



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

CIMM • NUMBER 135 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

—
Chair

Mr. Robert Oliphant

Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

• (1530)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Robert Oliphant (Don Valley West, Lib.)): Good afternoon, everyone. I'm going to call to order the 135th meeting of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.

Pursuant to Standing Order 81(5), the supplementary estimates (A), 2018-19, votes 1a, 5a and 10a under the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and vote 1a under Immigration and Refugee Board have been referred to the committee on Wednesday, October 24, 2018 for consideration.

I now call vote 1a under the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, and I welcome the minister. Thank you for coming today and for bringing your deputy and officials with you. We offer you 10 minutes to open the conversation about our supplementary estimates.

[Translation]

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon, dear colleagues.

I am pleased to be here to present my department's supplementary estimates (A) for fiscal year 2018-2019. Today I'm accompanied by some of my officials from Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada.

[English]

They are Marta Morgan, the Deputy Minister; Daniel Mills, Assistant Deputy Minister and Chief Financial Officer of Immigration; Paul MacKinnon, Assistant Deputy Minister, Strategic and Program Policy; and Dr. Harpreet Kochhar, Assistant Deputy Minister of Operations.

The 2018-19 supplementary estimates (A) for Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada include a net increase of \$59.9 million in resources. The most significant component of this is under grants and contributions. There is \$50 million earmarked to support provinces in providing temporary housing for asylum seekers. These amounts support the government's earlier funding announcements that we made in the summer of 2018. This includes a commitment of \$11 million for the City of Toronto, \$3 million to the Province of Manitoba and \$36 million to the Province of Quebec.

Also included in grants and contributions is the renewal of \$3 million per year over five years under the global assistance for

irregular migrants program to support the government's renewed migrant smuggling prevention strategy. This strategy funding is provided to trusted international, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and partners to help efforts to detect, prevent and deter human smuggling operations.

These estimates also cover three other key categories. First, our increase for operating expenditures totals \$7.1 million. This includes \$2.7 million to expand biometric screening in Canada's immigration system to verify the identity of all visa-required travellers seeking entry into Canada; \$2.1 million to support the protection of classified information under division 9 of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, when this information is used to make decisions on temporary or permanent resident applications in Canada; and \$1.1 million to support an outreach strategy to key populations to deter irregular migration and dispel misinformation and to conduct in-depth analysis of irregular migration trends and demographic profiles.

There are also capital expenditures of \$8.6 million to improve IT platforms or systems in order to deliver on key initiatives. These include \$3.2 million to expand biometric screening in Canada's immigration system and perform remaining information technology system enhancements and changes; \$3 million for the international mobility program, under which we work with the Department of Employment and Social Development Canada; and \$2.4 million for the entry-exit information exchange program to allow real-time exchange of traveller data between Canada and the United States.

In addition, IRCC intends to transfer close to \$9.4 million to other government departments. The vast majority of this includes a transfer to Global Affairs Canada in the amount of \$9.2 million. This will support growth in IRCC's international network to meet the requirements of our multi-year immigration levels plan.

[Translation]

The government is delivering on its key commitments to welcome those who want to contribute to our country's success, reunite families and uphold Canada's humanitarian tradition.

•(1535)

[English]

As our multi-year levels plan for 2019-21 suggests, our priority for immigration is to meet our country's economic needs and address labour market and skills shortages. That is why, from 2020 to 2021, 72% of the additional admissions are being allocated to economic programs primarily under the express entry system and the provincial nominee program.

By helping to meet our labour market needs in regions across the country, our government will plan to help to boost Canada's economic potential in the face of an aging population and slowing labour force growth.

Our government has also introduced new programs and is testing new ideas to help attract the specific talent that our country needs. This past June, we celebrated the first year of the global skills strategy. Since its launch, that program has received over 15,000 work permit applications, meaning more employers across the country have been able to quickly get the talent they need to Canada.

We also recognize the success of the start-up visa program, and we turned it into a permanent program in April 2018. This will drive innovation and support job-creating entrepreneurs to move to Canada and then scale up, because that's where the jobs are. More than 130 start-ups in many different industries have launched across the country with the help of this program.

Developed in collaboration with the Atlantic provinces, the Atlantic immigration pilot program continues to help designated Atlantic businesses attract international graduates and skilled foreign workers to fill job vacancies and help grow economies in Atlantic Canada.

In addition to helping our country meet its economic needs through immigration, our government is firmly committed to uniting families with their loved ones faster. We aim to reunite 88,500 permanent residents with their families in 2019, and we have slashed the wait times for spouses from what it used to be, 26 months, to 12 months in the vast majority of cases. To help reunite even more parents and grandparents with their families, our government has quadrupled the number of applications from 5,000 in 2016 to 20,000 in the beginning of 2019.

We've also made significant progress in reducing backlogs in our spousal caregiver and parent and grandparent programs. The extra spaces help us to reduce those backlogs.

With respect to maintaining our humanitarian tradition, refugee numbers have more than doubled from pre-2015 levels. The number of spaces for privately sponsored refugees has actually quadrupled under our government. Our goal in 2018 is to welcome 27,000 resettled refugees, and in 2019 we will welcome 29,950 admissions. This includes the additional 1,000 spaces in budget 2018 to provide protection to 1,000 vulnerable women and girls.

•(1540)

[Translation]

Mr. Chair, our government wants to ensure that Canada's immigration system is based on compassion and economic

opportunities for all, and that it benefits both Canadians and the newcomers that it serves.

[English]

As such, we will continue to work with provinces and territories as well as our various other partners to ensure that our immigration system not only operates efficiently but also protects the health, safety and security of Canadians and grows our economy even further.

My officials and I would now be happy to take any of your questions.

[Translation]

Thank you very much.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much, Minister.

[Translation]

Mr. Whalen, you have seven minutes.

[English]

Mr. Nick Whalen (St. John's East, Lib.): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you for appearing, Minister. It's always great to have the opportunity to review changes to the estimates, which is probably one of our primary functions.

With respect to the votes to increase operating expenditures, one of the items that catches my eye—it's not a particularly large number, but it seems to be important operationally—is the \$1.1 million to support outreach strategy to key populations. Could you describe a little further what that program is doing and whether we consider this to be an operational increase that will persist for the future or if it's a one-off change in operating?

If it's going to expand, which countries do you intend to expand it to?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: Thank you very much for that really important question.

You touched on an expenditure that has proven to be much value for money for our government. It has funded the aggressive and sustained outreach program that we've had since 2017 to support our outreach to various communities in the United States and beyond to address misinformation and clarify our immigration system and asylum procedures.

This money has also allowed us to engage with governments like Nigeria, and engage with our partners in the United States to deter irregular migration through addressing issues around misuse of U.S. visas. The fact of the matter is that this investment has had quite an impact in the sense of the reduction in the number of Nigerian nationals who have been coming to Canada irregularly and the progress we have made in terms of addressing the abuse of the U.S. visa system. Equally important is its impact on the misinformation that we've been able to address on the ground in the United States with various communities and individuals who are seeking to find out about our asylum and immigration system, and who were subjected to misinformation about our system.

Mr. Nick Whalen: This function, it sounds like one of those situations where a shilling of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

I'm just wondering. This function that's being carried out through the IRCC, do you foresee this continuing there, or is this something that Global Affairs Canada should be doing on a regular basis as part of our embassies and our missions abroad, just continually, as regular practice, to manage and monitor migration trends and potential pitfalls for Canada?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: This has primarily been led by the IRCC, but our missions abroad have been engaged in this. For example, in the United States, our embassy in Washington as well as our consulates across the United States have been engaged in this.

Members of Parliament have also gone there and engaged with many stakeholders, including service delivery organizations, lawyers, community activists and potential asylum seekers themselves, to answer questions directly and clear up misinformation, and really engage with community media, as well. That has had quite an impact.

You can see, for example, the reduction in the number of Nigerian nationals who have come to Canada irregularly this year versus last year, and also, the appreciation that some of these individuals have had in the United States for that engagement, clarifying and pushing back against misinformation and answering their questions on their concerns about asylum.

Mr. Nick Whalen: Thank you.

It seems like the efforts and the two learnings from the Haitian migrant situation really paid off this last year.

The other budgetary item on the operations side that caught my eye was the biometrics screening. That's because oftentimes when we think about biometric screening, we think about capital costs associated with technology and training costs associated with using the technology. Then, anytime you implement a technological solution, it seems like it can be a never-ending money pit.

With this \$2.7 million, is this one of these situations where we foresee spending \$2.7 million every year extra, or do you see growth within the biometric cost? From the estimates perspective, it's not clear to me how this expenditure is going to grow over time.

•(1545)

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: That's a very good question.

Let me address the need for biometrics. It is really about supporting our security screening of foreign nationals coming to

Canada before they arrive in Canada. By having a system that fundamentally gives us even more confidence in terms of being confident of the identity of the individual, it contributes to stronger safety and security of Canadians.

It also, on the other side, allows for facilitation of frequent travellers. Once you get your biometrics done, it's good for 10 years. Therefore, the next time you come to Canada it facilitates your travel because we know who you are. We don't have to worry about your identity.

