the regime and rules of operation applicable to closed centres. Job offers for social workers in closed centres published by the Public Service responsible for recruiting these civil servants (Selor) state: 'as the official responsible for repatriation you will, by means of interviews, prepare residents for their expulsion such that this can be effectively conducted under humane conditions'.

<sup>13</sup> Conka v. Belgium 51564/99 (Sect. 3) (bil.) ECHR 2002 – I – (5.02.02).

with Article 5 (ECHR)'. This is even more relevant when it relates to people who are not illegally resident.

Under the so-called Dublin procedure (see above), even people who have duly presented themselves when asked to do so over a period of several months are suddenly arrested and detained, the reason given being that there is a risk that they will not agree to being escorted back to the border.

During the EP delegation's visit, these practices were confirmed by migrants and, particularly, by the account of a young woman who was arrested in this way, together with her children, before being taken to a closed detention centre.

### **5. Recurrent medical and psychological problems in closed detention centres**

According to the NGOs, seriously ill people are frequently detained and others develop illnesses directly related to their detention. The lack of independence of the medical and social services must be emphasised, together with the fact that psychologists undertake this work whilst also being members of the detention centre's management.

### **6. Conditions of detention**

Apart from problems of dilapidation, there is a strong prison atmosphere: a high presence of guards, barbed wire, video surveillance and a disciplinary regime that extends to isolation. The possibilities for exercise are very limited (around two hours per day) as are the possibilities of contact with the outside world (it is possible to telephone out by paying for a telephone card but not to receive calls, except from one's lawyer).

Another problem that is often very difficult for the detainees, some of whom have lived in Belgium for years and have links with the country, is that visits from family and friends are impossible in centres located near an airport.

The NGOs also complained about the uncertain nature of their right to visit the centres: this right is at the discretion of the Ministry of the Interior and may be withdrawn by the authorities without any reason, which, according to the NGOs themselves, could make their work less effective. The NGOs do not have access to the 'INAD' centre.

### **7. Pressure and violence surrounding deportations<sup>14</sup>**

The main feature of deportations is their lack of accountability. External controls are virtually non-existent, internal controls are sporadic, there is no video surveillance and the chances that a complaint should actually succeed are virtually nil. The NGOs report numerous cases of violence during deportations.

## **IV. Description of the visit to the administrative detention centres**

### **A. The 'INAD' centre (Zaventem airport)**

The 'INAD' centre is situated within the actual buildings of Brussels National Airport. It was opened to receive (so-called) 'inadmissibles', i.e. men, women and children who are refused

---

<sup>14</sup> Taken from the summary of the report 'Centres fermés pour étrangers État des lieux', [http://www.liguedh.be/medias/579\\_etat\\_des\\_lieux\\_centres\\_fermes.pdf](http://www.liguedh.be/medias/579_etat_des_lieux_centres_fermes.pdf).

entry and who are thus waiting to leave without having entered the country.

It was opened following the criticisms made previously with regard to the accommodation (sleeping on mattresses on the floor) and hygiene conditions that people refused entry to Belgium had to endure.

The following people may be held in the 'INAD' centre:

- people who are the subject of a deportation order because they do not have the necessary documents to enter the country or because the reason for their visit is, in the opinion of the border police, 'not clear'<sup>15</sup>. They are held whilst waiting for the airline that brought them to take them back;
- people illegally resident and considered as being easily deported;
- failed asylum seekers who have been held in a closed detention centre and who are transferred to the 'INAD' centre a few hours before their deportation.

The 2006 report, which the delegation received from the Belgian authorities, also lists more than 200 EU citizens who have stayed at 'INAD' (from Malta, Germany, France, Poland, the United Kingdom, Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Latvia and Lithuania).

It seems that, in principle, people held at the 'INAD' centre do not stay for long although, if they challenge their deportation order, they run the risk of remaining there longer.

### *Conditions in the centre*

The centre is tiny. It is the size of a flat and consists of relatively small rooms: an entrance hall, a living room, a kitchen and two small dormitories (one for men and one for women) with around fifteen bunk beds in each. There are windows looking out onto the airport tarmac but no possibility of opening them. The detainees are not allowed to go out into the fresh air.

Neither NGOs nor visitors have access to the 'INAD' centre because the centre is within the airport. UNHCR told the delegation that it regretted that it was not allowed regular access to 'INAD'.

There are no social workers. No infrastructure is in place for children who arrive at 'INAD'.

