



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 013**

**PUBLIC PART ONLY - PARTIE PUBLIQUE SEULEMENT**

Thursday, November 20, 2025

---

Chair: Julie Dzerowicz





## Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

Thursday, November 20, 2025

• (1530)

[English]

**The Chair (Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.)):** I call this meeting to order.

Good afternoon. Welcome to meeting number 13 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.

Before I start off with a few reminders, I would like to warmly welcome students and guests from Tobago, who will be viewing part of our meeting today. I just want to say a warm welcome to all of you.

In terms of general comments and reminders, kindly wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. Please do not speak over each other, as it will be hard for our translators to translate and it makes their job very difficult. Ensure that all your comments are addressed through the chair, and please raise your hand if you wish to speak. The clerk and I will manage the speaking order as best we can.

With that, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted by the committee on October 23, 2025, the committee is resuming its study of the subject matter of Bill C-12, an act respecting certain measures relating to the security of Canada's borders and the integrity of the Canadian immigration system and respecting other related security measures.

I would now like to welcome the witnesses in our last panel on Bill C-12 for our last hour of study.

From the Canada Border Services Agency, with us is Aaron McCrorie, vice-president, intelligence and enforcement. From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, we have Mr. Jason Hollmann, director general for asylum policy, and Tara Lang, director general for integrity policy and programs. From the Department of Justice, we have Karen Hamilton, senior counsel at IRCC legal services, and Anna Lillcrap, senior counsel at IRCC legal services.

I understand that it will be Mr. Hollmann who will be making an opening statement of up to five minutes, after which we will proceed to a round of questions.

Go ahead, Mr. Hollmann.

[Translation]

**Jason Hollmann (Director General, Asylum Policy, Department of Citizenship and Immigration):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you for the invitation to appear and provide further information on the immigration measures in Bill C-12, strengthening Canada's immigration system and borders act.

[English]

Bill C-12 responds to challenges and potential challenges to the asylum system. Through new ineligibility provisions, Canada will deter misuse and prevent further surges in an already strained system.

The first ineligibility would apply to claims made more than one year after first entry into Canada. With recent changes to immigration levels planning, we know that some people were hoping to stay and may no longer have a pathway to do so. We want to discourage them from using the asylum system for that purpose.

The second ineligibility is for those who cross the border irregularly and make an asylum claim 14 days or more after entry. Claims after the 14 days effectively evade the safe third country agreement, which is designed to manage asylum claims across our shared border with the United States. This ineligibility safeguards Canada against future surges of claims.

[Translation]

Canada will continue to meet its legal obligations: those whose claims are found ineligible for referral to the Immigration and Refugee Board can access a pre-removal risk assessment.

In the risk assessment, trained officers review each case on its own merits. They use the same country condition information and—unless the applicant is inadmissible on serious grounds—the same grounds for protection.

In all cases, officers will assess if there's a serious credibility issue and, if so, an oral hearing will be held. Applicants can seek legal assistance and make submissions regarding the risks they face. New material can be provided for consideration until a decision is made.

[English]

Today's approval rates don't predict future decisions. For example, the majority of PRRA applications today are rejected because applicants have already been determined to not require protection by the Immigration and Refugee Board. Only new evidence is reviewed, so many cases stand by the original decision. These measures will alleviate some pressures on the strained Immigration and Refugee Board.

In addition to the ineligibilities, the legislation would improve the asylum system to address current inventories and reduce timelines. It removes bottlenecks and streamlines processes so that cases move as quickly as fairness allows.

[Translation]

Bill C-12 also introduces new legislation to better manage immigration documents and applications, improve efficiency and reinforce the integrity of Canada's immigration system. It'll allow greater flexibility to respond quickly and responsibly in times of crisis or uncertainty.

To be clear, there is no particular set of circumstances where these authorities will be used, and the legislation does not predetermine scenarios for use. Rather, the authorities would be available for use against threats to Canada's national security, public health, ability to safely manage the flow of people coming into the country or other matters of public interest.

