



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 035**

Wednesday, October 12, 2022

---

Chair: Mrs. Salma Zahid





# Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

Wednesday, October 12, 2022

• (1435)

[English]

**The Chair (Mrs. Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre, Lib.)):** I call the meeting to order.

Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome to meeting number 35. We'll be studying—

Go ahead, Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC):** Madam Chair, there's a motion I'd like to make.

**The Chair:** I am just opening the meeting. Let me open it and then we will come back.

Welcome to meeting number 35 of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(4), the committee is meeting today to consider a request received by the clerk and submitted by five members of the committee to discuss undertaking a study of the coming into force date for the College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants act. Members have all received the letter and have had a chance to look at the meeting request.

I will open the floor for debate. First of all, I will suggest that the motion be read for the record. Would any member like to read that motion?

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** I would like to do that, Madam.

Actually, the motion is going to be slightly different. The clerk has a copy. I would like her to send it around to everybody right now. As we're doing that, I'll thank everybody for being here today. My colleagues and Alexis requested this meeting, so I'm thankful everyone is here today.

I'll begin reading it. You should receive it shortly.

The motion is this:

That pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) the committee conduct a study into allegations of potential obstruction of justice at Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada; that this study consist of at least three meetings; that the committee invite Minister Mendicino for one meeting, departmental officials for one meeting, that the Minister appear separately from officials, that the officials invited include Patrick Therrien, Counsel, Legal Services (DOJ), IRCC and Brian Smith, Assistant Director, Immigration, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada; that the third meeting be outside legal experts, and other witnesses as the committee sees fit; that these meetings be televised; that these meetings occur at the earliest opportunity possible and no later than November 4, 2022; that the Committee send for all information and documents, including: emails, briefing notes, memorandums, text messages, all electronic forms of communications, phone calls [including summary notes], hand written notes and any other correspondence, communication or documentation in the possession of Immigra-

tion, Refugees and Citizenship Canada or any subsidiary organizations relating to either the trademark case T-834-20 and related counter-suits before the federal court, or to the coming into force of section 292 of the Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1, provided that:

(a) these documents shall be deposited with the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel, in an unredacted form, within 14 days of the adoption of this order;

(b) the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel redact all information that might reasonably be expected to compromise the personal contact information of individuals, and provide the redacted versions to the Committee;

(c) that the Access to Information packages JUS-A2020-00969, PCO-A-2020-00569, IRCC-2A 2020-93519 (part 1, part 2 and part 3) be sent to the Parliamentary Law Clerk without redaction for the Clerk to determine if redactions can be lifted and tabled with the committee,

(d) the committee hold an in-camera meeting with the Law Clerk, within seven days of the conclusion of his redaction of the documents, in order to determine which documents could be made public; and,

(e) should the department not provide documents in their unredacted form within ten days to the Law Clerk, that the Deputy Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Refugees Canada be scheduled to appear, and the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Refugees Canada be invited to appear before the committee within 21 days of this motion passing to explain why the documents were not provided,

(f) should the Minister or Deputy Minister after this appearance still not turn over the documents in an unredacted form within ten days, or fail to appear within the 21 days, the Chair shall be instructed to report at their earliest opportunity to the House the following: "Your committee has requested documents from Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada and these documents have not been provided."

That's the motion, Madame Chair.

• (1440)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Redekopp.

I think your motion has just been sent by the clerk to all the members. I will suspend the meeting for three or four minutes so that everyone can have a look at that motion, and then we'll come back.

The meeting is suspended for a few minutes so that members can have an opportunity to look at that motion.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC):** I was going to ask that Brad read it again, actually. He did such a good job the first time.

**The Chair:** We will suspend the meeting for a few minutes to let everyone read that.

Madam Clerk, have you circulated the motion in both official languages?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Stephanie Bond):** Yes, I have.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

• (1440) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1445)

**The Chair:** I call the meeting back to order.

Mr. Redekopp has moved a motion. I hope everyone has been able to read it.

Would any members like Mr. Redekopp to repeat his motion, or is everyone okay?

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** I wouldn't mind, as you asked the question, if he repeated it.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Zuberi.

Mr. Redekopp, would you please repeat your motion?

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** My motion is as follows:

That pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) the committee conduct a study into allegations of potential obstruction of justice at Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada; that this study consist of at least three meetings; that the committee invite Minister Mendicino for one meeting, departmental officials for one meeting, that the Minister appear separately from officials,—

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** On a point of order, are translators able to translate this into French?

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** I'm assuming that everybody's reading along.

**The Chair:** Can you go a bit slower, Mr. Redekopp?

Yes, Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ):** Point of order, Madam Chair.

I think there is a problem with the sound.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Madam Clerk, could you check the interpretation?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** There is a lot of reverberation. It's difficult for our interpreters, who do a great job. We should make it easier for them.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Okay. It's good now.

Mr. Redekopp, please start again, and go a bit slower for the interpreters.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Okay.

The motion continues as follows:

that the officials invited include Patrick Therrien, Counsel, Legal Services (DOJ), IRCC and Brian Smith, Assistant Director, Immigration, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada; that the third meeting be outside legal experts, and other witnesses as the committee sees fit; that these meetings be televised; that these meetings occur at the earliest opportunity possible and no later than November 4, 2022; that the Committee send for all information and documents, including: emails, briefing notes, memorandums, text messages, all electronic forms of communications, phone calls (summary notes), hand written notes and any other correspondence, communication or documentation in the possession of the Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada or any subsidiary organizations relating to either the trademark case T-834-20 and related

counter-suits before the federal court, or to the coming into force of section 292 of the Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1, provided that:

(a) these documents shall be deposited with the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel, in an unredacted form, within 14 days of the adoption of this order;

(b) the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel redact all information that might reasonably be expected to compromise the personal contact information of individuals, and provide the redacted versions to the Committee;

(c) that the Access to Information packages JUS-A2020-00969, PCO-A-2020-00569, IRCC-2A 2020-93519 (part 1, part 2 and part 3) be sent to the Parliamentary Law Clerk without redaction for the Clerk to determine if redactions can be lifted and tabled with the committee,

(d) the committee hold an in-camera meeting with the Law Clerk, within seven days of the conclusion of his redaction of the documents, in order to determine which documents could be made public; and,

(e) should the department not provide documents in their unredacted form within ten days to the Law Clerk, that the Deputy Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Refugees Canada be scheduled to appear, and the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Refugees Canada be invited to appear before the committee within 21 days of this motion passing to explain why the documents were not provided,

(f) should the Minister or Deputy Minister after this appearance still not turn over the documents in an unredacted form within ten days, or fail to appear within the 21 days, the Chair shall be instructed to report at their earliest opportunity to the House the following: "Your committee has requested documents from Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada and these documents have not been provided."