The delegation considers that the material conditions of the accommodation are not suited to detention and, in any case, not for more than a few hours; in this regard it agrees with the conclusions of the Council of Europe's Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) in its last report on 'INAD'.

It appears that plans for a new centre are under way.

### *Discussions with the authorities*

During discussions with the authorities' representatives and, in particular, when the representative of the Office des étrangers was asked a question, the latter described to the MEPs how, during deportations, people who appeared nervous or aggressive were handcuffed in case they tried to escape or for security reasons. Handcuffs are also used on people when

---

<sup>15</sup> See below for a direct account of this.

they are moved from one centre to another or from a centre to the airport.

The rapporteur asked which countries people are repatriated to: to the country of transit or the country of origin. The example of someone arriving in Belgium from Africa and passing through Libya was mentioned. The OE's representative said that in such cases the people are sent back to Libya, the country of transit, in accordance with the agreements on airline responsibilities (Chicago Convention).

During a discussion on the issue of placing aliens in the transit area, the OE's representative provided some explanations to the delegation.

When a person arrives at the border, they receive two separate decisions, a decision to deport them and a decision to detain them for that purpose. If the Chambre du Conseil (Chamber of the Council) decides that this detention is illegal and the person must be released, the Office des étrangers decides to 'release' this person into the transit area of the national airport.

The delegation considers this practice to be unacceptable: people find themselves in the transit area without any support; they have to sleep on seats in the airport or even on the floor, without any possibility of taking a shower. In truth, one kind of detention is replaced by another. The European Court of Human Rights has, moreover, ruled that a transit area may be considered a place of detention<sup>16</sup>.

In addition, the dissuasive nature of this 'release' makes the legal remedy for challenging the decision to detain someone in a closed centre ('INAD') ineffective, and this infringes the European Convention on Human Rights. The detainees are informed that a possible release will result in their being placed in the transit area, which discourages many of them from making the appeal for their release that is provided for by law.

The practice has already been widely denounced by Belgian NGOs, lawyers and the Federal Belgian Ombudsman. The Brussels Court of First Hearing (Tribunal de première instance), sitting in summary proceedings in 2003, also considered that the Belgian State was responsible for unlawful conduct tantamount to a 'farce'. The Court stated that this was inadmissible and contrary to the rule of law and that *'the Belgian State is placing [the alien] in another closed place (transit area) in which his/her living conditions are inhuman and degrading in the hope that [that person] decides to comply with the expulsion order "voluntarily"'*.

In its last report on Belgium, the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture<sup>17</sup> also recommended that the Belgian authorities should immediately take the necessary measures to put an end to this practice once and for all. The rapporteur is in complete agreement with these recommendations and requests that the Office des étrangers provide clarification on these practices given that, as far as the MEPs are aware, three cases of 'release' into the transit area occurred during September 2007.

Moreover, Belgium was very recently condemned by the European Court of Human Rights, in a ruling dated 24 January 2008<sup>18</sup>, for having 'released' two Palestinian nationals into the

---

<sup>16</sup> Guzzardi v. Italy, 6 November 1980, Amuur v. France, 25 June 1996 and Shamsa v. Poland, 27 November 2003 rulings.

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.cpt.coe.int/documents/bel/2006-15-inf-fra.htm> paragraph 49.

<sup>18</sup> RIAD and IDIAB v. BELGIUM (Petitions 29787/03 and 29810/03).

transit area of Brussels airport. The Court considered that placing them in the transit area did indeed constitute a form of detention, that this detention was illegal and that it represented inhuman and degrading treatment.

### *Testimony from migrants*

At the time of the visit only three people were present in the centre. Two of them, from the Congo and Rwanda, were in possession of the necessary documents required to enter Belgium (study visa, travel documents, money, etc.) but had received a deportation order because the reason for their journey, in the opinion of the border police, 'was not clear'. They were being held whilst waiting for the airline they had arrived on to take them back.

As in the case of these two people, when someone is refused entry to the country they receive:

- a form indicating the reason,
- a decision to hold them in a closed detention centre.

The form is filled in by the border control official and is written in Dutch. The foreigner has to sign at the bottom. The delegation is surprised that the alien receives no translation of this form, even if he or she speaks one of the two other Belgian national languages, French or German. The decision to hold them in a closed detention centre is produced both in Dutch and in French but is based on the deportation order, which is only in Dutch. The authorities say that this practice accords with Belgian law on the use of languages for administrative purposes.