It is in line with what our closest allies have done. They've had biometrics in place for a while now. We're catching up to that and making sure that we have the same system. This allows us to really, as I said, deter those who shouldn't be coming to Canada.

It allows us to know about them and to do a security screening before they arrive here. Then for frequent travellers who are bona fide travellers it allows more facilitation, at a time when you see longer and longer lines at airports, for people coming back to Canada or visiting for the first time. This will certainly help in that process.

Mr. Nick Whalen: Of the amount of money that's been spent to date and projected into the future, this \$2.7 million is on top of everything that's already been budgeted. I want to get a sense of the scope of commitment to this project. If there are cost savings in other places, it would be nice to know about that as well, but it does seem to be growing quite fast.

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: I'll let my officials address that particular aspect.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Daniel Mills (Assistant Deputy Minister and Chief Financial Officer, Finance, Department of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Chair, the amount of \$2.7 million in supplementary estimates (A) is needed because of a delay in the project last year. So, these are funds from last year that are being transferred to this year. They are not additional funds, but the request is due to a delay in the implementation of the biometrics system.

This year, we will be completing the last phases of the project. The \$2.7 million...

The Chair: I apologize for interrupting you, but the member's speaking time has elapsed.

Ms. Rempel, you have the floor.

[*English*]

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Thank you.

For the benefit of the officials and the minister, my questions relate to resources allocated to support casework processing inquiries, including the ministerial enquiries division, the minister's office, the information centre for members of Parliament and senators, and the client support centres run by the Department of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship.

Minister, first, it's my understanding that under subsection 24(3) of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, an immigration officer shall "act in accordance with any instructions that the Minister may make."

Is this correct?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: I'll let my officials address that particular aspect of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: I'm just looking for.... It's from the act. I typed it out.

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: I don't have the act in front of me, so I trust my officials.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Okay. Are you aware that for some of the casework inquiries that may come in from MPs to these various streams, they may call upon you to make determinations using your authority under that section?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: We have engaged with members of Parliament from all parties to work with them. My team works with them to make sure we help them in their work, assisting—

Hon. Michelle Rempel: That's perfect, great. Thank you.

Can you tell us how many times you've used your authority under subsection 24(3) of IRPA, based on requests made by Mr. Raj Grewal, his constituency staff; Mr. Jagdeep Mann or any employees or associates—

The Chair: I'm just going to remind the member that we are here to discuss supplementary estimates (A). If you could tie this in to supplementary estimates (A)....

There's no point of order.

Mr. David Tilson (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): What do you mean, there's no point of order? Of course there's a point of order. I just made a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: If I may, Mr. Chair, I have outlined on the front end of my comments today the relevance I'm tying this in to. It's with regard to the resources allocated to assist MPs with processing casework.

• (1550)

The Chair: Is that in the supplementary estimates?

Hon. Michelle Rempel: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

On page 1016 of Bosc and Gagnon with regard to supplementary estimates, it states that "the questions...at these meetings are generally wide-ranging". On page 1078, it says, "There are no specific rules governing the nature of questions which may be put to witnesses appearing before committees, beyond the general requirement of relevance", which I have established.

Thank you. I will continue at 1:30 of my time.

Mr. David Tilson: Do not delete her time, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: I will ask again: How many times have you used your authority under subsection 24(3) of IRPA based on requests made by Raj Grewal or his constituency staff; Jagdeep Mann, or employees or associates of Jagdeep Mann Immigration Consulting; or any friends or family members or employees of Yusuf Yenilmez?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: To answer the question, I and my ministerial staff respond to members of Parliament from all parties on immigration matters as they represent their constituents, but each case is looked at on its own merits. I'm proud of the work that we've done with members of Parliament on that score.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Chair, I move that, pursuant to subsection 10(2) and subsection 10(3) of the Parliament of Canada Act, the minister be examined under oath for the remainder of this meeting.

The Chair: I'm going to take a moment to consult with my clerk on that issue. This is a first for me.

That is a motion that is duly moved. We can vote on it.

Mr. David Tilson: I'd like a recorded vote.

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Before we go into the recorded vote, I wonder if Ms. Rempel can put in context the rationale for her motion for the benefit of all committee members.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Certainly.

Subsections 10(2) and 10(3) of the Parliament of Canada Act state the following:

(2) The Senate or the House of Commons may order witnesses to be examined on oath before any committee.

(3) Any committee of the Senate or the House of Commons may administer an oath to any witness examined before the committee.

The Chair: There is a point of order.

Mr. Matt DeCoursey (Fredericton, Lib.): I understand that the opportunity to move such a motion exists within the Standing Orders, but I don't think that the member opposite has clearly identified how this is relevant to the minister appearing before this committee as part of an examination of the supplementary estimates. I would ask for your ruling as to how this is at all relevant to a conversation around the budgetary matters—

Hon. Michelle Rempel: In response to the point of order—

Mr. Matt DeCoursey: I'm not done with my point of order yet.

The Chair: Could I have one moment, please?

I'm going to suspend the meeting for a few moments. The clerk would like to check out one legal issue on my behalf, so we will suspend for a few minutes.

• (1550)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (1600)

The Chair: I'm going to call the meeting back to order. I'm going to rule that the motion is in order, and that the committee will need to decide whether they wish to swear the minister in.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Will that be a recorded vote, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Yes, it will be a recorded vote.

Mr. Nick Whalen: Is it not a debatable motion? I've already put myself on the list to speak.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: The question has been put.

The Chair: The clerk didn't see you, so does that mean—

Hon. Michelle Rempel: The clerk didn't see him and that is on the record. The question has been put.

The Chair: I didn't see you raise your hand. I think we will just vote and get it done.

Mr. Nick Whalen: Sure.

(Motion negatived: nays 5; yeas 4)

The Chair: We will continue now with your questioning, Ms. Rempel.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Thank you.

I find it interesting to note that on this line of questions, my colleagues from the Liberal Party have voted against the minister being sworn in under oath.

We will go back to the resources that are allocated as part of the supplementary estimates for MP support. I will ask if the minister would undertake an analysis of the number of times he has used his authority under subsection 24(3) of IRPA, based on a request made by Mr. Raj Grewal, his constituency staff, Jagdeep Mann, any employees or associates of Jagdeep Mann Consulting, or any friends, families or associates of Mr. Yusuf Yenilmez, and provide that to the committee.

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: As the honourable member must know, all cases are treated on a case-by-case basis, based on their merits. I cannot talk about individual cases or a group of cases, due to privacy laws, and the honourable member must know that. I cannot answer that particular question.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: This is not private.

Just to be clear, Mr. Chair, I'm not asking for individual cases. I'm asking for an aggregate number based on the question.

Is the minister willing to provide the aggregate number of times he has used his ministerial authority based on requests made by the group of people I've mentioned and would he table that with the committee?

• (1605)

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: I'm not in a position to discuss specifics regarding certain cases, because of privacy laws, but I'm happy to meet the requests of the member if it's general about our approach to cases and so on—

Hon. Michelle Rempel: I will take that as a yes.

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: —which is, as I said, on a case-by-case basis. I'm not going to be able to provide the member with specifics on any cases, due to privacy laws.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Again, related to the resources allocated to MP support, has the minister, minister's staff or any member of the Department of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship been

requested to provide documents to the RCMP in relation to the investigation related to MP Raj Grewal?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: No.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Thank you.

Mr. Raj Grewal is under an ethics investigation for inviting Yusuf Yenilmez to meet with the Prime Minister.

Mr. Matt DeCoursey: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

How is this relevant at all to our conversation around supplementary estimates?

Hon. Michelle Rempel: I'm happy to provide relevancy. It's with regard to the resources provided to Mr. Grewal in support of any casework inquiries that may come through the minister's department. This is my relevancy in terms of allocation of resources.

The Chair: If you're speaking on a point, would you address me, please, not the minister?

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Sure. Sorry. I'm just thinking. I'm tying it in to how the minister has been using these resources. Thank you.

This is preamble. On October 11, 2015, the minister posted a picture to his Twitter account with Mr. Yenilmez and his “large team”, thanking him for his help in campaigning.

Minister, are you aware of or do you have any reason to suspect any abuse of MP Grewal's position advocating for immigration—

Mr. Matt DeCoursey: I am raising a point of privilege, Mr. Chair. This is a clear attempt to try to impute the Prime Minister.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: —per the resources that are allocated....

The Chair: There's a point of order being raised. Just as you have raised one, there is now one being raised on this side.

Mr. Matt DeCoursey: The member is simply trying to take us off on a line of questioning that has nothing to do with supplementary estimates, in an ill-fated attempt to try to.... I don't know what she's trying to do, but she has clearly demonstrated that there is no link to her line of questioning and what we are here to examine, which is the supplementary estimates that have the minister and the officials here in front of us today.

They have already told her they cannot speak, due to privacy laws, based on any individual cases or situations.

I would ask you to rule that, as she continues to try to draw specific individuals in and ask for specific information about specific cases, that is not what the minister is able to do and not what he or his officials are here to do today.