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Redekopp.

Go ahead, Mr. Zuberi.

• (1450)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I did hear the French interpretation, but I would like Mr. Redekopp to provide a summary of the access to information files he spoke about.

[*English*]

Can you please give us some summary, Mr. Redekopp? Your motion is extremely long and packed. I think for all of our understanding, so that we're on the same page and know what we're discussing, can you please give us an adequate summary—not a minimal summary, but an adequate summary—so that we can have a proper understanding to judge what this motion is actually about?

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Zuberi.

We have two hands raised, after which we can go to Mr. Redekopp.

Go ahead, Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** I am concerned that this will delay our study of Roxham Road. In my view, this study is as topical as today's motion. In addition, the committee voted unanimously in favour of the Roxham Road motion. It is rare that our committee members unanimously agree on a particular issue.

I don't know how we can go about this in terms of procedure—as is well known, procedure is not my strong point—but I would like to find a way to alternate the two studies. Does anyone have an idea on how we could do this?

Should we remove “November 4” from the motion?

The motion states, “...that these meetings be televised; that these meetings occur at the earliest opportunity possible and no later than November 4...”.

I believe that if this date is kept in the motion, it will mean that we will have to postpone our study on Roxham Road. In my opinion, if we removed “and no later than November 4, 2022”, we could conduct the two studies alternately.

Next Tuesday we have a steering committee meeting to organize our schedule. At that time, we might find a satisfactory common ground.

What do my Conservative friends and those of the other parties think of this?

[English]

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Ms. Kwan.

**Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP):** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Before we get into scheduling issues, which I'll defer for further discussion at a later time, on the substance of the issue, which is where we are with respect to this motion, I think committee members may have received these documents. They were sent to me, but I understand they were also sent to the clerk for distribution. They may not have gone through translation. I'm not quite sure. In any event, I received a whole stack of documentation on this issue, including the ATIP document. It's over 300-some pages, so I pored over that document.

There is some pertinent information that I think is important to bring to the attention of the committee. I would then have some questions for Mr. Redekopp as well.

The ATIP document shows that on Friday, November 20, 2020, Ian Shugart, who was then the clerk of the Privy Council, signed an order stating that the Governor General “fixes the day on which this Order is registered”.

I don't know what that means and what compelled him to fix the date. How did he fix the date and for what reason did he fix the date? It is important for us to get an understanding of that.

The other interesting note for me in reading the document is that on Monday, November 23, 2020, Sabrina Kabir in the Department of Immigration wrote, “The GG already signed on Friday or Saturday, so technically the act is now in force.” According to the immigration department, officials seemed to think that the act had already come into force as well.

Subsequent to that on November 23, assistant director Brian Smith wrote, “The GG signed off on the order late Friday. As such, the act is already in force as of November 20, but this is not yet in the public domain”, so that's yet another official confirming that the act has been signed and is in force.

We know that on November 25, according to the documents, Gervas Wall wrote to the Federal Court in Toronto, stating that the act was “proclaimed in force on November 20, by order in council

PC Number 2020-0903.” That was another definitive statement from officials.

We then have other officials writing to Mr. Therrien, asking, “Do we know how this came into force? I assume there is a paper trail aside from the lines we reviewed. Can you let me know please...?” Officials are trying to find this paper trail.

On November 27, Madam Chair, Jonathan Shanks, who is the senior counsel for the Privy Council Office, wrote, “I understand that the Order was made on November 20. ...the Order will be registered on December 9.” There's a discrepancy.

If you look at the order, it does not say that the registration would have a different date. The OIC dated November 20 clearly indicates that:

Her Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, pursuant to subsection 300(1) of the Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1, chapter 29 of the Statutes of Canada, 2019, fixes the day on which this Order is registered as the day on which section 292 of that Act comes into force.

The language there is quite clear in saying that the order was registered as the date on which the section of that act came into force. It was supposed to be the same day.

There's something odd about this OIC, and I don't know how that came about. On the bottom of the OIC, there's a “date modified”, which reads, “2017-04-31”, referring to April 31, 2017. I don't know what that date means or how it came about.

● (1455)

Obviously, there's a glaring concern in the sense that April does not have 31 days. Regardless, that might be a computer glitch or something. I'm not sure. The OIC, though, was very clear about the date this comes into force.

On November 27, a counsel wrote to Mr. Therrien, “Oh boy. Anyway for next week now.” Somehow an alarm bell has been rung that something was awry here.

Then the assistant director, Brian Smith, wrote on November 30, “Things are on fire over here.” I don't know what prompted that comment, but something is definitely not quite right, judging from that comment.

Further down in this document of 300-some pages, it notes that Brian Smith sends to staff an email that says, “For urgent briefing:

“Remedial measures likely required re: College Act coming into force.

“Issue: The College Act is not yet in force, and will not be in force until December 9, 2020, the day on which the order in council will be formally registered. The department will need to consider remedial measures, given public communication of November 25, 2020, that the College Act was already in force.”

Officials there have now noted that there is a major concern and that some sort of remedial measure is required.