The person has 24 hours to lodge an appeal against the deportation order under the urgent applications procedure (which suspends deportation). If the Conseil du contentieux des étrangers (CCE) fails to give its verdict within 72 hours then deportation is once again possible.

For those people wishing to obtain the support of a lawyer, the centre's authorities give them a telephone directory. They may choose between a publicly assigned lawyer (whose services come free of charge) and a lawyer of their own choice (at their expense). There is a public phone in reception but it is impossible to call from there with any privacy. Lawyers wishing to meet with their clients must do so in the airport police offices, where their client is taken under police escort from the 'INAD' centre.

## **B. The '127 transit centre' (Melsbroek)**

This centre is situated in Melsbroek, alongside the military airport. It is built from prefabricated units (dormitories of around 20 beds, common room, kitchen, canteen and visitors' rooms). A small part (management, social services, medical department) is of permanent construction. There is a small courtyard but the time allocated for exercise in the open air is limited. The centre is surrounded by wire fences and barbed wire.

The centre is dilapidated. It dates from 1988, when it was built as a temporary measure. The delegation notes that this 'temporary' situation has lasted 20 years. The creation of a new centre to replace 'INAD' and '127' was announced several years ago. The first stone was laid by the Minister of the Interior, P. Dewael, several months ago but construction is expected to start in March 2009 and the centre should be operational in 2010.

The people held in the centre are men, women and accompanied children, asylum seekers and illegal immigrants.

The last report on the centre in 2006 gave the following figures:

In all, 2 132 detainees were registered in 2006; this figure is continuing to rise in relation to previous years.

Of these, 558 were women, 152 were accompanied minors and 31 were unaccompanied minors.

The average length of stay for unaccompanied minors was 25.2 days in 2006, the shortest period being 1 day and the longest 66 days.

The average age in 2006 was 27. The centre's youngest resident was three months old and its oldest was 64 years old.

One person had been released into the transit area; three had escaped.

According to the report, hundreds of EU nationals were held in this centre during 2006: Polish: 321; Czech: 12; Hungarian: 11; Slovakian: 10; Latvian: 5; Estonian: 2; German: 1; Slovenian: 1.

The presence of families, accompanied and unaccompanied children raises serious problems given the complete lack of privacy in this detention centre: children sleep in the same dormitories as adults who are not family members.

Detainees cannot receive visits from friends or family because the centre is located within the airport. Members of NGOs visit them.

### *Discussions with the authorities*

During the visit to the '127' centre, the OE's representative told the delegation that Member State nationals were detained in the '127' centre 'because they are suspected of petty crimes or moonlighting'.<sup>19</sup> The detention of these people, in the absence of any conviction, raises many issues. The MEPs questioned the centre's authorities in this regard and consider that further explanations are necessary: if they are criminals then justice must take its course but if they are innocent people then they should be released.

In the case of the detention of children, the authorities explained that there was a difference in treatment between accompanied and unaccompanied children:

- Accompanied children remain with their parents or legal guardian in the closed centre in order to preserve the unity of the family.
- Unaccompanied minors arriving at the Belgian border, about whose age there are no doubts, are kept at observation and guidance centres. If their age is uncertain, minors remain at the closed centre for as long as is strictly necessary in order to ascertain their age.

---

<sup>19</sup> Under Belgian law, citizens of the Union or members of their families may be detained for the period strictly necessary for their deportation if they have not complied with an order to leave the territory within the time limit set. European Community aliens may be denied entry and residence only on grounds of public policy, national security or public health (Law of 25 April 2007 amending the Law of 15 December 1980 on access to the territory for, and residence, settlement and deportation of, aliens). In addition, those who are denied such permission are in every case people who are not registered with the municipal administration of the place where they are residing or have not applied for such registration.

A brochure is also said to be available in several languages.

The social services assist asylum seekers with practical matters, monitor their cases and give them information about the procedure and the rules.

### *Testimony from migrants*

The people interviewed showed their children to the delegation saying that this was not a place for them, that they live and sleep with adult strangers and that they constantly hear the discussions of adults.

Some people complained of the noise of planes taking off and landing, which is sometimes deafening.

A boy from Rwanda recounted the procedure followed for his case and complained that he had not been able to fill in the questionnaire given to him by the Office des étrangers himself and that the official who had filled it in had made errors that had then had implications for the rest of the procedure.