The Chair: Ms. Rempel.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As you are aware, because we've discussed this so many times in this committee, there are resources. In fact, we've had officials in front of committee talking about the resources allocated to provide support for members of Parliament with casework. This subject has come up on both sides. We've had multipartisan complaints about this, on whether or not the casework resources provided to MPs and members of the public, even in terms of our immigration consultants study, are adequate.

The questions I am asking, Mr. Chair, are on whether or not there has been an appropriate use of those resources by the minister and a current member who is currently under ethics investigation. I believe this is directly relevant given the fact that we are here to examine the estimates and the appropriateness of their allocation—how they're used. I have, in each and every one of my questions, drawn it back to that point.

To my colleague opposite, I would also note that I did ask for the aggregate total. I am asking how much service Mr. Grewal and other people I've mentioned have gotten from the minister as part of the use of these resources as allocated under the supplementary estimates, which I believe is in order.

The Chair: Mr. Ayoub.

[Translation]

Mr. Ramez Ayoub (Thérèse-De Blainville, Lib.): Today, we are trying to obtain specific information. If, at a committee, we ask what services the minister's team provides to other members in general, that is one thing; but if we attempt to obtain information on a particular member, that is something else. We are not authorized to do that here. Questioning the minister on particular cases is not part of the committee's mandate. We are wasting time and, unfortunately, we are using the minister's time poorly even though we have important matters to discuss.

If the member across the way wants to obtain more information on a member and the use of specific resources, she may make a written request outside of the committee. The fact is that she's preventing the rest of the committee from working while we should be discussing important immigration issues that are of concern to Canada. We are not here to discuss former member Mr. Grewal's particular case. He is no longer an MP. I find it regrettable that we are wasting other members' time and that of the minister and his team, despite the fact that we are facing certain situations in Canada.

I am somewhat surprised by Ms. Rempel's behaviour, as she is really concerned with immigration matters in Canada and sometimes makes judicious interventions in the House on that topic. Today, we have the opportunity of moving the immigration file forward and allowing Canadians to understand what the government is doing in that area. And yet, the member is not using her speaking time to do that.

I am going to stop here. I could go on at length and waste everyone's time, but I don't want to do that. I have questions for the minister so that we can move the immigration file forward. I would like my colleague to do the same.

• (1610)

[English]

The Chair: We'll have Ms. Rempel, then Mr. Whalen, and then Mr. Maguire.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Thank you, Chair.

To my colleague's point, it is actually, per the rules of Bosc and Gagnon, my determination whether or not I feel my time that is allocated is being best spent with the minister. As reference, I would point to page 1016 of Bosc and Gagnon, where it states that the questions and discussions at meetings related to the estimates “are generally wide-ranging”, and on page 1078, that there are “no specific rules governing the nature of questions”.

In each of my questions I have put forward very detailed information regarding how this is relevant. Again, to my colleague, I would remind him that the minister does expend a significant amount of resources, public funds, tax funds. This is what we're doing here. We're examining the use of taxpayer funds in supporting MPs and other people in casework.

He does, as I have established in questions with him, have the authority under subsection 24(3) to direct immigration officials to make determinations based on his own will. I feel it's very relevant to understand how much time has been allocated to the friends and associates of a member of Parliament who is currently under investigation by the RCMP, given that the minister has been pictured with one of these people.

I would point out to my colleague opposite the optics on this particular point of order. We have my Liberal colleagues here who voted against putting the minister under oath on this particular thing. That doesn't look particularly wonderful. In fact, Mr. Chair, I would argue that if this is ruled out of order, it looks like the minister and my colleagues opposite have something to hide.

Similarly, I would also observe that the extensive delay that we saw earlier in this meeting, when we had to suspend to determine whether a motion that was clearly in order was in fact in order, would be another example of this.

I'm not sure why my colleagues would not do their job as parliamentarians. They don't hold government positions. Their job is to hold the government to account.

Let me ask these questions because I want to know if there is something wrong here. That means that each and every one of us, and each and every one of our constituents have been held at a disadvantage. Frankly, I would hope that the minister would just say, “Nothing to see here, folks. There are no anomalies.” He'd be happy to post the aggregate data, which isn't confidential, on the number of case inquiries that Mr. Grewal, these various people that I have read, have made to him. Then we can clear this matter up and the public can rest confident that this is in fact, per the review of the supplementary estimates, an appropriate use of taxpayer funds.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I have two speakers left.

I am already prepared to rule on this, but I'm also willing to listen to Mr. Whalen and Mr. Maguire.

Mr. Nick Whalen: A number of items were raised by Ms. Rempel in the context of this point of order that I feel I should speak to. It's going to take me the better part of 15 minutes to do that.

The first issue would be with respect to whether this is adequately within the scope of supplementary estimates (A), whether there are any changes in supplementary estimates (A)—

• (1615)

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Mr. Chair, on a point of clarification, if I may...

Mr. Nick Whalen: I have the floor with respect to this point of order.

The Chair: He has the floor. When he's finished with the floor then I can hear a point.

Mr. Nick Whalen: On this point, since there are no changes in supplementary estimates (A) with respect to whether members' allocation of time is allowed or not.... That's the first category of things I'd like to talk to.

The second category I'd like to speak to is whether the existing oath and affirmation we all take as MPs is already applicable and whether it's appropriate in any circumstances to ask an existing member of Parliament to breach their privilege by taking some additional oath. That's the second category.

The third thing is that each minister has his or her own oath that they take. There's also the standard expectation that when people are before committee they're going to come with candour.

The fourth part of the analysis on the allegations that Ms. Rempel brought earlier is as to whether there is some type of dishonesty. That's the point. Unless there is some form of dishonesty that is expected, or there is some reason to believe that someone isn't acting with candour, that's the point at which those types of motions are brought. It was quite insulting to everyone in the room and to the process and the institution to bring that type of a motion before there would be any type of allegation of impropriety at all.

Then it brings us back to another category of things that I'd like to talk about, which is whether it's appropriate to get into the individual line items of members of Parliament when the minister has already said that he's prepared to answer the question.

I think that if I went through all those things, we wouldn't get time for the member of the NDP to ask her questions, so I will stop talking now because I know she's well prepared for the meeting.

I think in the future all members should be cognizant of the fact that we can all play these theatrical games, and no work can get done here. It's not just the opposite side that can do these foolish things.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Maguire.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): I wasn't going to say anything. I would just say to my colleague that I back her in her efforts to do this. I happen to not think these are foolish things. That kind of language adds to the problem that may arise in the future with the types of questions that need to be answered in this case.

The oath request is certainly a rule of the House. Everyone is innocent until proven guilty, but we're just asking questions. I'll leave it at that, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Baylis.

Mr. Frank Baylis (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): The concept of asking someone to go under oath has been used when there's a suspicion of misleading someone. That being said, the expectation that a minister would know the individual files of 338 members of Parliament over a past period of time is, quite frankly, ridiculous.

I don't know how many times I've spoken to the minister on a particular case for me, so if I were to be asked just how many times I have interpellated a minister on a particular case, I wouldn't be able to answer that.

If I simply can't answer it, putting me under oath does not give me some extra superpowers to answer it. The gamesmanship here—pretending that we're going to put someone under oath to get to the truth—is defamatory and part of some political game intended to suggest that the minister is hiding information, which is not true.

If the member is truly interested in getting this information, there's a process. You can file a paper called an access to information. You don't expect a minister to come to committee knowing the files of 338 people off the top of his head. That's ridiculous.

Normally, when I speak in other committees, I don't have to deal with other members. I did not interrupt Ms. Rempel. I did not interrupt Mr. Tilson. I did not interrupt Mr. Maguire. I find it quite annoying, Chair, that he feels it's his right to speak over me every time I say something.

I don't see how you have that right.

If you want to take my time, go ahead and do it, and I'll come back. If you have something to say, I'm going to cede my time so you can say it, Mr. Tilson, but then I want my time back.

I'm not going to speak over him, though, Chair. I'll wait.

The Chair: It won't work quite like that. If you'd like to be on the list—

Mr. Frank Baylis: I'll be back on the speakers list after Mr. Tilson has spoken, but I will continue to speak, and I will not speak over him. I will wait my turn. If he feels he has something more important to say than I do, he's welcome to say it.

The Chair: I have Ms. Kwan, Ms. Rempel and then maybe Mr. Baylis.

• (1620)

Mr. Frank Baylis: If Mr. Tilson, Mr. Maguire or Ms. Rempel feel they have to say something over me, they'll let me know, but if not, I want to speak when they're done talking over me.

The Chair: Thank you.

We'll cede the time. You can stop, but it goes to Ms. Kwan now.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I'll be brief. I know you have indicated to the committee that you're ready to rule on this question, so I'm not even sure why we're going around in circles. As far as I can understand, what's going on here is that Ms. Rempel has actually put a question on the record, asking for the minister to provide numbers in the aggregate of how many inquiries have occurred within the group of people to which she has referred. It does not breach any confidential information. I think it's a fair question to ask, and I believe the minister has said he will undertake to provide that information.