Finally, Madam Speaker, on November 27 Jonathan Shanks wrote, “I understand that the Order was made on Nov. 20....the Order will be registered on December 9”, so now a changing of the date has occurred or is occurring.

Subsequent to that, Mr. Gervas Wall was at a case management hearing in Toronto. He said the following:

...it was brought to my attention this morning that, although the order in council was signed on the 20th, the registration date of that order is actually December 9, and so the act will come into force on December 9th....

He went on:

I thought that it was the 20th, but registration date was something that I was not familiar with, and it missed me. ... I'm so embarrassed about that, but I do apologize.

That's what he seemed to have indicated.

That was followed by Jennifer Chow on December 3, who wrote the following:

I'm advised the in force date of the College Act...that we referred to at Ms. Saloum's cross-examination held on November 26, 2020 is incorrect. Typically, the date of the OIC is the same as the in force date, but this OIC had irregular wording and the in force date...is expected to be December 9....

These are some of the key passages that came about from the ATIP document.

I have a question. I wonder why Mr. Redekopp decided not to include, for example, the then clerk of the Privy Council, Ian Shugart, who signed the order, as one of the officials to be invited to come to committee. He actually said very clearly that he signed an order stating that the Governor General “fixes the date on which this order is registered”. What fix was he trying to do here? Why was he asked to do a fix? I think that's pretty critical information for us to obtain.

Three officials were very clear to say that the act was passed on November 20 and came into force on the 20th. They were all wrong, apparently. It wasn't one official; all three officials were wrong. What triggered, then, the need for the change? Why did the order in council have this irregular wording? What prompted it?

As we know, orders in council are very intentional. The wording is not just something you dream up. It's very intentional, for a purpose.

● (1500)

The order in council clearly stated that the registration date is the date on which it comes into force. Why did it have that intentional wording? Then, later on, it was discovered that it was irregular wording. Why was it necessary, then, to change the coming into force date to December? All this is tied to a copyright issue. I don't know enough about that case, but I think dates matter from this perspective.

My other question for Mr. Redekopp is this: Is it his intention with this motion to exclude other officials who we might need to call upon to shed light on this situation, or would the committee members, if deemed necessary, be able to request other officials to come before the committee for clarity??

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Kwan.

We see that there's a speaking list. Before we go on, I want to read this for you.

As chair of the standing committee, I received a letter from the deputy minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. I will read that letter:

Dear Chair:

I am writing to you in advance of the October 12, 2022, meeting of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration regarding the coming into force date of the College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants Act (College Act). I would like to provide clarity regarding the events that took place and assure you that every step was taken to rectify the initial human error of announcing the coming into force date as November 20, 2020, instead of the correct date of December 9, 2020.

The Order in Council—

Yes, Mr. Serré?

**Mr. Marc Serré (Nickel Belt, Lib.):** Madam Chair, on a point of order, I want to make sure that the letter—I just saw it—was sent to all of the members so that we all have access to it. The clerk just sent it.

● (1505)

**The Chair:** Yes, but I just want to read it—

**Mr. Marc Serré:** I just want to make sure that all members can look at that letter while you're reading it.

**The Chair:** Yes. The clerk just circulated it. I am just reading that letter:

The Order in Council (OIC) to bring the College Act into force was made by the Governor-General-in-Council on November 20, 2020. It was subsequently posted on the Privy Council Office (PCO) Website on November 25, 2020. At that time, the understanding with Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada...was that the making of the OIC marked the coming into force of the College Act. As such, on November 26, 2020, a news release was issued by IRCC announcing its coming into force.

Following the news release, the Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council (ICCRC)—at that time, the regulator for immigration and citizenship consultants—immediately submitted a continuance application to the Minister on November 26, 2020.

A coming into force date of November 20, 2020, was also introduced in the public domain via litigation before the Federal Court in ongoing separate litigation (ICCRC vs CICC Corp., Her Majesty the Queen (HMQ) v. CICC Corp. and CICC Corp. v. HMQ and ICCRC).

Subsequent to these events, IRCC was informed by the Department of Justice that the College Act would not, in fact, be in force until December 9, 2020, the date the OIC was to be formally registered in the Gazette part II. Once this became known, the following actions were taken:

On December 3, 2020, a Case Conference was held in the matter, and the Department of Justice brought the mistake to the attention of the Court.

On December 9, 2020, the Department of Justice confirmed to the Federal Court that the College Act came into force on that day through a letter (Annex A). This correction was subsequently recognized and accepted by the Court.

IRCC updated the information in its news release with the correct information regarding the coming into force of the College Act (Annex B).

The ICCRC refiled its continuance application with the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, at the time, the Honourable Marco Mendicino.

I sincerely hope this provides you with the necessary assurance that all appropriate steps were taken in order to correct the error of the coming into force date once it had been discovered.

I would like to thank you for your consideration of these facts.

It's signed “Yours sincerely, Christiane Fox”.

“Annex A” is the “Letter from the Department of Justice to the Federal Court of Canada confirming the coming into force date of the College Act”.

“Annex B” is “Minister Mendicino announces the coming into force of the College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants Act” - Canada.ca.”

I just want you to read that before we go on.

After Ms. Kwan, we had Mr. Serré. Go ahead, Mr. Serré.

**Mr. Marc Serré:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to follow up a bit on what was just said and look at the motion that was read earlier here by our colleague. I want to thank Ms. Kwan for bringing up the ATIP and the document that we have.

It's 730 pages, and that's a lot of pages to digest. To my understanding, because the ATIP response is such a large document, there wasn't an opportunity before today to get it translated and sent out to all the committee members. The document is very comprehensive and goes into great detail.

I'm asking all members here if there's a possibility for us to kind of put the motion aside and try to deal with the ATIP process and get it translated so that we can talk about that. As well, as Madam Chair just read, we received this, I think just minutes before the committee, from Christiane Fox, that clearly indicates it's a human error.