Belgian legislation stipulates that the OE must register the application, interview the person and 'give the alien a questionnaire in which he is invited to give the reasons for his request for asylum along with the possibilities for returning to the country from which he fled'<sup>20</sup>. This declaration is signed by the asylum seeker and then passed on to the Commissariat général with the complete file. Nothing in the law states that the official must fill in the questionnaire on behalf of the asylum seeker.

According to the NGOs interviewed, it seems, however, that in practice it is the OE officials who fill in the questionnaire instead of the asylum seeker. This is done with the assistance of an interpreter but the person does not have the right to a lawyer. Asylum seekers complained about the hasty manner with which they were handled and the poor living conditions in the detention centres (noise, temperature) during the meeting with the OE official.

Ramadan is respected: people have the choice of eating earlier/later during this period.

### **C. The '127 bis repatriation centre' (Steenokkerzeel)**

This centre is located in Steenokkerzeel, also beside the airport. It is surrounded by two very high metal fences and several rows of barbed wire. It gives the very strong impression of a prison. The windows have bars on them.

The centre consists of two buildings. The first building houses the social, administrative and medical staff, along with a disciplinary isolation cell. On the other side of an internal courtyard, there is the building reserved for the migrants, behind rows of wire mesh five metres high, topped with lengths of barbed wire.

This centre houses both illegal immigrants arrested within the country and asylum seekers, men, women and children, both accompanied and unaccompanied.

---

<sup>20</sup> Article 51/10 of the Law of 15 December 1980.

## **Figures**<sup>21</sup>

In 2006 a total of 2 228 people (1 691 adults and 537 children) were registered at the '127 bis' repatriation centre in Steenokkerzeel (not counting the 520 who spent only one night there), as opposed to a total of 2 196 in 2005.

Women represented 22.58% of detainees, children accounted for 24.10% and the remainder were men. Four unaccompanied children stayed at the centre in 2006.

EU nationals have also been held at this centre (from Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, Slovakia, the Czech Republic: 212 adults and 81 children in 2006).

The average length of stay was 16.08 days in 2006. The shortest stay was less than one day and the longest was six and a half months. Over 2006 as a whole, the average number of detainees per day was 96.83.

There are social workers and youth workers in the centre. Many women (especially young women) work at the centre. According to the staff, this is a deliberate policy, designed to reduce tension. Several members of staff have a background in the social sciences. Some NGOs can visit the migrants.

### ***Testimony from migrants***

Many migrants complained of a lack of adequate medical care: difficulties in seeing a doctor or communicating with him due to a lack of interpretation and rushed visits. Particularly scandalous was the situation of a woman whom the delegation met who was five months pregnant and was experiencing a difficult pregnancy.

The parents of young children were concerned at the lack of a paediatrician on the medical team. The migrants complained about receiving painkillers for everything and nothing, of not being informed of the nature of the medication prescribed to them and only being told how many times a day it had to be taken. This practice violates the rights of all patients, particularly those in a difficult situation as they do not have the possibility of choosing another doctor.

The detainees explained that they are particularly scared since the death of a young asylum seeker in September 2007. According to the migrants, the communication from the authorities with regard to this matter left a lot to be desired.

The lack of information about progress in their cases and the fate that awaits them undermines the detainees' morale.

The migrants' comments are, moreover, backed up by the 2006 annual report, which provides information on:

- hunger strikes undertaken by dozens of people, sometimes entire wings of the centre, including the children. The aim of these strikes was to highlight complaints and grievances or to protest against the little food they generally received;
- three attempted suicides in 2006.

---

<sup>21</sup> OE report for 2006 on the '127 bis' centre.

## V. Rapporteur's observations

### *Systematic detention*

The rapporteur would first of all like to emphasise that, in his opinion, the very nature of temporary administrative detention is in itself a violation of human rights and the notion of administrative detention is unacceptable from a legal point of view. In fact, the deprivation of a person's liberty, often for a disproportionate length of time, is stipulated for a crime of an administrative nature (illegally entering a country or surpassing one's permitted stay).

Consequently, the detention centres must not be tolerated and should therefore be closed. That would be the first step towards enabling another reception method to be envisaged.

It is particularly unacceptable that asylum seekers are treated in this way: these men, women and, sometimes, children who flee difficult situations and seek refuge in Europe cannot be incarcerated in structures that violate their personal liberty and represent an attack on their fundamental rights.

The rapporteur thus considers that asylum seekers must not, under any circumstances (as stipulated in the international conventions), be subjected to administrative detention. The detention of aliens violates a fundamental freedom and should remain the exception and not the rule, as confirmed by the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights.