I think we can get on with it, because there are a whole lot of theatrics going on here, on all sides of the House. Maybe we can just get on with the work we need to do, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I have Ms. Rempel, and then if either Mr. Maguire or Mr. Tilson would like to speak, they're next. First is Ms. Rempel.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Chair, since my colleague, Mr. Baylis, raised the relevancy or the issue of points in time when people are sworn in, I would refer him to chapter 20 of Bosc and Gagnon, under reference 687, where it says:

At various times, committees have sworn in the Prime Minister, Ministers, the Auditor General, senior public servants, and members of the Privy Council. See, for example, Special Committee on Certain Charges and Allegations made by George N. Gordon, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence, March 3, 1932, Issue No. 1; Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence, January 28, 1987, Issue No. 20, pp. 3-4, 9-14; Speaker Fraser's ruling (Debates, March 17, 1987...); Standing Committee on Public Accounts, Minutes of Proceedings, May 3, 2004, Meeting No. 39; Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics, Minutes of Proceedings, February 5, 2008, Meeting No. 13; Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, Minutes of Proceedings, June 2, 2010, Meeting No. 21.

The reference further states:

A committee may also decide to swear in all witnesses appearing before it in connection with a particular study. See, for example, Standing Committee on Public Accounts, Minutes of Proceedings, April 14, 2004, Meeting No. 25.

I would just like to refute the aspersion put forward in my colleague's comments, given that it's very well established in precedent that this is something that occurs and is routine.

Again, Mr. Chair, I would just re-emphasize my further point. We are talking about the use of taxpayer resources to assist members of Parliament with their work. At the same time, we have a colleague who it was my understanding had resigned, although I just read, Mr. Chair, that Elections Canada says he has not resigned.

I would like to know how many cases he referred to the minister's office and the list of other people that I have put forward, and how many times the minister used his authority under section 24(3) of IRPA based on requests of this member of Parliament. I believe we should determine—

The Chair: Please speak to the point.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: The point is relevancy, so I am speaking to that. The point is that this is very much in order.

I'm sure the government doesn't like that I am asking these questions, Mr. Chair, but I would suggest that this is something that would be of interest to every single one of my colleagues, and I

would like to see that information. I just wonder why none of them would want us to see that put forward.

It seems odd, Chair. That is all.

The Chair: This being so-called “giving Tuesday”, Mr. Baylis offered time to either Mr. Tilson or Mr. Maguire, if you would like to comment.

Mr. David Tilson: I wasn't speaking to Mr. Baylis. If he wants to get into a debate with me, I'd be pleased to do that.

Mr. Frank Baylis: I don't want to get into a debate, I—

Mr. David Tilson: Mr. Baylis, you're now interrupting me, my good friend.

The Chair: Out of respect for the interpreters, could we have one person speaking at a time?

I think that was a no, and is that another no from Mr. Maguire?

Now we go to Mr. Tabbara.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): As my colleague across the way just mentioned, she was talking about all the related issues of wrongdoing. In this particular case, we don't have a case of wrongdoing. She has been asking the minister about specific cases, and he has already pointed out that there are privacy laws that prevent him from talking about them.

As my colleague said, I have approached the minister on certain cases that I have needed to....

• (1625)

The Chair: I need you just to speak to the point of order. I don't want to get into debate on the topic. The point of order was about whether Ms. Rempel had strayed from relevancy, so I would like members to speak just on relevancy.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: She has strayed from relevancy. There is no sign of wrongdoing here, and she is asking the minister to go under oath even though he has already taken an oath.

The Chair: That one is done.

Mr. Whalen and Ms. Kwan are prepared to hear my ruling.

Ms. Rempel.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Just on a point of clarification, Mr. Chair, how much time do I have left for questions after we're done with this?

The Chair: You have about two minutes and eight seconds.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Great. I will let you give that ruling, then.

The Chair: My ruling may be lengthy.

On the point of order I am going to actually....

Mr. Baylis.

Mr. Frank Baylis: I was waiting to speak while Mr. Tilson, who seems to not like being interrupted, if you recall—

The Chair: I thought they didn't speak, so I didn't know if you still wanted to speak.

Mr. Frank Baylis: No, it's okay. He seemed not to appreciate when someone was talking over him.

I'm glad you didn't appreciate it, and I'm with you on that. I didn't appreciate when I was talking and you were speaking over me, Mr. Tilson. Do you want to do it—

Mr. David Tilson: You know, this member's new to the committee, and he's—

Mr. Frank Baylis: I'm leaving in a minute.

Mr. David Tilson: He's interrupting the meeting and stalling for time. I would suggest that you allow the chairman to make his ruling, as we've all requested.

Mr. Frank Baylis: Why didn't you say that when you had the chance to say that?

Mr. David Tilson: Why don't you speak through the chairman? Why are you speaking to me?

As your minister of public works said, do you want to go out into the hall?

Mr. Frank Baylis: I thought it was my time to speak, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: It is your time, and I'd ask all other members to please be quiet. You may continue.

Mr. Frank Baylis: On that point, I ceded the chance to Mr. Tilson to say that diatribe, but he chose not to, except when I was talking again.

Ms. Rempel said that those acts of that oath were related to charges of allegations. This is her bringing it up, not me. There are no charges of allegations here, number one.

The Chair: I'm going to ask the member to speak on the point of order, which is simply now on the relevance of this question to the supplementaries.

Mr. Frank Baylis: She has said clearly that the government doesn't like this to get out. That's what's relevant. She seems to me to be making a statement about why none of us would want to see that report now. I've never said I don't want to see that report.

I cannot leave that on there—

Hon. Michelle Rempel: You're saying that's relevant. We have agreement.

Mr. Frank Baylis: No. I can't let you make a statement that puts words in my mouth to say, "I don't want to see that report". I never said I don't want to see the report. I've never made that statement.

The Chair: I just remind the committee there's no such thing as a point of clarification. You have a point of order or a point of privilege.

We have one point of order on. If there's a point of order with respect to the point of order, I would hear it.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Yes, on a point of order.

I believe that my colleague is arguing against relevancy. I would argue on a point of order that if he's arguing that my line of questioning is, in fact, relevant, then the challenge that we're having now is moot.

Mr. Frank Baylis: You lost me.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Yes, let's rule.

The Chair: I'm going to rule that Ms. Rempel has her seven minutes and she is able to continue in the line of questioning that she has engaged in, provided two things.

One is that no one in this committee should impugn the reputation of any other member of Parliament, either directly or indirectly. It's very clear in the House of Commons rules that an indirect impugning of one's character by suggesting, either indirectly or directly, that they are not telling or will not tell the truth is not going to be allowed in this committee as long as I'm the chairperson.

Anybody who suggests that someone—on either side or either end of this table, if they are a member of Parliament or have taken an oath—is not acting appropriately, then they will be ruled out of order.

I will ask for the Speaker's help with respect to that person as a matter of parliamentary privilege. Part of parliamentary privilege is to be able to come to this committee having taken an oath and be assumed to be telling the truth. That is the fundamental nature of the Westminster parliamentary tradition.

Ms. Rempel will have the floor in a moment, when I'm finished. She will be able to continue, as she will define for herself—and then the court of public opinion will decide—whether she is relevant or not. That is for her to make up.

I'd like to finish this. I'd like to read that last statement. It goes to the point of impugning someone's character. While the rules of procedure have said one thing, in 1960, in relation to the appearance of current and former ministers, the law clerk of the House advised the chair of what was then the railways, canals and telegraph lines committee that in the view of his oath as a privy councillor, he need not necessarily be sworn, although it would not be inappropriate to do so if a member of the House committee raised the point.

I wanted to raise that point that there's no requirement, ever, for a member of the Privy Council—or, I would actually argue, a member of the House of Commons—to be sworn in. The motion was in order. You could entertain that; however, it was also in order that the committee voted that it was not necessary.

I've made those three statements. I understand, unfortunately, that the minister has to leave to go to another appointment he committed to from 3:30 to 4:30. The committee was all well aware of that. Unfortunately, he has to leave. Our committee will continue with officials.

Ms. Kwan.

● (1630)

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In light of this situation, I don't think it served anyone from the point of view of being able to ask questions of the minister. I note that the question that Ms. Rempel asked is entirely legitimate, and we should not have intervened. We should have allowed her to finish, and we would have gone through the rotation accordingly, and we would have been able to ask our questions.

Because this has not happened, Mr. Chair, I would like to move that we invite the minister back to complete the supplementary estimates for another hour at another committee time.

The Chair: The motion is in order.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: I would like a recorded vote.

(Motion negatived: nays 5; yeas 4)

The Chair: I'm going to suspend the meeting for a few minutes, and we will return in five minutes when the officials have had time to collect their thoughts and when I have had time to collect my thoughts.

We'll resume in five minutes.

•(1630) _____ (Pause) _____

•(1635)

The Chair: I call the committee back to order. We are beginning our second hour. These are almost like separate meetings. This second hour is with the officials continuing and the questions that the committee will have regarding supplementary estimates (A).