In light of these two documents, and as Alexis indicated earlier about the Roxham study, I'm wondering if there's a possibility that because of the two documents—the ATIP and also the letter that Christiane Fox just submitted in French and English that's it's a human error—we could get an opportunity here to absorb this before kind of diving into the motion. Maybe these two documents could enlighten us to maybe change the motion or to make some recommendations related to the motion.

I want to make sure we look at those two documents before we kind of dive into the motion itself. I just want to put that out there and ask if there's a possibility of doing that.

Thank you.

● (1510)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Serré.

We will now go to Mr. Zuberi.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I know that you have a lot of things moving around right now and that we're asking each other a lot of questions through you, so I'll just reiterate my initial question, through you, to Mr. Redekopp—or to anybody else, for that matter—around a summary of the access to information documents referred to in the motion. That's one.

Two, through you, I would like to ask the member from the NDP if she could please submit the document she was making reference to, if that's possible.

Ms. Kwan, I apologize, but I'm wondering if you could also summarize the heart of your commentary in terms of what you're asking

for from this committee. You did speak at length. Can you give us just a quick summary of that?

I'd also like to say that I support Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe's idea of having a parallel study. It makes sense. We've seen in committees that sometimes we're not able to move on one item and we get completely clogged. The whole committee gets completely clogged because it has one item on its docket. It doesn't move beyond that singular item to other items until the first one is addressed. We don't want that in this committee. We don't want this committee to get completely clogged up by one item on the docket.

Therefore, I would support what Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe is saying concerning parallel themes that are brought to this committee. For example, maybe the first day that this committee sits in a week, it will look at item (a). The second day that the committee sits that week it will look at item (b). We can continue like that, and that way, if item (a) gets clogged up or filibustered or whatever, then at least item (b) can move ahead and the committee's work can continue instead of being completely clogged.

Finally, I'd like to read into the record some email exchanges that I think would clarify that this was a good-faith error.

I apologize, but I don't have my glasses. I forgot them. If I read a bit slowly, please bear with me. I'll do my best. I'm not as fast a reader as Mr. Redekopp, and on top of that I have no glasses, but I'll do my best.

I'll start with an email dated November 19, 2020, sent at 11:33 a.m. This email came from Brian. I'll give just the first name in order to respect people's privacy. It was sent to a number of civil servants in government. The subject was a reply to the College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants Act coming into force. It says:

Hi Chaitanya, thanks for the estimated timelines below. It would be great to know as soon as the GG has signed off so we have a better sense of when the Order will be published on the website.

One Q: Once the GG has approved, but before the Order has been published, is there anything stopping IRCC from giving the current regulator (and future College) a heads up that the coming-into-force has been approved and will be published shortly?

That was the first email. There was a reply to that from the person addressed, Chaitanya, on Thursday, November 17, 2020, at 11:45 a.m. It was a reply to Brian and copied to others. It says:

Good morning Brian,

I will definitely let you know as soon as I have word that it has been signed. IRCC can let the regulator know as soon as the GG has approved (At that point the Order is made regardless of the fact that it hasn't yet been published).

Hope to be in touch soon!

Chaitanya

I apologize about the pronunciation of names.

● (1515)

There's a reply to that email, from Chaitanya to Brian, and several others are copied. It says,

The OIC has been approved earlier than expected (late yesterday I understand)! Will you be able to find it on this website in the next few days <https://orders-in-council.canada.ca/>.

It has been a pleasure working with you and the whole team there! Wishing you all the best of luck with getting the College up and running!

Chaitanya

What a pleasant email.

I'll continue.

The next email comes from Brian on Monday, November 23, 2020, 11:30 a.m. It says:

One last quick Q.

Our Comms folks would like to add a link in the News Release that would take the reader to the OIC for the College Act (on the OIC website). Do you get a heads up of when exactly the OIC will appear on the website, and if so would you be able to flag to us so that the news release can go out asap after? If you have to look periodically yourself to see the OIC appear on the site, then no worries, we'll monitor from our end.

Thanks!

Brian

We'll continue.

A reply from Chaitanya was sent on November 23, 2020, at 11:37 a.m., to Brian. Nobody else is copied at this point. It reads:

Hi. Unfortunately I don't get a notification when it is up. Checking the website periodically is the best bet. The search engine is really good though - I just checked right now and it took me to the designation order. I'd expect it likely tomorrow or Wednesday.

Brian replies directly to Chaitanya on November 23, 2020, at 11:41 a.m. People are really fast here in government. That's kind of nice.

The reply says:

Ok, no worries, we'll keep an eye on the website. Don't want to jinx it, but probably won't need to bug you again.

All the best!

Brian

Then the reply again, and this is from Chaitanya on November 23, 2020, at 12:12 p.m. It's been sent to Brian and copied to somebody else named Sabrina in CIC. It reads:

It is never a bother to hear from you guys! Hope things go smoothly though.

Chaitanya

We're almost done here.

Then Sabrina from CIC on Monday, November 23, 2020, at 1:18 p.m., writes with high importance,

I think Brian definitely jinxed it. Urgently hoping you can provide me the exact date that the GG signed the OIC. If we are to refer to the date the Act came into force in briefing materials, what should we put? It is the date that the GG signed or the date that the OIC goes online?"

I've been reading a lot, so I'm going to read this part again, because this is really the kicker and the crux of the issue.

We're seeing now an exchange between government officials, a good-faith exchange. They are diligent civil servants replying quickly. They're not waiting a day or two to reply to emails. They're replying in real time, cordially, working together towards a common objective. Now we get an email with "importance: high" and a flag, a flag that the civil servants who were working in good faith were having a good-faith error that is now being picked up on. I'll read it again so we understand the tone here.

• (1520)

The key elements read, "Urgently hoping you can provide me the exact date that the Governor General signed the order in council. If we are to refer to the date the act came into force in briefing materials, what should we put?"