Moreover, Belgium seems to detain asylum seekers at the border along with asylum seekers under the 'Dublin' procedure in a widespread and systematic manner, whoever they may be (families, children) and whatever their risk of eluding the Office des étrangers.

Since the introduction of the new law, the opportunities for detaining asylum seekers have clearly increased. This breaches the fundamental principle of the Geneva Convention according to which asylum seekers should not be penalised for entering or illegally remaining in a country.

In its report to the Council and European Parliament on the application of the Reception Directive<sup>22</sup>, the European Commission also recalls that, *according to the Directive, detention is an exception to the general rule of free movement which might be used only when 'it proves necessary'; automatic detention without any evaluation of the situation of the person in question is contrary to the Directive.*

The conditions for the smooth implementation of asylum procedures are not fulfilled by closed centres: apart from the strong psychological pressure exerted by the very act of detention, it is extremely difficult to communicate with the outside world, to obtain the opinion of an independent social or legal worker, to gather information useful to the procedure (no Internet connection), etc.

In the absence of any real access to a lawyer, it is virtually impossible to submit an appeal in the form and within the (very short) timeframe required, especially as the CCE procedure is a written procedure, which leaves the asylum seeker very little opportunity to make oral

---

<sup>22</sup> Report from the Commission to the Council and European Parliament on application of Directive 2003/9/EC of 27 January 2003 laying down minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers in Member States - COM(2007)745 final.

comments at the hearing. These excessively short deadlines are a serious concern.

### ***Length of detention***

The length of detention is an important issue in terms of the effects a long period of detention can have on a person. This duration is already excessive if we consider the recommendations of the Council of Europe, which suggested that this type of detention should be limited to one month<sup>23</sup>. In practice, there are no limits to detention in Belgium as a new time limit commences whenever a person appeals against their deportation.

A report recently requested by the European Commission<sup>24</sup> also noted, *with regard to the period of detention, that in terms of the Directive's applicability to asylum seekers held in closed centres, the question arose as to whether the two-month period of legal detention (which may be extended up to eight months) could be considered as being a reasonable period of time and as short as possible.*

### ***The detention of minors***

In Belgium accompanied and unaccompanied children are held in closed detention centres and, according to the NGOs, the numbers are rising. The detention of children infringes the Convention on the Rights of the Child<sup>25</sup>, not to mention the interruption this causes to their schooling. Belgium was recently condemned by the European Court of Human Rights for detaining and repatriating a minor<sup>26</sup>. The Court considered the following elements as being inhuman treatment: detention in a centre initially designed for adults, detention under the same conditions as an adult without regard for the child's age and extreme vulnerability.

In the report from the Commission to the Council and European Parliament on the application of the Reception Directive<sup>27</sup>, Belgium also figures among the countries that refuse to allow minors in detention to have access to education, or in practice make it impossible or very limited. The Commission notes that this is an infringement of the Reception Directive. The Reception Directive stipulates, in fact, that *'Member States shall grant to minor children of asylum seekers and to asylum seekers who are minors access to the education system under similar conditions as nationals of the host Member State for so long as an expulsion measure against them or their parents is not actually enforced. Such education may be provided in accommodation centres'*.<sup>28</sup>

The Commission also noted that some Member States, including Belgium, had no procedure for identifying vulnerable asylum seekers and observed that *'there might be serious doubts as to how and whether persons with special needs are actually identified in Member States with*

---

<sup>23</sup> Recommendation 1547 of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe.

<sup>24</sup> Report on Belgium, produced on behalf of the European Commission, on the application of the Reception Directive, to assist in the preparation of the Commission's report to the Council and European Parliament on application of this same Directive, COM(2007)745 final.

<sup>25</sup> Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its Resolution 44/25 of 20 November 1989, entered into force on 2 September 1990, see <http://www2.ohchr.org/french/law/crc.htm>.

<sup>26</sup> ECHR, 12/10/06, No 13178/03, Mubilanzila Mayeka and Kaniki Mitunga v. Belgium.

<sup>27</sup> Report from the Commission to the Council and European Parliament on application of Directive 2003/9/EC of 27 January 2003 laying down minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers in Member States, COM(2007)745 final.

<sup>28</sup> Article 10, Reception Directive.

*no such tool'. According to this report, 'serious problems might arise in Member States which do not exclude the detention of asylum seekers with special needs. Given their particular situation, detention of vulnerable asylum seekers should be considered only as a last resort, in duly justified cases'.<sup>29</sup>*

The rapporteur stresses that in no case should minors be held in detention and that the greater interest of the child must never be ignored. A state that does not protect children violates our highest values.