• (1535)

[English]

No immigration documents will be automatically cancelled as a result of this bill. The use of these authorities would require a separate cabinet process. The Governor in Council would determine if an intervention is in the public interest, based on all relevant considerations, including the impact on vulnerable populations. These authorities are limited to interventions on immigration documents and on the applications for those documents. The new authorities cannot be used to cancel asylum claims or to revoke people's status in Canada.

[Translation]

I welcome the committee's questions regarding the legislation and the immigration system. Thank you.

[English]

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

Now we will start our rounds of questions. The first round is six-minute questions, and we'll begin with Ms. Rempel Garner.

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

In 2012, former immigration minister Jason Kenney used one-time legislation in the 2012 budget to cancel specific applications. Why does the government need the powers outlined in this bill for applications? Why couldn't you just put it in a piece of legislation?

**Tara Lang (Director General, Integrity Policy and Programs, Department of Citizenship and Immigration):** Currently, no authorities exist to cancel applications en masse. The 2012 federal

skilled worker inventory elimination was accomplished through legislative amendments to—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** That's right, but why couldn't you just do a piece of legislation?

**Tara Lang:** It doesn't allow for the flexibility to define the public interest, as well as—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Okay, so, you, as the bureaucracy, want to be able to determine that without going through Parliament.

**Tara Lang:** No. The policy intent is to be able to quickly respond to emergencies, crises and health issues.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Why didn't you define what public interest means in the legislation, then?

**Tara Lang:** It's because there are so many potential instances. That's why we were trying to say health, security—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Why isn't that defined in the legislation?

**Tara Lang:** It would too closely restrict us to only being able to apply a recommendation to the OIC in—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** It's a fairly big devolution of power to the bureaucracy from Parliament. I'm trying to understand because there hasn't been an instance given by you or the minister of where that would be used or why that couldn't be achieved by legislation.

**Tara Lang:** May I offer some examples? Thank you.

It quickly facilitates the extensions or stay for temporary residents in Canada following a significant natural disaster. When intelligence is received from security partners, if there's a suspected specific threat of foreign interference, electoral interference or espionage, we could pause any applications in that process.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Why didn't you include a report to Parliament as part of the use of these powers?

**Tara Lang:** We were trying to clearly indicate that there is no one clear path for the use of these powers.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Except for legislation...which has been used before.

**Tara Lang:** That's right. It is a very defined portion of a one-time elimination of a backlog. It doesn't involve applications or documents.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Okay, so it's the backlog. We've now gotten to the heart of the matter.

Did you guys include this because the backlog is so big and you need to kind of...a little bit?

**Tara Lang:** This is exactly why we didn't go with one-time legislation, such as what was done in 2012 with former minister Kenney. That was a one-time elimination of a backlog. The intention of this has nothing to do with backlogs.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** You just talked about backlogs. Would you ever use it to clear a backlog?

**Peter Fragiskatos (London Centre, Lib.):** I have a point of order, Chair.

The witness has wanted to offer a full statement. I'm not sure that she's had the opportunity to do that on a few occasions here. Let's just allow for that.

**The Chair:** Please let her answer the question.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** That's not a point of order. Thank you.

I'll ask again. You brought up the point of backlogs. I'm trying to figure out why I should support this. I'm on the fence, honestly, because it's a big devolution of powers. We've had a lot of witnesses say that I shouldn't. I need you to convince me, because the department has messed up. You guys have said that there's fraud. There's a huge backlog. We all get casework. Now you're telling me that I should give my powers as a legislator to you without any report to Parliament. Why should I trust you?

• (1540)

**Tara Lang:** The checks and balances are present there. The transparency through the publication of the Gazette, the conversations we'll have with—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** What would be published in the Gazette?

**Tara Lang:** It would be any potential options around the public interest to suspend, cancel—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** What level of detail?

**Tara Lang:** It would be very detailed. It would have to be down to the type of application and the type of person. It would depend on the situation. It could involve, like I was saying before, a health care situation. If we needed to mass-extend health care workers because of a crisis in Canada, it would have to specifically say that these applications of people who are already in Canada would be extended. The level of detail is there. Going back to the legislation that was tabled in 2012.... That is not nimble. It doesn't allow us, as Canada, to respond.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I have a problem as a legislator giving you these powers. It's a big devolution of powers, and I feel that the department and the minister haven't done an adequate job. I would encourage you, in the short time we have left, to explain this in more detail because you guys were roasted by the legal community. In ethnic media, there's a lot of fear over this right now. I don't think you've adequately communicated what this means, and that's a problem for me as a legislator.