They're asking each other what they should put. They don't know. They're debating and discussing it, as they should, because they don't know. They should be talking to each other to get the best information. They're doing their job.

"Is it the date that the GG signed"—they're asking if it is the date that the Governor General signed it—"or the date the order in council goes online?" They don't know. They're asking the question of each other.

There is a reply from Chaitanya. It didn't take long. It was just four minutes after that, on November 23, 2020, at 1:22 p.m. It's to Sabrina and Brian. It reads:

Haha. She

—meaning the Governor General—

approved November 20th. You should use that date as the official day the Order was made rather than the date it goes online.

That was from Chaitanya.

As a final email, Sabrina replies:

Merci! For the quick response!

All the best,

Chaitanya

This was sent on November 23, 2020, at 1:23 p.m. See? They're so fast.

We see an exchange between civil servants. We see an attempt here to nail down an important date, which is what we are discussing here. It's what this whole committee meeting is revolving around. We see that they are doing their utmost to determine something.

We know that civil servants are humans. We are all human. We can all err, despite trying our best, as we always should. We know that ministers and the government rely on the expert advice of civil servants. There is no fault here on the part of the civil servants. They were doing their absolute best and working as diligently as possible.

This issue in question of the date and erroneously landing on it revolves around human error. We know that any reasonable minister would rely on the expert advice of civil servants, as they should, especially when it comes to these technicalities. I think it would be erroneous and unbecoming, or just a waste of time for the minister to drill down into that type of date. That's exactly the job of a civil servant. It's not the job of a minister to verify a particular date in question. If we had that level of expectation of our ministers for each and every date that's put into documents, we would not have a document published because of the amount of time it would take to verify it.



I'll leave it at that, Madam Chair. I have asked a number of questions through you. I'm hoping that we can get complete but clear responses so that we can make a determination of the questions at hand.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Zuberi.

I see a speaking list, and yes, I took note of the questions. Maybe when we go to Mr. Redekopp, he can answer your questions. We can go to Ms. Kwan at the end.

We have Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe next on the list. Go ahead.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

First, if the motion is passed, we will have to make sure that it is written somewhere that the documents requested to be produced must be in both official languages.

Secondly, when I signed the document promising this emergency meeting under Standing Order 106(4), I read what had happened in the newspapers and I got down to business. You know me, I'm not someone who does my job in a very partisan way. Everyone who works with me can testify to that. I started to analyze in more detail what had happened and, from what I understood, it was good faith errors by public servants.

What I am concerned about, as I said at the beginning of the meeting, is that this motion, that we take up this study no later than November 4 and have meetings on it, will mean that we have less time for other studies. Much less time should be given to this study. If this is not accepted, unfortunately, I find it difficult to see how I can support a motion that I think is going to waste more time when we could be dealing with motions that have been voted on unanimously by all parties on the committee. Frankly, it scares me a little.

On the other hand, I don't necessarily see the scandal that was mentioned when I signed the Standing Order 106(4) document. I think that by simply going for an explanation, the matter will be cleared up. The committee does not need to waste so much time on such a study. This is my opinion and I submit it to the members of the committee, with whom I work well, regardless of their party. I sincerely believe that this is not the time to be very partisan, especially as we have many important studies to deal with. That is my feeling at the moment.

• (1525)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe.

Go ahead, Mr. Ali.

**Mr. Shafqat Ali (Brampton Centre, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I've been listening, and I've reviewed the email chain and the documents. I agree with Alexis that it's very clear this was a human error on a public servant's part. I think putting the committee's resources and time into this is a waste. On top of that, you just read the letter from the deputy minister saying that it was a human error,

which was corrected later on. It was provided to the court. It was accepted.

I'd prefer for us to spend our time on things that matter to Canadians and to newcomers. We can use our time to get a better outcome for Canadians. I just want to reiterate what Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe said and what Mr. Zuberi said. To me it's very clear it was a human error on the part of a public servant, and it was corrected as soon as it came to their attention.

I also want to ask something. Ms. Kwan talked about the letters and the order signed by the Clerk of the Privy Council. It was a broader discussion. If she could summarize it in simple words, that would be helpful as well.

Thank you so much, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Ali.

Next we have Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Folks, we're here on a parliamentary break week. Let's work on moving the discussion forward. I'm going to propose a concrete amendment that I think reflects some good suggestions made by a number of colleagues. It might not be the be-all and end-all, but I'm working on the fly on how we can move forward effectively and in a timely way on this matter.

I do want to say, just responding to some of the comments, that the distribution of materials in both official languages is already covered by routine motions. That would be a given. There could be no distribution of the documents requested in this motion if they were not received in both official languages or translated once received.

There's been some discussion of the substantive matter underlining this, and suggestions about what may or may not have caused the problem here. I do think it's really important, though, that Government of Canada lawyers said in court on November 20 that the act was in force. Likely, the decision to say that was made even before the initial meeting took place, so we have not one but actually multiple different cases of wrongdoing or multiple overlapping errors here. It's more than just the coming-into-force-date issue. It's the coming-into-force-date issue compounding the fact that representations were made in cabinet prior to that initial determination.

Look, I'm not here to say definitively what did or didn't happen. I think that's why we put forward a study motion. Reading into the record emails and discussing what the view of the deputy minister is are germane as evidence, but we know there were multiple different problems here. You have a court meeting on the same day as cabinet considers the OIC, so cabinet is considering the OIC on the same day that the discussion is happening in court. However, it's being said in court that the OIC has already gone through. Even independent of the subsequent events, that raises some significant questions.

I think we need to have a short study on this. I think we need to have a look at it. It may be that committee members come to one conclusion or another after that study takes place, but I think we need to have the information.

The amendment I'm going to propose would make two changes. Number one, in the first paragraph, after "departmental", I would add "and PCO". I guess PCO is notionally a department, but it would specify, in response to Ms. Kwan's interventions, that we specifically want to hear from PCO officials involved—

• (1530)

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Mr. Genuis. Where are you adding that? Is it after "that the committee invite Minister Mendicino for one meeting, departmental officials"?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Yes. It would say "departmental and PCO officials".