### ***Lack of information for migrants***

Whilst the Reception Directive and the Procedures Directive impose clear obligations to provide information to detained migrants, the detainees' accounts demonstrate that they have very little knowledge or understanding of the procedures, rights and possible appeals or simply what is going to happen to them. This lack of information is most evident in the '127 bis' centre.

With regard to 'INAD', neither NGOs nor visitors nor lawyers have access to the centre; lawyers can speak to the migrants at the police station. However, the Procedures Directive and the Reception Directive stress that the lawyers, UNHCR or NGOs must be able to access centres in which asylum seekers are accommodated with a view to providing them with support. Limitations cannot be imposed on this access other than for the purposes of the security of the centres (and not that of the neighbouring airport) and premises, as well as that of the asylum seekers. The Procedures Directive stipulates that restrictions are only possible if '*access by the legal adviser or other counsellor is not thereby severely limited or rendered impossible*'.<sup>30</sup>

In the other centres visited, '127' and '127 bis', NGOs have access but it is an uncertain right; migrants' friends or other visitors have access to the '127 bis' centre but not to the other two centres.

A recent report ordered by the Commission<sup>31</sup> points out that *most residents do not receive a welcome or information pack. The vast majority of occupants are unaware that they have the right to bring an action. They do not always have access to an interpreter. In some closed centres there is a problem with organising a duty roster for the medical services. Numerous residents complain about a lack of monitoring of their mental health. There are problems with regard to the nature and quality of legal assistance. Even though there are no problems with regard to the level of administrative supervision, psychosocial supervision could pose a problem. Finally, respect for the family unit of asylum seekers held in closed detention centres is not guaranteed.*

*In addition, the education of minors is a problem in closed centres and they are detained with adults, in violation of Article 37(c) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.*

---

<sup>29</sup> Report from the Commission to the Council and European Parliament on application of Directive 2003/9/EC of 27 January 2003 laying down minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers in Member States, COM(2007)745 final.

<sup>30</sup> Article 16, Procedures Directive.

<sup>31</sup> Report on Belgium, produced on behalf of the European Commission, on application of the Reception Directive, to assist in the writing of the Commission's report to the Council and European Parliament on application of this same directive COM(2007) 745 final.

## **VI. Conclusions**

1. The detention of certain categories of asylum seekers, which is virtually systematic in the 'Dublin' cases<sup>32</sup>, without any regard for the specific situation of the people being detained, is unacceptable. The situation is all the more shocking when vulnerable people (particularly children, pregnant women and families with babies) are detained.
2. The lack of privacy, noise, different pressures, prison atmosphere and having to share their limited living space with other detainees means that a sometimes long period of detention (in some cases more than 5 months) is a harsh additional hardship for the detainees.
3. The detention of EU citizens at detention centres for third-country nationals who are illegal immigrants seems shocking and disproportionate, particularly if it is true that it can be imposed merely because a simple administrative violation has been committed. The figures provided by the Belgian authorities are worrying in this respect.
4. The right to an interpreter and to receive decisions concerning them in a language that they understand should be respected for all foreign nationals subject to a decision of the Belgian authorities, and Belgian law on the subject should provide for compliance with this requirement.

### **The Delegation recommends that the Belgian Government:**

1. Provide clear information concerning, in particular:
  - the detention of EU citizens in Belgian centres,
  - recent data (2007) on detention centre figures, giving details per detainee, not just 'averages'.
2. Clarify its position concerning, in particular:
  - whether it intends to continue the practice of detaining children, despite numerous reports indicating the serious consequences of this<sup>33</sup>,

---

<sup>32</sup> The figures on the population in the open and closed centres show that asylum seekers are not detained automatically. Only in the Dublin cases does Belgium automatically detain asylum seekers, because the Dublin Convention states that a country loses its right to send an asylum seeker back to the transit country if a certain term is exceeded.