We begin a new round.

Mr. Tabbara, you have seven minutes.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to the officials for coming. We apologize on our side for a bit of theatrics that happened in the first hour, but nonetheless, my question will be about collaboration with the provinces of Ontario and Quebec regarding asylum seekers.

Can you go into a bit more detail about what our government has done in terms of outreach and the collaboration that we have with those two provinces specifically?

Ms. Marta Morgan (Deputy Minister, Department of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes, thank you.

We've been working very closely over a two-year period now with both the Ontario and Quebec governments. Quebec has been a very important partner with us in addressing, in particular, the irregular migration flows that are coming through at Lacolle, Quebec. We have been working operationally on the ground very closely with the province as we manage that flow responsibly, and Quebec has been providing temporary shelter assistance and other assistance to irregular migrants as they seek asylum.

We are in very close co-operation with both the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario. We communicate very regularly with their officials. We share information about trends and about what we see happening, both in terms of flows at the border and also within various housing systems. We work with them on any questions they might have, so it's quite a good working relationship at the operational level.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: My colleague Mr. Whalen touched upon this a little bit, and the minister added to this as well in his speech. There has been \$3.2 million to expand biometrics screening, and the minister said that our allies had done this before. They've invested in this biometrics screening. We're maybe a little bit late on it but we're investing now.

In our last meeting yesterday, we talked about the global impact for migration. Will it help with safe, orderly and regular migration if we do biometrics checks?

Ms. Marta Morgan: We see biometrics as the foundation of identity management within the immigration system. The implementation of biometrics will allow us to establish the identity of individuals who are coming to Canada on visas either to visit, to study or to work.

That is really helpful, I think, in general, in terms of good migration management, to know who is coming. Eventually with the entry-exit initiative—and there's a bill already in the House on that—we'll be able to know who's coming and who's leaving. Biometrics are very foundational to that. It's a really important initiative for us from the perspective of management of the entire immigration continuum.

•(1640)

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: My next question will also be about migrants.

We often hear that migrants are a burden and a problem for Canadian societies. We hear the rhetoric coming from individuals in society. We really want to bring out the success stories.

My region is known for the high-tech sector in the Kitchener-Waterloo region, and I've met individuals who have come to Canada as refugees or they've come here at a very young age. These migrants have been successful. They've started up companies, and they've employed many people in our region. Can you specifically speak about the economic benefit for Canada?

Mr. Paul MacKinnon (Assistant Deputy Minister, Strategic and Program Policy, Department of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Chair, I just have a few comments.

I think you're asking about refugees in particular. We do see good results with refugees over a period of a number of years. In 2016, for example, refugees accounted for 3% of the labour force, while immigrants made up about 24%, but considering they're coming with many needs when they arrive, we think those numbers are good.

The labour market participation rate of refugees is just around 79%, which is consistent with the Canadian-born population.

Just to give you some facts on earnings, while the entry earnings of refugees are the lowest of all the immigrant categories—in particular in terms of government-assisted refugees, the average earnings for refugees are just around \$20,000—that is in the early years of arrival. Then 10 years after landing, the share of refugees who report employment income on par with the Canadian average is just about 65%.

Those years in Canada when they become integrated and learn language skills is when you start to see those numbers really tick up.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: If these numbers show that they're on par with Canadians in society, would you say that investment in education and certain social programs would help with these numbers?

These numbers are already great numbers, but do you think that they would be even better if we're investing in these sorts of resources?

Mr. Paul MacKinnon: Certainly for the settlement service money that our department manages with some hundreds of groups across the country—with a fairly large percentage of that money being focused on language training—we think it's obviously critical that those investments are made, in particular for the refugee immigrants, I would say, who perhaps arrive with higher needs than some other immigrants when they arrive.

Those investments are critical.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: I think just over \$1 million is allotted for outreach and to talk about the misconceptions of those asylum seekers. I know that we did a lot of outreach in certain states in the U.S. and also in Latin America.

Has this been successful for us? I think we've seen the numbers of asylum seekers drop, specifically coming from particular regions.

Ms. Marta Morgan: Yes, we think this outreach has been very helpful.

One thing we saw—particularly the first summer when we had a lot of people who were Haitians coming—was a lack of information about the Canadian asylum system and what it takes and what it requires to be a legitimate asylum seeker.

Providing that kind of information, in our view, has certainly been helpful.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Rempel.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Thank you, Chair.

Just with the time I have, I'd like to put something on the record. My colleague opposite, Mr. Tabbara, used the term “theatrics” in his statement. One of my colleagues in the Liberal party wrote a very excellent article about microaggressions.

I did a lot of research on privilege and relevancy and I came to this meeting prepared. To use the term “theatrics” for something that is kind of misogynist. It's that kind of anti-feminist word that I'm not sure he would use for a male colleague.

I would also like to say one more thing. I've been called “hysterical”—

• (1645)

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Chair, on a point of privilege, I would say that to anyone: a male, a female or someone who doesn't conform to a certain gender. I would say that to anyone.

I truly believe that at certain times you do use theatrics and I will stand with that statement.

The Chair: Speak to the chair.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: I apologize to the chair.

It was a waste of the minister's time. He did swear an oath and I'm not going to get more into this, but we've already spent a lot of time in the first hour.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Bosc and Gagnon is fairly clear on rules of order and decorum, and you just made a good, pointed speech around casting aspersions on people and proceeding with decorum. I realize that my colleagues might be frustrated by the fact that I come

to meetings prepared with relevant questions that the minister has perhaps not replied to, but to characterize the pursuit of information in the parliamentary committee as “theatrics” is like, to have a prime minister who's a feminist, to say that, it's a little fake to me.

I just want to put it on the record, in terms of my colleague responding to my point of order, to make him perhaps have a thought about his language. Maybe I'm just better at my job, but I reject that term and I would ask him, in his point of order, to apologize. Thank you.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Chair, I wouldn't apologize for that, and the reason being is that we've repeatedly seen from that member that every time she questions witnesses, she allows them maybe six seconds to speak. For the three years that she has been on this committee, she's never apologized—

The Chair: I'm going to actually call this discussion over. The committee can overrule me on this, but I would like to move on with your question. I think you wanted to make your point. Your point was made.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Those who have ears to hear will hear.

Your time will continue. Thank you.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Thank you, Chair.

To any young women who might be listening, I would just like to say that one should never have to apologize for being exceptionally good at their job. Thank you.

Ms. Morgan, with regard to resources used to support inquiries coming in from members of Parliament or members of the public, would you be able to table with the committee the number of times that the minister has used his authority under subsection 24(3) of IRPA, or any other intervention, based on requests made by Raj Grewal, his constituency staff, Jagdeep Mann, any employees or associates of Jagdeep Mann Immigration Consulting, or Mr. Yusuf Yenilmez?

Ms. Marta Morgan: We have a number of ways in which the minister and MPs are able to seek information on individual cases. We have an MP line through which MPs may call and ask the department for information on particular cases that are brought to them by their constituents, and we provide information through that line. Often, when MPs call, they have information about a number of cases. We also brief MPs in order to give them information about the immigration system and issues that may arise, as we know that they receive many of these types of questions in their constituencies—

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Thank you, Ms. Morgan. I asked a very blunt question: yes or no? Would you be able to table with the committee the information I just requested?

Ms. Marta Morgan: When we get requests through our MP line, we do not track which MPs are asking for requests, and when we deal with cases we address, we provide case information on a case-by-case basis. However, I do not believe that information is available or kept by the department.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Do you track when an immigration consultant or someone would be intervening on a person? Do you track that information at all?

• (1650)

Ms. Marta Morgan: No, we do not track information on that, unless we have reason to believe there are integrity concerns where we may have investigations under way. In general, we do not track that information. We deal with cases on a case-by-case basis.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Can you table with the committee any instances where you have noted integrity concerns on a case-by-case basis in this regard?

Ms. Marta Morgan: I would be happy to table information about how we address integrity within the system. Because of privacy concerns, I would not be at liberty to table information on individual and specific cases.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Just an aggregate....

Ms. Marta Morgan: As I said, we are not at liberty to disclose private information. However, I would be happy to provide aggregate information on how we address integrity within the system and the considerations around that.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Can I ask a question on process? If an immigration consultant called into one of these various tip lines, is there a consent process that the department undertakes to give information to somebody who's intervening for someone else?

Ms. Marta Morgan: An individual can elect to provide consent for a consultant or anyone else speaking on their behalf.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Like a member of Parliament...?

Ms. Marta Morgan: Yes, that would include members of Parliament seeking information on their cases.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Do you track those consent forms, Ms. Morgan?

Ms. Marta Morgan: Most of the information we provide directly is provided on the phone, and often when there are a number of cases. Sometimes a consultant may seek information on a number of cases, or sometimes—

Hon. Michelle Rempel: How do you collect consent? When it happens over the phone, would you phone that person to ask if they would agree to let so-and-so intervene on their behalf, or is it done by email?