Again, I think Ms. Kwan had some good suggestions for officials who could be named, and perhaps wants to propose names in a sub-amendment, but I think that's probably covered by just adding "and PCO".

Then I want to strike out "and no later than November 4, 2022". That doesn't need to be a sticking point. I certainly recognize the importance of some of the other issues that are being worked on. Having a three-meeting study without the time parameter required will hopefully allow us to dig into this in a way that I think reflects the consensus of the committee that this issue needs to be looked at in a measured and reasonable way.

I propose that amendment and hope we can have the consensus to move forward.

**The Chair:** You are proposing that we add "and PCO" after "departmental".

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I propose adding the words "and PCO" and removing the words "and no later than November 4, 2022".

**The Chair:** Okay.

We now have—

**Mr. Shafqat Ali:** Madam Chair, I'm sorry for the interruption, but can we have a two-minute break, please?

**The Chair:** One second. Let me just state what's on the floor.

Mr. Genuis has moved an amendment to add, after "departmental", the words "and PCO", and to strike, after "earliest opportunity possible", the words "and no later than November 4, 2022". That is the amendment on the floor.

Go ahead, Mr. Ali.

• (1535)

**Mr. Shafqat Ali:** I'm just requesting a two-minute break, please.

**The Chair:** Would members like to suspend for two minutes?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** We already had one suspension in the first hour of the meeting. I suggest we try to complete this work.

**The Chair:** Members who are willing to proceed, please raise your hand.

Members who want to have a break—

**Mr. Shafqat Ali:** I need to go to the restroom.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** We'll make sure there are no votes.

**The Chair:** We'll give two minutes to Mr. Ali.

• (1535)

(Pause)

• (1540)

**The Chair:** I call the meeting back to order.

We have an amendment on the floor. I see that on the speaking list we have Mr. Redekopp and Ms. Kwan.

Go ahead, Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Madam Chair, I am totally fine with the proposed amendment.

I do want to speak to some of the questions that have been asked about the main motion, so I would suggest that we vote on the amendment and then get back to talking about the main motion.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Ms. Kwan.

**Ms. Jenny Kwan:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

On the amendment, I'm fine with those changes, but I'm also seeking your advice as to whether this is the time to respond to some of the questions that were put to me. Do you want me to defer that to a later time?

**The Chair:** We will have to deal with the amendment first. An amendment has been moved by Mr. Genuis. Once we deal with the amendment, we can go to Mr. Redekopp and then to you, Ms. Kwan, to answer the questions raised by the members who are looking for some clarification.

Is there any further discussion on the amendment moved by Mr. Genuis? No.

Madam Clerk, let's take the vote on the amendment moved by Mr. Genuis.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** We will now go back to Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

There are a lot of questions, and I want to address some of them.

The first one, to start with, is the core issue of whether this is a good use of committee time or not. Forgive me if I'm not too willing to put all my eggs into the basket of a representative of the government coming to this committee meeting, reading some emails and saying there's nothing to see here, everything's fine and let's move on and do something else. This is, to me, not a good enough way to study this issue.

The core issue, I think, if I look at it, is that on November 20, there were lawyers in court—if you just think about the timing here, this would be during the day at some point—telling a judge that something happened and a decision had been made, when that very day cabinet was going to consider that idea. Generally speaking, cabinet meetings are in the later part of the day. To me, that raises a whole bunch of questions: Lawyers were told to do something in anticipation of something probably happening later that day, and then we get into all the date questions after that.

To me, there is an ample number of questions here that need to be addressed beyond the simple, “Oops, we made a mistake, and it should have been this day or that day.” Right at the very start of this, before those supposed human errors were made, there was a fundamental question of whether lawyers were instructed by someone in cabinet to say something that actually hadn't happened yet.

To me, there are ample questions here that need to be looked at. We don't need to spend weeks and months on this. It's a very quick thing. I believe there is a very strong case for looking at what was done and how it was done so that we can make sure.

If there is nothing wrong, that's great. If there was something done wrong—and from that perspective it appears very questionable—then I think it's something that we as parliamentarians must look at to make sure that the process is updated or fixed in the system. To me, that's the fundamental question here. I think there are plenty of reasons to proceed with this study.

Now I'll get to some of the questions.

To Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe regarding the Roxham Road study, the way this is written is “November 4”. There are six meetings before then, so there is ample time to do this and do Roxham Road at the same time. As you saw, we're very willing to get rid of the November 4 date, too, if that's what's necessary. Even with that date in there, there is ample meeting time to do this.

As to Ms. Kwan's question of inviting other people, again, we attempted to do that. Even in the wording as it is, at the third meeting we can invite whomever we want. It's certainly not my intention to restrict the kinds of people we would request to come to the meeting. There's ample opportunity to invite others the committee feels are necessary.

To Mr. Serré and delaying this in order to do other things, the whole point of it is to do the investigation. This meeting here today is not to actually perform the investigation. It's simply to decide to do this or not. I think that's the whole point of the meetings, so that's what we'll need to do.

To Mr. Zuberi and the question of the summary of the ATIP, Ms. Kwan actually did a great job of explaining some of what's in the ATIPs. These three ATIPs are specific to this case. There are a lot

of documents in there similar to the ones that Ms. Kwan read out. They detail some of the back-and-forth that happened during this time and they're very relevant to this particular case. That's the high-level summary of what's in there. Ms. Kwan also did a great job of giving you some of the more nuanced details of the kinds of materials in there. That's very important and pertinent to the case.

I think that summarizes most of the answers to the questions that I've heard to date. I think the key point here is that this is an important study. It doesn't have to be a long study, but there are some pretty significant questions about what happened on that day regarding the lawyers in the court, what they said to the judge and why they said that even though the decision may not have actually been made at that point.