I have another set of questions, with the time I have left. We heard, this week, that your department, as part of the bill review, had really devolved the screening of asylum claimants through the use of this one-touch system. It was reported to the committee by the head of the union, and it's very concerning.

We also had stories from Global News that Hamas terrorists have been granted asylum claims. Your department couldn't answer an Order Paper question on how many citizens...criminals you gave citizenship to.

What's going on with this one-touch system? Let's start there.

**Aaron McCrorie (Vice-President, Intelligence and Enforcement, Canada Border Services Agency):** Perhaps I could answer that, Madam Chair, and I'll try to be quick.

I'll touch on why we introduced one-touch, how we went about developing one-touch and what one-touch is. In fact, if you cast your mind back a few years ago, we were facing fairly significant volumes—overwhelming volumes—at the border and what—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** It was #WelcomeToCanada volumes, yes.

**The Chair:** Ms. Rempel Garner, kindly let the witness answer the question.

**Aaron McCrorie:** At that time, the practice was to adjourn a lot of these claims, and that pushed the risk inland and pushed the volumes inland. This committee itself observed the delays in getting eligibility decisions with that practice. It was in fact our frontline staff who looked at how we could do this better, do this differently, and who worked to develop a new process, which is what—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** It's a self-declaration—

**The Chair:** Ms. Rempel Garner, your time is up. I was just allowing our witness to complete his answer.

**Aaron McCrorie:** Fundamental to one-touch is that it's not a self-declaration. In fact, the front end of it involves an in-depth review by face-to-face interview. There is the collection of biometric information and an assessment by a highly trained and experienced border services officer, who will make a determination based on the level of risk.

Based on that level of risk, if the risk is low, we will then allow the administration portion of the assessment—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Was the head of the union lying?

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Rempel Garner.

Thank you, Mr. McCrorie.

Next, we have Mr. Zuberi for six minutes.

**Sameer Zuberi (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** I'll pick up on the line of questioning we just heard about the one-touch system, just to better understand the situation.

Is the one-touch system the only check around security issues for someone who is going through that process of the one-touch system?

**Aaron McCrorie:** Perhaps if I could continue, in fact, there's that initial face-to-face risk assessment, and the biometric information is collected. It's run against our databases and run against CPIC police databases. There's an assessment of risk that is done by one of our experienced and trained border services officers. They will make a decision at that point.

If the claimant is low risk, we will move the file inland and allow the administration portion of the assessment to be done inland, in part by the claimant rather than having a BSO do a lot of data entry. If they are deemed to be high risk, we complete the full process right there at the port of entry. A minister's delegate, a more senior official, a more experienced official, will review that work prior to the decision being made.

To your point, to your question, that is not the end of the review. Then, 100% of in-Canada asylum claimants go to our Centre for Immigration National Security Screening for an in-depth security review of each and every one of them. There is a fairly significant inventory there, but we go through each and every one of them, and we do a risk assessment on them.

Further, both IRCC and CBSA hearings officers will review cases to decide which ones we should send to IRB to challenge their application for asylum, based on a variety of factors. In fact, there are multiple layers of defence. The first and foremost is our BSOs at the front line, who meet each and every claimant.

• (1545)

**Sameer Zuberi:** I appreciate that answer. It gives a lot more clarity to this question we've been looking at today and especially at our last meeting. This level of detail is really helpful.

I'll go back to the question around the public interest. This, as it's written currently, is quite broad. It leaves a lot of room for discretion, depending upon the cabinet of the day.

Do you think you could fashion this in a way that's still broad but also narrows the scope a bit, for example, with terms like "in exceptional circumstances"? It would be something that clearly narrows the usage, because you did just testify that it would be in very exceptional circumstances, such as a menace to public safety. Mr. Hollmann mentioned public health. COVID-19 is an example. It would be for very exceptional situations.