Ms. Marta Morgan: I would be happy to provide information to the committee on exactly how consent is collected. Often in the case of immigration files—

Hon. Michelle Rempel: What you've just said is that in order to have somebody intervene, they require consent. I require consent as a member of Parliament. You've said that you ask for that. One would surmise that you have that information somewhere.

Would it then be accurate to say, based on that information, that you could provide the committee with the information I requested? You have to ask for consent, and you have just said that you track that.

Ms. Marta Morgan: I think the issue is what is actually tracked as data within our system. Certainly when a phone call is received—

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Do you not don't track consent?

Ms. Marta Morgan: We track consent, but we don't necessarily add—

Hon. Michelle Rempel: You do track consent.

Ms. Marta Morgan: We don't necessarily add up all of the calls and who made which call on behalf of whom, in a way that we could provide data on that to a committee.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: How do you know when someone's intervening if you're not applying the consent to individual interventions?

Ms. Marta Morgan: I'm not sure that I'm following the question.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: I'm sorry. I'm trying to get the information that I'd like, and I find it odd that you can't provide it. You just said that you provide information with regard to consent. Anybody intervening on someone's behalf, including a member of Parliament, would have to get consent, yet you say that you don't associate it with follow-up.

I'm just wondering whether there's a privacy issue writ large here, because your officials aren't directed to see if there's actual consent each time somebody calls in. Oftentimes it's not a one-off process. I surely know that. Certainly we don't get same-day service from your department when we call.

Ms. Marta Morgan: Mr. Chair, I regret that the member does not get same-day service when she calls our line. We endeavour to provide as good a service as we possibly can.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: It's about 30 days.

Ms. Marta Morgan: I think there's a difference between consent provided on individual questions versus collected data that could be tabled at a committee. I think that the member has asked for data, which is not necessarily collected in that way. I would be happy, however, to look at whatever data exists.

The Chair: I'm sorry, I need to end there.

Ms. Kwan.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Thank you very much.

On that issue, I think it's important to try to figure out how many requests have come in. I think that's the data that Ms. Rempel is asking for, and I think this would be for the benefit of everyone.

Now, I want to get into some other questions. The supplementary estimates provide for \$50 million to compensate provinces for housing for asylum seekers. I know that British Columbia did not get a penny of that money, yet British Columbia in 2017 received 2,325 asylum seekers and 30% of them entered into B.C. irregularly. Each month we have about 130 individuals crossing over through our southern border at the Peace Arch in British Columbia.

Why didn't B.C. get any support out of that \$50 million?

•(1655)

Ms. Marta Morgan: On the first point about the number of requests, we absolutely do track the number of requests, the number of calls. That sort of aggregate data is available and we'll certainly provide it to the committee.

Regarding the \$50 million, it was allocated for this year and is part of the supplementary estimates. The government pledged an initial \$50 million to assist the provinces of Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba. To date, \$11 million has been transferred to the City of Toronto and \$3 million to the Province of Manitoba.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Sorry, I'm going to interrupt, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Marta Morgan: Those were the areas that saw the largest increases in the number of asylum claimants.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: That was not the information I asked for. I asked why British Columbia didn't get any portion of that \$50 million. I would appreciate it if my question could get answered with respect to that.

Then, on that question, British Columbia as a province received the second-largest number of asylum seekers. Our numbers were above Manitoba's, for example. Why didn't British Columbia get a share of that money?

Ms. Marta Morgan: What the federal government was looking at in providing that \$50 million in funding to the City of Toronto and the Province of Manitoba—there's some remaining, obviously, that has been pledged to the Province of Quebec—is the proportional increase in the number of irregular migrants who had been coming across through irregular means.

The impact of that had been felt, in the year we were looking at it, particularly in Quebec, which has been the largest recipient, then the migration to Ontario of about 40%, and then the much smaller impact in absolute numbers, but proportionately fairly large, in the province of Manitoba.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: I'm saying that there is a significant impact for British Columbia as well, yet somehow British Columbia was not factored in.

I wonder if Ms. Morgan could table for this committee the formula that was used to calculate the allocation for the different provinces, and specifically what information is required for British Columbia to get a portion of that money.

Ms. Marta Morgan: We would be happy to table with the committee the considerations that went into the determination of the funding for that \$50 million.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Specifically, I would like to have information about British Columbia, about why British Columbia didn't get the money and what British Columbia needs to do to demonstrate the need. Yes...?

Ms. Marta Morgan: Yes.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Thank you.

On the question around asylum seekers, the supplementary estimates talk about using the dollars to deter asylum claims or asylum seekers. We note that the U.S. is now firing tear gas at migrants still in Mexico to deter them from making an asylum claim.

Are tear gas launchers a deterrent being examined within the government's work?

Ms. Marta Morgan: No. This sort of funding refers to communications and outreach to ensure that correct information is understood regarding Canada's asylum system.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: On that basis, then, is the ministry looking into whether or not firing tear gas at migrants prior to arriving at a border is an appropriate action under the 1951 UN convention and the 1967 protocol for asylum seekers?

Ms. Marta Morgan: Canada continues to meet our international obligations with respect to asylum seekers. We're working very closely with the United States on management of the Canada-U.S. border, where we do have close and ongoing relationships with our U.S. counterparts.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Sorry, but my question is this. Has the department confirmed whether or not firing tear gas at migrants prior to their arriving at a border to make an asylum claim is consistent with the 1951 UN convention and the 1967 protocol for asylum seekers?

Mr. Matt DeCoursey: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I'm not sure how this applies to the estimates.

The Chair: I was just going to remind the member.

If you could make a case as to how this applies to the estimates, I would entertain that.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Yes, I will make a case.

The Chair: Please make the case—under time.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: The minister has said that he's spending money to deter asylum seekers. We now know that people firing tear gas at asylum seekers is not something the minister is looking at. Related to that is whether or not the department officials have conducted any examination of the asylum seekers entering into the country based on the safe third country agreement, consistent with the 1951 UN convention.

This is all part of the department's work, Mr. Chair, under asylum seekers. Every aspect of it, when you make a decision related to that decision, actually applies.

•(1700)

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms. Marta Morgan: The funding provided in the supplementary estimates is utilized in order to provide information in the United States and in other places regarding Canada's asylum system and to correct misinformation that may be circulating—

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Thank you.

Ms. Marta Morgan: —regarding Canada's system. That is what that funding is used for.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: I gather, then, there's no inquiry into that.

How many asylum claims does the ministry expect the IRB to have referred to it in total in 2018, 2019, and 2020? Given that the government has continued to choose to underfund the IRB, how many of those claims referred to them does the department expect them to process in each of those years?

The Chair: I'm afraid I need to end you there.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Can I get that information tabled?

The Chair: No.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: So much for getting information.

The Chair: Mr. Whalen, it's your question.

Mr. Nick Whalen: Thank you, Chair.

I'm happy to have Ms. Kwan's question answered.

Mr. Paul MacKinnon: Mr. Chair, this year—2018—we're expecting approximately 50,000 asylum claims overall.

Ms. Kwan, you might have been asking about the backlog at the IRB. As of October this year, there are about 69,000 decisions pending.

In terms of 2020, I wouldn't want to suggest what that number will be, but the 50,000 last year and 50,000 this year seem to be about on par in terms of a yearly intake.

Mr. Nick Whalen: Thank you.

With respect to the line of questioning earlier about the consent management process, in my office, when I happen to deal with an immigration case, I'm often asked by the agent on the phone for the date of birth, the UCI and the application number. They verify my identity and that I have this information, and that's what's deemed consent. I contrast that with the CRA, where I'm required to provide a physical consent form. I think there are two different standards of consent.

I like the process at the IRCC, so I'm not suggesting you change. But one thing about that process is that there's no ability for the IRCC to know from me whether or not I'm acting on behalf of any other individual group or for someone else's benefit. That's an ethics question.

Do you have some other mechanism to obtain that information generally, or does it not exist?

Ms. Marta Morgan: No, we would not have information on that. We are operating on the basis that MPs receive questions from their constituents and that if the MP has the information, it indicates that they have consent. We only provide information on the file.

Mr. Nick Whalen: With respect to the MP hotline, there's no ability for someone who answers the phone to take any decision that's outside their purview or to be influenced or lend or sell influence through using the MP hotline?

Dr. Harpreet Kochhar (Assistant Deputy Minister, Operations, Department of Citizenship and Immigration): It is the case that the person who is receiving the call on the other end is able to go into the global case management system, look at the status of the file, and see if there are particular inquiries, for example, about whether something is missing or how much time.... That is all. They don't have the ability or the power to change anything or influence a decision.

Mr. Nick Whalen: That's perfect.

I'm going to ask some questions along the lines of the levels plan, because I think it affects the estimates process in terms of whether there will be more or less, or how the run rate is going to work in the budgetary process as we look forward.

In terms of the increased operating expenses, there doesn't appear to be anything related to increased or decreased costs associated with the levels plan. For the 2018-19 fiscal year, how are we doing, what ballpark are we at now, with respect to the levels plan and the expenditures? Do you expect expenditures to fluctuate with where we are in the levels plan, or are we going to be down the middle regardless, and plus or minus 20,000 cases really isn't going to change our operating expenses?