I'll leave it at that for now.

• (1545)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Redekopp.

Ms. Kwan, you wanted to clarify some questions asked by the members.

**Ms. Jenny Kwan:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I think at issue here is the question around the OIC coming-into-force date. If you look at the documents that were sent to committee members—and a member asked me to table these documents—you'll see these documents were sent to the clerk. I received a copy as well, separate and apart from that, so committee members, if they have not received them from the clerk already, will, I assume, at some point in time be getting these documents.

Upon receipt of these documents—and let me say there were a lot of documents—I began to look through the information, aside from having to read what was available in the public realm through the media. To that point, I also requested that we have this meeting, because I think it's important for us to get clarity on the issue and to try to shed some light on the situation.

The heart of the issue is the date the OIC came into force, and the copy of the OIC that the government issued. There were supplementary documents to indicate that. The act came into force and was registered on November 20, and the OIC said that this was the date on which the act would come into force. That's very explicit in the language.

Now, I'm not a lawyer. I'm also not a cabinet minister at this level, but having been a cabinet minister at a different level, I can tell you that when OICs come about, they're very intentional. They're not just made-up words. Officials are not loosey-goosey about them. They're very intentional. This may be just a human error, and I know the officials are saying it's just a human error, but I think we need to delve into that a bit and be certain that it was in fact a human error.

The OIC explicitly says that November 20 is the day the act would be registered and would come into force, so that language to me is not confusing. That language is very clear in terms of what it is.

Why is it the case that this language differs from that in other OICs? As stated in one of the ATIP documents, one of the officials indicated that there was unusual language being used. To me, that begs the question: Why was unusual language used for this OIC? What's the rationale for that? Maybe there's a really legitimate reason for that. I just don't know at this point in time. Therefore, I would like to get clarity from the officials on why this particular OIC is different from other OICs, and would like them to explain the discrepancy between the clarity of the OIC itself and the change in date to December 9.

From that perspective, I think it is important, given the significance of the issue, to get clarity on it. It might just be an honest mistake. If it is, it's not my intention to chastise anyone. It's just so we can clear the air. The last thing I would want is for the minister or the government to be under that cloud. I don't think that's good for anyone. It's not good for democracy, so let's clear it up once and for all.

With respect to the number of meetings, do we need three meetings? Do we need one meeting? To be honest with you, I'm not sure. Maybe it's just one meeting. Maybe the light will be shone and we'll all see it very clearly, but I think we should have a meeting and at the very minimum find out what the lay of the land is. I'd like to have those questions answered, and then we can make a determination as to whether or not additional meetings are required.

This motion calls for three meetings, but we should have at least one meeting, find out what the lay of the land is and then make a determination on how best to proceed. I think as elected officials we should do our due diligence on this. I know we received a letter from the deputy telling us that this was a human error, so let's get the information to clarify that so we can be certain, as officials around this table, that we are addressing this issue.

• (1550)

That's what I would like to propose, Madam Chair, and I hope that answers the questions of committee members.

Finally, I want to address the questions around concurrent meetings and so on. We are doing concurrent meetings, by the way, at committee. It's a bit confusing, truth be told. We're doing a report on a different study, and we're continuing work on another study. There is, of course, the Roxham Road issue as well, which is very important and very serious. I absolutely want to get to that. At our last meeting I moved a motion, which was supported by this com-

mittee, on the Afghan file. Some people's lives hang in the balance, so that too is very important.

It is not my intention to delay anything. We have a lot of work to do and we need to get to it, but to clear the air on this, we should at least have one meeting and find some clarity on where it lies. If it's honestly a human mistake, then so be it and we can move on, but we should actually have that clarity.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Kwan.

We will now proceed to Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Our meeting today is very interesting, and I think everyone involved is acting in good faith.

That said, I think we're forgetting one element that is essential to our discussion. To be honest, I have to say that I only realized this during the meeting.

If I understand correctly, it is thought that this is a matter for our committee to deal with, since this incident occurred in the Immigration Department. The incident that occurred and that brought us together urgently today is an ethical issue. We are not on the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics; we are on the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.

Just because the error occurred at the Department of Immigration does not necessarily mean that it concerns us.

I hear the arguments from both sides. In my view, it is not our place to look at this issue. I would suggest to my Conservative friends that we put a motion before the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics. For our part, we will be able to look at issues that directly concern immigration to Quebec and Canada.

The more we talk about this, the more I realize that I cannot support this motion in the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration. This is really an issue that should be studied by the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics. We must try to convince the members of this committee to study the motion. They are the experts who must look at motions that concern the ethics of government and departments.

Our work is about immigration. This study does not include anything related to immigration to Quebec and Canada.

As Ms. Kwan just said, we have important studies to do that have already been voted on. We will decide on the timeline fairly quickly.

I am not saying that the motion is good or bad. What I am saying is that it is not our business and should be dealt with by another committee.

The Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration has to deal with immigration issues. The Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics should deal with ethics issues. That is my position.

I will not be supporting this motion. I want us to deal with the problems of immigration, the immigration files and the issues of immigration. That is our job.

I know that everyone is acting in good faith. We could already go to the vote. I personally have made my decision and I think most people here have. I see no reason to delay today's meeting any further.

You know which way I'm going to vote. We all know how this will end, so we can vote now.

That's all I have to say, Madam Chair.

• (1555)

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Actually, I'll just strike that because I saw that Mr. Redekopp's hand was up first.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I guess I'm not opposed to having a vote, but I want to say that this is very much an immigration issue. This has to do with the management of IRCC, how IRCC is represented in the courts of Canada and how it implements the orders and laws made by the immigration minister and the immigration department.

With all due respect, Alexis, I believe very strongly that this is a case for IRCC to look at. It's very relevant that it be done at this committee. I'll say again that I appreciate that the Roxham Road study is important, and we want to work together to make that happen.