The way it's written right now doesn't narrowly focus the mind to very exceptional situations. Do you think we could do something to fix that? If you just want to plead the fifth, you can.

**Tara Lang:** No. I mean, I suppose it would be possible to define public interest to mean safety, security, emerging threat, crisis....

**Sameer Zuberi:** You could put in a non-exhaustive list: "includes X, Y and Z". That's done regularly in law. Those who have studied law know this. Our lawyers know this and jurists—

**Tara Lang:** Yes, I would have to defer to Department of Justice colleagues about the limitations around that, because it is purposely undefined to account for the unknowns.

**Sameer Zuberi:** Which is normal. Law should be written in a way that it does pass the test of time, but it should also be written in a way that directs the civil service to apply it as the legislator intended, as you are intending, which is very narrow at this point in time. I'm happy that we got that on the record.

Now, we did hear from a number of groups about the PRRA process. In particular, we heard from the UNHCR and CARL, the Canadian Association of Refugee Lawyers, and from other groups.

The way the PRRA process functions right now is that it is a process of last resort after other processes have been exhausted, but in

this legislation, the way it will be used will be as a process of first resort. In terms of what we've heard in this committee testimony, international pacts and covenants, which we have ratified and which effectively are our laws now—domestic law—require, from my understanding, that there be a hearing, an in-person type of hearing.

As it's written right now, there seems to be a bit of a void in that regard between conformity with our laws and this current piece of legislation. What can we do to close that gap?

**Jason Hollmann:** Thank you for the question. Maybe I can start and then ask my justice colleagues to comment on the last piece.

Just to be clear, there are other groups who are directed towards the pre-removal risk assessment stream who are ineligible claimants today, who are effectively under that mechanism as their first determination. It's not—

**Sameer Zuberi:** I understand your position. I'll get in one last question.

We've heard about two points. One was that there was a salient point about the first entry into this country versus the latest entry. That's a salient point.

On this one point, I'd like you to respond. There were some classes of people—minors, moratorium countries, survivors of gender-based violence, LGBT people—in a number of categories where the one year doesn't work well for them. Do you have a comment on that?

**The Chair:** Give a quick response, please.

**Jason Hollmann:** I can respond on the first piece.

Effectively, the measures are designed to help deter people who might be looking to misuse the system. Changing the measure to most recent entry may not serve that deterrent effect, in part because people may look to leave the country quickly in order to reset the clock and come back, potentially by using the land border with the United States and coming right back again. We may not see the deterrent value or the operational impact of the measure.

The legislation does allow for the creation of exceptions at the regulatory stage. Those affected by the moratorium countries are in a group affected by the pre-removal risk assessment process today. Those individuals, while they may not trigger a pre-removal risk assessment until their removal, are in Canada and safe from the persecution they are claiming to be facing. They will receive a work permit and interim federal health care while they're here, and as soon as country conditions improve, they would get access to the PRRA, which would proceed with the determination.

• (1550)

**The Chair:** We've gone way past, but thank you so much, Mr. Zuberi.

[Translation]

Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe, you have the floor for six minutes.

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'd like to thank the witnesses for being with us today. I'll start with the officials from Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, or IRCC.

Many critics of your bill come from migrant advocacy groups, such as Amnesty International, the Refugee Centre, and so on. They tell us that Bill C-12 will restrict the rights of asylum seekers if it is implemented as currently drafted.

How do you respond to those criticisms?

[English]

**Jason Hollmann:** Thank you for the question.

The ineligibility measures that are largely being commented on are designed in large part to prevent misuse of the system. That said, we do want to make sure Canada fulfills the protection obligations that we have, and that is part of the reason we are ensuring people get access to the pre-removal risk assessment prior to being subject to removal.

That assessment process—I know questions have come up—effectively looks at the same protection definitions as the IRB process. It does have a lot of guidance and training, which are provided to the officers who are doing those assessments. They look at the same country conditions that are being explored. They use hearings when credibility of the client is at the root of the decision. The paper-based process allows for us to look at certain situations where people might be facing an easy “yes”. For example, they look at the country conditions that might be being experienced, and it might be easy to determine that somebody should warrant protection. There is a robust process there that has stood up to court challenges as well.