I just want to get a sense of that, because there's quite a broad range within the levels plan. From my perspective, if we were to hit the top ends I would expect to see some additional costs, or if we're at the low end, maybe some lesser costs.

I'd like to understand how you manage the finances in conjunction with the levels plan.

• (1705)

Ms. Marta Morgan: One thing that has been a real game-changer for us has been the multi-year levels plan the government tabled last year and then again this year, because it really does allow us to plan, budget and resource—in terms of human resources as well—on a multi-year, ongoing basis. Particularly when we have, as we do over the next number of years, an increase in the levels year after year, it allows us to be prepared for that.

We were provided funding in budget 2018 to support the growth in the levels plan. We are on track now, both in terms of the levels and utilization of the funding. We monitor this very closely because we want to make sure we are within the range that was approved by Parliament. Both on the funding and on the numbers side, at this point we would say that we are on track to do that.

Mr. Nick Whalen: That's wonderful.

With respect to internal transfers for the migration policy development program, which is used to fund international forums and research on international migration policy issues, what policy issues were specifically done this year for that transfer? What is expected next year? We don't have project-based estimates reporting for your department, so it would be nice to see what the projects are like.

Mr. Paul MacKinnon: I'd be happy to table that information, but I can give you a sense of it if you don't mind me using the time.

We do a lot of workshops, for example, in Central America that look at capacity-building issues around visa and passport issuance. We work with the International Organization for Migration to better understand migration trends.

We had an earlier question about refugees. We're also doing some interesting work with an organization called Talent Beyond Boundaries that is looking at how we can look at refugees—and not just through the refugee lens of needing protection. A number of refugees are very skilled. Could we be bringing those folks in through economic pathways? We're doing some work there, and we've actually had, I believe, two people arrive in Canada through our work with Talent Beyond Boundaries, which is funded in part through this money.

Those are just some examples. There's a long list of examples that we could share.

Mr. Nick Whalen: Mr. Mills.

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Mills: I'd like to add that the transfer of \$650,000 was to meet the growing need for Canadian expertise in the execution and implementation of immigration policy and refugee protection policy at the international level. This is an internal transfer between our integration level and that program.

Mr. Nick Whalen: Mr. Mills, is your department effecting a transition in this manner...

The Chair: I am sorry to have to interrupt you, but your time is up.

[English]

Mr. Nick Whalen: It's project-based funding.

The Chair: Mr. Maguire.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate having the opportunity to ask a few questions here.

First, are there any permanent full-time-equivalent positions being funded through the supplementary estimates (A)? Could I get a response from you on that?

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Mills: I have that information and I will give it to you in a few moments. In the meantime, perhaps we could go on to the next question.

[English]

Mr. Larry Maguire: Okay.

The IRCC's departmental results report, the performance report, was just tabled, and I think \$63.7 million was budgeted for health protection in 2017-18. However, \$133 million was spent. I'm wondering how you can end up spending double what was budgeted. What caused the department to be so far off its estimates? Could you help me with that?

Ms. Marta Morgan: I would want to confirm that for sure because I don't have the departmental report in front of me at this committee hearing. My working assumption is that this is the interim federal health program, which is driven by the number of individuals who are eligible for the program. It does vary year over year. Since

we had a large increase in the number of asylum claimants, that is probably what you're talking about, but because I don't have it in front of me, I would want to come back to you, just to be sure, and table that with the committee.

• (1710)

Mr. Larry Maguire: I wonder if you could do the same thing for the temporary economic residents, as \$24.5 million was budgeted and the government spent \$46.2 million.

Ms. Marta Morgan: We would be happy to do that.

Mr. Larry Maguire: I just wonder how you could be that far out. You believe that it is relevant to the number of people who applied for their particular health situations. Would that be as a result of the increase in refugees that we've had come into Canada?

Ms. Marta Morgan: Certainly, asylum seekers are eligible for that program.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Has any money been allocated through main estimates, through vote 40, to introduce a permanent path to permanent residency? Part of the minister's mandate letter, I believe, is about trying to provide an opportunity to have as much permanent residency as we can. That has gone on, so I'm assuming that some funds are allocated in that resource.

First of all, I need a yes-or-no answer on that. If it is "yes", could you just provide me with an estimate of how much was used in that area?

Mr. Paul MacKinnon: I can't provide you with an exact estimate, but I can say that the work we're doing associated with more permanent pathways for temporary foreign workers is just with the teams and the policy people we have in the department now. It's not an incremental that we're getting to do the policy work on that.

I can say, just for interest, that in 2017, Canada transitioned just over 56,000 temporary residents into permanent economic immigrants, through permanent economic programs. There's a number being transitioned right now, even before this work is finished. A number of those transitions are happening at the provincial level, through the provincial nominee program from coast to coast.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Okay. How are you doing?

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Mills: Mr. Chair, I can answer the question on the number of full-time employees in supplementary estimates (A). It is in the line which has the

[English]

funding to support the use and protection of classified information in immigration proceeding.

[Translation]

This initiative was renewed on a permanent basis and requires 22 full-time permanent employees.

[English]

Mr. Larry Maguire: Okay. Thank you.

In vote 40, the budget implementation vote by departments, there are a couple of lines here. For the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, there's \$85.9 million budgeted. The only funds that have been spent are the \$17 million on irregular migration, I think for protecting temporary foreign workers. There is nothing for getting into and staying in the workforce and career pathways for visible minority newcomer women in Canada, protecting vulnerable women and girls, supporting Canada's official languages or expanding the diversity of entrepreneurs.

There was \$17 million allocated. There has been—

The Chair: I'm afraid I need to end you there. Sorry.

That seems to be happening a lot today. I advise all members to keep their clocks on and manage that time.

[Translation]

Mr. Ayoub, you have five minutes.

Mr. Ramez Ayoub: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Have any amounts in the credits been allocated to processing asylum requests from persons who entered irregularly by Roxham Road? We are told that there are 69,000 files awaiting processing.

What amounts were specifically allocated to resolve that situation and what are the new “normal” wait times? Were there average wait times that no longer apply, given the situation of the past two years in that part of Quebec?

Ms. Marta Morgan: Thank you for your question.

Budget 2018 includes an amount of \$174 million over two years to manage irregular migration, as well as for management at the border and the processing of asylum requests.

• (1715)

[English]

To speed up the processing of claims, \$74 million will go directly to the Immigration and Refugee Board. This will allow the IRB to hire 248 new staff, including 64 decision-makers, in order to review an additional 17,000 asylum claims this year. The IRB has also increased its efficiency over the past year and finalized more than 50% of claims over what was foreseen. A dedicated effort is being made in order to address the increasing number of claims.

In terms of the normal time frame, the time frame for decisions at the IRB has varied greatly, depending on what's happening in terms of asylum claims in Canada. If you look over a historical period, you can see that when there are significant increases in claims, the processing time has gone up and then when the claims decrease, the processing time has gone down.

Prior to this significant inflow, I think that the flow coming in and flow going out, on any given year, was roughly in balance. At that point, the IRB had been funded to process between 20,000 to 24,000 claims a year because that was about what was anticipated, on an ongoing basis, until the recent increases that we've seen in the last two years.

[Translation]

Mr. Ramez Ayoub: I would also like to know how much time you needed to process the 24,000 or 25,000 files that you normally received. Were they processed in 12 or 18 months?

Ms. Marta Morgan: The first case study was done in one year. Things were balanced: in one year, we received approximately 24,000 files and we processed 24,000 files.

Mr. Ramez Ayoub: They were then out of the system.

Ms. Marta Morgan: Exactly.

Mr. Ramez Ayoub: During that time, you provided accommodation and services to these asylum seekers, while they waited for a final answer on their file.

[English]

Ms. Marta Morgan: Yes. Typically when asylum seekers have required assistance, it has been provided by provincial governments in the past.

[Translation]

Mr. Ramez Ayoub: Okay, thank you.

My next question is about the figures. What percentage of requests are denied?

[English]

Mr. Paul MacKinnon: We could share those numbers with you.

Generally, this year, Mr. Chair, I would say it's about 50%, but it depends upon the country. Some countries have high rejection rates.

We have those figures and would be happy to share the overall figures with the table.

[Translation]

Mr. Ramez Ayoub: That's all for me, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: You are done?

Mr. Ramez Ayoub: I have 20 seconds left. I'll use them to thank the witnesses.

The Chair: Fine.

[English]

We'll continue with Mr. Maguire.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Under the estimates, you sought millions of dollars in contingency funding under vote 5a. It was emergency funding out of the Treasury Board's contingency fund—so it has to be paid back by IRCC—used for biometric programming, temporary foreign workers and the exit-entry program.

In that you personally had to sign off on this Treasury Board funding to access this emergency funding, why did they need the emergency funding, and what are the specifics around each reason for the requirement for this emergency funding?

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Mills: We do not accept emergency funds. The department's vote 5a is a capital expenditure credit. It will be used for computer systems that are being developed. So it is not the same vote 5a as that of the Treasury Board Secretariat, which is the central reserve.