Something fishy has happened here, and I think Ms. Kwan identified that pretty clearly. There is something strange, and it's something that deserves some investigation. It doesn't have to be a month of investigation, but it does need to be looked at for the sake of clearing the air, as Jenny said, about this issue. That's why I put this forward. I think it's important. I think it's important work for the committee to do, and I think it's something that's very relevant to this committee.

I'll leave it at that, from my perspective. If anyone else has anything else to add, I'm happy to listen.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Genuis, did you want to say something? Okay.

Seeing no further hands raised, we can go to the vote.

Madam Clerk, can you please take the vote on the motion by Mr. Redekopp?

**Mr. Shafqat Ali:** To clarify, are we voting on the motion?

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Ali.

Just to clarify for all the members of the committee, we are voting on the motion by Mr. Redekopp.

(Motion negated: nays 6; yeas 5)

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

• (1600)

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Given that this subject matter now has been dealt with—not in the way I wanted it to be—I'd like to now move another motion that I had on notice. I think it should be fairly quick. I think it's a good opportunity to do it now. It's been on notice for a while.

The motion is with respect to concerns around citizenship ceremonies. Despite the country being generally open, I have some information about people not being offered citizenship ceremonies in person. The motion is as follows:

That the committee report to the House that it calls on the government to immediately re-instate in-person citizenship ceremonies for all who request them, and that the committee request a government response to this motion pursuant to Standing Order 109.

Again, I think it's fairly non-partisan. I suspect that members are hearing similar things from their constituents, and members have had this motion for I think a number of weeks.

People who have come to this country and have been through a citizenship ceremony will I think very often remember that experience for their whole life, and it will have great significance and meaning for them. I think it's unfortunate that some people haven't had the option of an in-person citizenship ceremony.

Giving people the significance and meaning of that moment of being welcomed to the Canadian family in person is very important. It's a way of honouring the commitment they're making to this country. That's why I wanted to put forward the motion, and it's also just to invite clarity from the government on the approach being taken.

I want to put that on the table. We'll see where we go.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

To clarify for all members, this meeting was called to deal specifically with Standing Order 106(4). I assume that, procedurally, this meeting should only deal with Standing Order 106(4) and not with anything else today. The motion has been dealt with under Standing Order 106(4).

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Madam Chair, I have a point of order on that.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I had the floor. It's a motion for which I gave notice. If you move a motion without notice, you need to be on topic, but having dealt with the matter.... It happens routinely, of course, that we have a meeting scheduled on one matter and someone moves a motion on a different matter and there's—

**The Chair:** I will suspend the meeting for two minutes. I will clarify with Madam Clerk and then come back.

The meeting is suspended for two minutes.

• (1600) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1605)

**The Chair:** Thank you, everybody. I call the meeting back to order.

Yes, we can deal with the motion that has been brought in by Mr. Genuis. I have checked with the clerk.

We have a motion on the floor from Mr. Genuis. I see some hands raised.

Go ahead, Mr. Sidhu.

**Mr. Maninder Sidhu (Brampton East, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I've been following citizenship ceremonies very closely. I know they started in person back in July. I advise the member to kindly check. I have had constituents coming to my office and thanking the Government of Canada. That's how I know first-hand.

I think it's important to note that this meeting was called on Standing Order 106(4) and the subject matter at hand. We dealt with that. I hope we can adjourn this meeting soon.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Ali.

**Mr. Shafqat Ali:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I agree with my colleague Maninder Sidhu. I'd like to bring my colleague Mr. Genuis's attention to the fact that in-person ceremonies are already in place. I know some of my constituents have had these ceremonies as well. I would ask him to look into it.

I ask for the meeting to adjourn. This meeting was called for Standing Order 106(4).

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I have a couple of things. We don't want to be wasting time dealing with motions like this one at committee meetings when we have witnesses, so I think this is a great time to deal with it. We have a bit of time. It's a fairly easy one to deal with, and I think this is the perfect time to do it.

Yes, there have been some in-person ceremonies over the past few months. I agree with that. I've been to one myself. However, that is still not the norm in our department. The purpose of this motion as I see it—and the reason I will be supporting it—is to compel the government to do them in person.

So many of my constituents.... As Garnett said, this is a life-altering moment that they remember forever. This is a very significant thing for them. I know, on behalf of my constituents who are going through these ceremonies, that they want them in person.

We still have the case where the department does not want to do them in person, and I think it's very important to compel the department to do them in person. It's what people want. It's what constituents want. We're past the time when we need to worry about doing things online.

I really support this motion. I hope you guys will too.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Redekopp.

**Ms. Jenny Kwan:** I'm sorry, but I have a point of order, Madam Chair, before you go to the next speaker.

**The Chair:** Yes, Ms. Kwan.

**Ms. Jenny Kwan:** I'm not clear if I heard Mr. Ali move to adjourn the debate. I thought I heard him say that, but I'm not sure. I want to get clarification.

**The Chair:** Okay. I'm sorry, Ms. Kwan.

Madam Clerk, was that moved by Mr. Ali?

**Mr. Shafqat Ali:** Yes, I said that. I think Mr. Genuis might not have been aware that in-person ceremonies are in place, and this meeting—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm sorry, but on a point of order, I don't think he was given the floor. I think a clarifying question was asked—

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, it's one person at a time. Please raise your hand and wait for the chair to acknowledge you—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm happy to provide rationale if he's providing rationale.

**The Chair:** Please wait for the chair to recognize you. We have a speaking list.

Mr. Sidhu is next on the speaking list.

Go ahead, Mr. Sidhu.

**Mr. Maninder Sidhu:** Madam Chair, I move that the meeting be now adjourned.

**The Chair:** Okay. We have a motion. This is a non-debatable motion.

Please take the vote, Madam Clerk.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (1610)

**The Chair:** The motion passes, so the meeting is adjourned. Thank you.









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: <https://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 des communes.

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 :  
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>