<sup>33</sup> Since the report of September 1999 by the Guidance Centre of the Université Libre de Bruxelles concerning a Lebanese family with minor children detained at the '27 bis' centre (in Steenokkerzeel), it has been established that detention of children in a closed centre has serious consequences for these children, seriously damages their development and may be regarded as constituting inhuman and degrading treatment, and at all events as a form of psychological abuse. The report by CIRE and OCIV of May 2003, the Report of the Délégué général aux droits de l'enfant of 4 April 2006 and the recent review of 24 October 2006 by a series of associations (Aide aux personnes déplacées, Caritas International, le Centre Social Protestant, CIRE, Jesuit Refugee Service Belgium, La ligue des droits de l'homme asbl, MRAX, Point d'appui, the social service of Solidarité Socialiste, Vluchtelingenwerk) arrives at similar conclusions, denouncing the inhuman conditions in which children are held at closed centres. In its 2005 general report, the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) notes that, whatever the reason for which minors are deprived of their liberty, they are intrinsically more vulnerable than adults.

- the cases in which it authorises the use of handcuffs to transport closed centre detainees,
- its interpretation of the international obligations arising from the Chicago Convention and its relationship with the international instruments for the protection of human rights,
- the legal bases for the practice of detaining in centres EU nationals who have committed 'petty crimes' or have been 'moonlighting',
- the measures taken to investigate the reasons for, and circumstances behind, the suicide attempts noted in the 2006 report.

3. Take important and urgent legislative and regulatory measures, in particular:

- to amend the deadlines for suspensive appeals against an obligation to leave the country (currently 24 hours) and for the decision of the Conseil du contentieux des étrangers (72 hours), ensuring in any event that the CCE's silence cannot be considered to be grounds for deporting an alien,
- to guarantee that the practice of illegal meetings designed to facilitate deportations, a practice that has already been condemned by the European Court of Human Rights, will indeed be prohibited,
- to stop the practice, also recently condemned by the European Court of Human Rights, of moving foreign nationals to the transit area,
- to guarantee access to education for all minors, particularly those being detained,
- to provide regular, regulated and non-arbitrary access to all centres (including the 'INAD' centre) for the NGOs that wish to enter them regularly to provide advice to the detainees and for UNHCR at the different stages of the procedure,
- to make every effort to ensure that the centres' social services no longer report directly to the Ministry of the Interior and to ensure that the centres' doctors no longer report to the closed centres' management,
- to ensure the presence in all centres of interpreters and cultural advocates who are independent of the centres' own administration.

# ANNEX 1



ЕВРОПЕЙСКИ ПАРЛАМЕНТ    PARLAMENTO EUROPEO    EVROPSKÝ PARLAMENT    EUROPA-PARLAMENTET  
EUROPAÏSCHES PARLAMENT    EUROOPA PARLAMENT    ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΒΟΥΛΙΟ    EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT  
PARLEMENT EUROPEËN    PARLAIMINT NA HEORPA    PARLAMENTO EUROPEO    EIROPAS PARLAMENTS  
EUROPOS PARLAMENTAS    EURÓPAI PARLAMENT    IL-PARLAMENT EWROPEW    EUROPEES PARLEMENT  
PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI    PARLAMENTO EUROPEU    PARLAMENTUL EUROPEAN  
EURÓPSKY PARLAMENT    EVROPSKI PARLAMENT    EUROOPAN PARLAMENTTI    EUROPAPARLAMENTET

**Parlement Européen  
Commission des libertés civiles, de la justice  
et des affaires intérieures  
Délégation en Belgique  
11 octobre 2007**

## LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

### Membres de la Commission LIBE

Martine ROURE – Chef de délégation  
Giusto CATANIA - Rapporteur  
Jean LAMBERT

Frieda BREPOELS (hors quota)

### Assistants

Pauline CHAIGNE (assistante de Martine ROURE)  
Edoardo BOGGIO (assistant de Giusto CATANIA)  
Matthias DIEPENDAELE (assistant de Frieda BREPOELS)

### Groupes politiques

Adam ISAACS (PPE)  
Annie LEMARCHAL (PSE)  
Anders RASMUSSEN (ALDE)  
Jean-Luc ROBERT (VERTS)  
Chiara TAMBURINI (GUE)