Vote 5 for Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada is really a capital credit that allows us to invest in our computer systems or our assets.

We don't borrow money and we do not use emergency funds in this case.

• (1720)

[English]

Mr. Larry Maguire: It doesn't have to be paid back. Is that what you're saying?

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Mills: Exactly, we don't need to reimburse it. It is not a contingency fund, it's a fund that belongs to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada.

[English]

Mr. Larry Maguire: Okay, thank you.

I'll turn it over to my colleague, Mr. Chair.

Mr. David Tilson: How many illegal border crossers are still living in hotels?

Ms. Marta Morgan: It's often the case that irregular border crossers or other asylum seekers require temporary housing assistance, and that housing assistance can be provided either by provincial governments or—

Mr. David Tilson: I know all that. How many of these illegal border crossers are still living in hotels?

Ms. Marta Morgan: Many asylum seekers require temporary assistance, and that assistance can be provided by cities, municipalities—

Mr. David Tilson: I understand that. How many illegal border crossers are still living in hotels?

Ms. Marta Morgan: I wouldn't have a number for asylum seekers who are living in hotels.

Mr. David Tilson: What's been the cost to date, since the beginning of 2017, for housing illegal border crossers?

Ms. Marta Morgan: One second, and we will have that for you.

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Mills: This year, in 2018-19, the Department of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship plans to spend about \$14 million for temporary housing, which includes hotels.

[English]

Mr. David Tilson: What's the rate of rejection of asylum claims of illegal border crossers?

Ms. Marta Morgan: We would be happy to provide you the IRB approval and rejection rate by country for asylum seekers in general.

Mr. David Tilson: Okay. You can give that to the clerk.

Of these, can you tell me how many have been removed to date? How many of these illegal border crossers have been removed to date?

Ms. Marta Morgan: We would be happy to provide that information. That is the responsibility of the Canada Border Services

Agency, so we would get that information from them to make sure that it's absolutely accurate.

Mr. David Tilson: Thank you.

Earlier this year, we were told that Nigerians made up the bulk of those crossing illegally in 2018. Is that still the case?

Ms. Marta Morgan: They're not the majority, but they're the largest single nationality.

Mr. David Tilson: What nationalities are currently most represented among the illegal border crossers?

Ms. Marta Morgan: Do you have that, Paul?

Mr. Paul MacKinnon: On irregular asylum claims from January 1 to October 28, 2018, we have Nigeria at just over 7,000; the U.S. A. at 971, and that's primarily children who were born in the U.S.; Colombia, 934; Pakistan, 569; Haiti, 554; and then "other", at about 7,000. That's just over 17,000.

Mr. David Tilson: Last fall we were told the IRB's processing capacity was about 24,000 cases a year. What's the IRB's current processing capacity?

Ms. Marta Morgan: The current processing capacity of the IRB is about 32,000 a year.

Mr. David Tilson: How many cases are we able to process per month and then per year?

Ms. Marta Morgan: At 32,000 a year, if divided by 12, it would be.... Sorry. It's on an even flow, although—

Mr. David Tilson: No, you're absolutely right. That was a silly question.

Ms. Marta Morgan: I would say that as the IRB is ramping up its capacity based on the \$74 million received in last year's budget. We would expect that number to be growing on a monthly basis.

The Chair: Thank you. I need to end you there.

Ms. Zahid, you have five minutes.

Mrs. Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Thank you, Chair, and thanks to our officials today.

The estimates contain \$3 million in funding under the migrant smuggling prevention strategy for delivering basic services to intercepted migrants and for their voluntary return and reintegration. I see this as a part of the whole-of-government approach to migrant smuggling, with funding also being provided to different agencies such as CSIS, the RCMP and GAC.

Could you please discuss the IRCC's role in combatting human smuggling?

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Mills: The department's strategy consists in coordinating the efforts deployed by all of the departments to disrupt the organized passage of clandestine individuals likely to head toward Canada, and we encourage co-operation among foreign countries by strengthening their capacity to detect clandestine entries and put an end to them.

The funding IRC requests is thus to provide basic services to intercepted migrants such as food, shelter and medical care.

• (1725)

[English]

Mrs. Salma Zahid: I note that over \$387,000 has been allocated to the IRB under funding for the 2018 to 2020 levels plan for operating expenditures for claims processing. Are there specific claims that this additional funding is being allocated to address? Also, has the legacy claims backlog been cleared?

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Mills: The \$387,000 the IRC will receive or is requesting in supplementary estimates (A) is truly related to the work it must do because of the increase in asylum seekers and refugees.

As you know, when people cross the border, they are processed by the Immigration and Refugee Board. Since the reference levels increase from one year to the next, they receive proportionate funding.

[English]

Ms. Marta Morgan: With respect to the legacy backlog, the IRB has 45 part-time members working on the legacy task force, which is focusing primarily on cases referred before December 2012. There are still some legacy cases outstanding, but good progress is being made on that task force. I think they're getting close.

Mrs. Salma Zahid: This amount of \$387,000 is just for the new cases? It will not be used towards the legacy cases.

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Mills: This aims to increase their capacity to process files. The amount will go to increasing productivity in general.

[English]

Mrs. Salma Zahid: I know there were some questions already discussed with regard to the money for housing the irregular migrants—the money that has been allocated especially for the provinces of Ontario and Quebec to handle the irregular crossers.

Have the issues raised by the City of Toronto last summer been addressed specifically, and have most now transitioned to permanent housing?

Ms. Marta Morgan: The City of Toronto received \$11 million last summer to assist it in addressing the pressures on its housing system. We continue to work very closely with the City of Toronto to understand the implications of the increase in asylum seekers overall on the city, and that is an ongoing relationship.

We also assisted Toronto in finding temporary accommodations for asylum seekers when they needed it, and those contracts were recently extended at the request of the City of Toronto.

We are in close communication with the City of Toronto regarding the implications of the increase in the asylum seekers in terms of housing.

Mrs. Salma Zahid: Has there been any further asks by the City of Toronto, or...?

Ms. Marta Morgan: The City of Toronto continues to communicate with us about the pressure, and we are trying to understand that with them and better understand what the extent of

the pressure is and what the implications of the asylum system are. There are ongoing communications with the City of Toronto on this issue.

The Chair: Thank you.

As an MP from Toronto, I thank you on behalf of Toronto.

Ms. Kwan, you have about two minutes, and you'll bring us home.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I note in the supplementary estimates that dollars are being expended, \$3 million for the TFWP and the IMP programs. Could the staff advise whether any of these funds are directed to the caregivers program?

Mr. Paul MacKinnon: No. That \$3 million is associated with building a technological interface between our department and ESDC to share information around compliance of temporary foreign workers, so there's no link to caregivers.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: What work is being done for the care program development? What resources are being directed there, and what work is being done in that stream?

• (1730)

Mr. Paul MacKinnon: Which one is that?

Ms. Jenny Kwan: It's the care program development. According to the supplementary estimates, there is the care program development component.

Mr. Paul MacKinnon: Is that associated with the \$3 million that I just spoke about? I'm just not familiar with that terminology.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: I'm just looking for the money.... It is the \$3 million. There's no money at all, whatsoever, for the caregivers component.

Mr. Paul MacKinnon: No. It's just a technological solution to share information between pipes.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: The last time staff was here, I asked this question about when we can expect the caregivers program to be announced. Does anybody have any indication of when that would be—the new caregiver program?

Ms. Marta Morgan: As the minister has indicated, an announcement will be made on a future pathway to permanent residence for caregivers before the current pilot ends in November 2019.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Yes, I know. That's been the line ever since the minister quietly put that up on the website to say that is coming to an end, but we have yet to learn when exactly the new program will be announced.

With respect to the—

The Chair: I'm afraid I need to end it there at 5:31, but don't move anyone.

We have some votes to do now with respect to these supplementary—

Mr. Nick Whalen: May we have a recorded vote, please? One on the first one would be enough.

The Chair: There are five votes, supplementary estimates (A), 2018-19, votes 1a, 5a and 10a under Citizenship and Immigration, and vote 1a under the Immigration and Refugee Board.

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION
Vote 1a—Operating expenditures.....\$7,113,949

(Vote 1a agreed to: yeas 5; nays 3)

Mr. Nick Whalen: Actually, I think we'll have them all recorded.
[*Translation*]

The Chair: Fine.

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP CANADA
Vote 5a—Capital expenditures... \$8,666,837
Vote 10a—Grants listed in any of the estimates for the fiscal year... \$53,000,000

(Votes 5a and 10a carried on division; yeas 5; nays 3.)

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE BOARD OF CANADA
Vote 1a—Program expenditures... \$1,809,767

(Vote 1a carried on division; yeas 5; nays 3.)

[*English*]

The Chair: This one will be interesting.

Shall I report the supplementary estimates (A) 2018-19 to the House?

(Motion agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: As there is no other business in front of the committee, I declare the committee meeting adjourned.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <http://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.noscommunes.ca>