### Secrétariat de la Commission LIBE

Ana DUMITRACHE

### Journaliste du Parlement (émission *Parlamento*, Euronews)

Andreas ROGAL

### Interprètes

**IT** : D. FUMAGALLI ; F. DI ROSSO; **NL**: BOERSMA J; et SIMONS K.; **FR**: GOOSSESNS  
VAERE; GOOSSENS GALLE

## ANNEX 2



ΕΒΡΟΠΕΪΣΚΙ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΟ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΟ ΕΥΡΟΠΣΚΪ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΟΠΑ-ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΕΤ  
ΕΥΡΟΠΆΙΣΧΕΣ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΟΟΡΑ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΒΟΥΛΙΟ EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT  
ΠΑΡΛΕΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΕΝ ΠΑΡΛΑΙΜΙΝΤ ΝΑ ΗΕΟΡΡΑ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΟ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΟ ΕΙΡΟΠΑΣ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΣ  
ΕΥΡΟΠΟΣ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΑΣ ΕΥΡÓΡΑΙ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΙΛ-ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΥ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΕΣ ΠΑΡΛΕΜΕΝΤ  
ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΟΠΕJSΚΙ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΟ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΥ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΥΛ ΕΥΡΟΠΕΑΝ  
ΕΥΡÓΠΣΚΥ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΟΠΣΚΙ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤ ΕΥΡΟΟΡΑΝ ΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΤΙ ΕΥΡΟΠΑΡΛΑΜΕΝΤΕΤ

**European Parliament**  
**Committee on civil liberties, justice and home affairs**  
**Delegation to Belgium**  
**11 October 2007**

### Draft Programme 4

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| 14:00 – 14:45: | Travel by bus from the European Parliament to the <b>centre ‘INAD’ (Zaventem airport)</b> |
| 14:45 – 15:30  | Visit of INAD centre  |
| 15:30 – 16:00  | Travel to the <b>Transit centre ‘127’, Melsbroek</b>                                      |
| 16:00 – 17:00  | Visit of the centre ‘127’   |
| 17:00 – 17:30  | Travel to the <b>Repatriation centre ‘127 bis’, Steenokerzeel</b>                         |
| 17:30 - 19:00  | Visit of the centre ‘127 bis’   |
| 19:00 – 19:30  | Return travel to the European Parliament  |

## ANNEX 3



ЕВРОПЕЙСКИ ПАРЛАМЕНТ    PARLAMENTO EUROPEO    EVROPSKÝ PARLAMENT    EUROPA-PARLAMENTET  
EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT    EUROOPA PARLAMENT    ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΒΟΥΛΙΟ    EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT  
PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN    PARLAIMINT NA HEORPA    PARLAMENTO EUROPEO    EIROPAS PARLAMENTS  
EUROPOS PARLAMENTAS    EURÓPAI PARLAMENT    IL-PARLAMENT EWROPEW    EUROPEES PARLEMENT  
PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI    PARLAMENTO EUROPEU    PARLAMENTUL EUROPEAN  
EURÓPSKY PARLAMENT    EVROPSKI PARLAMENT    EUROOPAN PARLAMENTTI    EUROPAPARLAMENTET

**Parlement Européen  
Commission des libertés civiles, de la justice  
et des affaires intérieures  
Délégation en Belgique  
11 octobre 2007**

**LISTE D'ORGANISATIONS QUI ONT PARTICIPE A LA PREPARATION DE LA  
DELEGATION ET A LA REUNION PREPARATOIRE DU 10/10/2007**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>CIRE (Coordination et Initiatives pour et avec les Réfugiés et Étrangers)</b>         | <b>Cédric Vallet</b>  |
| <b>Vluchtelingenwerk Vlaanderen</b>  | <b>Pieter Stockmans</b>   |
| <b>UNHCR<br/>Protection Unit</b>   | <b>Christine Flamand</b>  |
| <b>Centre pour l'égalité des chances et pour la lutte contre le racisme</b>              | <b>Caroline Stainier</b>  |
| <b>Ligue des droits de l'Homme asbl</b>  | <b>Pierre-Arnaud Perrouty</b>   |
| <b>Médecins Sans Frontières<br/>Artsen Zonder Grenzen</b>                                | <b>Pierre Ryckmans: °<br/>Alice Rousseaux: °<br/>Benoit De Gryse: °</b> |
| <b>Caritas international België Belgique</b>   | <b>Mathieu Beys</b>   |
| <b>Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) - Belgium</b>  | <b>Edouard Jadot</b>  |
| <b>Comité Belge d'Aide aux Réfugiés<br/>Belgische Comité voor Hulp aan Vluchtelingen</b> | <b>Mathilde Henkinbrant</b>   |
| <b>Aide aux Personnes Déplacées asbl</b>   | <b>Régine Thiebaut</b>  |
| <b>IOM</b>   | <b>Anne-Christine Roisin</b>  |
| <b>Amnesty International EU Office</b>   | <b>Kris Pollet</b>  |
| <b>AEDH</b>  | <b>Mélanie Bartezen</b>   |