[Translation]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** I get the impression that the pre-removal risk assessment is widely used to justify Bill C-12, at least in your area.

What is the percentage of people who have gone through a pre-removal risk assessment and are able to stay in Canada?

[English]

**Jason Hollmann:** As I mentioned in my opening remarks, it's difficult to compare the approval rate today with what the approval rate will be for the new group. In large part, the majority of people today—

[Translation]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** The question was simple: What is the percentage of pre-removal risk assessment cases that currently remain in the country?

[English]

**Jason Hollmann:** The approval rate today for those who are subject to the pre-removal risk assessment is 14%. However, the majority of those are people who have already gone through the—

[Translation]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** So it's 14%. Some people told us that it was between 6% and 14%, depending on the situation. Let's say it's around 10%.

So what you're telling me is that things will change with the implementation of Bill C-12 and that many more people will obtain a permit to stay following a post-removal risk assessment, because they won't have been able to file their asylum claim.

Is that what you're telling me?

[English]

**Jason Hollmann:** We expect that the approval rate will go up because they would be getting their full determination.

[Translation]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** My understanding is that it won't change anything, since, at the end of the day, the person won't be able to make a claim for asylum, and they will remain in the country after the pre-removal risk assessment.

So what difference does it actually make?

[English]

**Jason Hollmann:** The measures are designed in part to avoid sending claims to an already overburdened Immigration and Refugee Board, which has significant inventories today. The pre-removal risk assessment process offers—

[Translation]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** I understand—

[English]

**Jason Hollmann:** —an approach to protection that meets our obligations.

[Translation]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** I understand, but—

[English]

**Jason Hollmann:** It is a faster mechanism.

[Translation]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** Let me stop you there.

I understand what you're telling me, but you're telling the committee that it will no longer be IRCC officers who process asylum claims and that it will instead be the people responsible for pre-removal risk assessments. Forgive me for saying it this way, but I understand that it will change absolutely nothing. You just explained it to us. As the saying goes, we're going to rob Peter to pay Paul. At the end of the day, the applications are going to be processed somewhere else anyway.

I have questions for the official from the Canada Border Services Agency, the CBSA. At the last committee meeting, we heard from the president of the Customs and Immigration Union, who told us that, oddly enough, Bill C-12 doesn't include the additional powers that the union had long been asking for, such as patrolling outside border crossings. He told us that this power would be very beneficial for the members of the union. Also, it's a purely administrative change. We don't even need to vote on a bill. You could deal with it right now.

How is it that this hasn't yet been done?

• (1555)

[English]

**Aaron McCrorie:** What it boils down to is that we have, I would argue, a very effective system in Canada. We have our colleagues in the RCMP who are responsible for patrolling between ports of entry, and we're focused at ports of entry. Our border services officers do a very good job at those ports of entry. They're very focused and they're dealing with lots of work there. Our colleagues in the RCMP are doing the same thing.

I'm not sure what the benefit would be of taking our officers away from a port of entry and having them duplicate what the RCMP is already doing.

[Translation]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** So you're saying that one of the main demands of the Customs and Immigration Union and its members is pointless and shouldn't even be heard. Okay.

In addition, the union president told us that if Bill C-12 were implemented now, there wouldn't be the necessary staff to implement it. Do you agree with him?

[English]

**The Chair:** That's your time, but Mr. McCrorie can give a quick answer.

**Aaron McCrorie:** I don't agree. That's also why I don't want border services officers patrolling between the ports of entry. We want them applied to the work we currently have and focused on those efforts.

**The Chair:** Thank you so much, Mr. McCrorie.

Now we'll move to five-minute rounds.

To remind the witnesses, if you want to respond, get right on it, because we have lots of questions in a very short period of time. Don't wonder who wants to go—just whip right on in there.

First up is Mr. Redekopp for five minutes.

**Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC):** Thank you, Chair.

Mr. McCrorie, carrying on with this point, Mr. Weber essentially said the one-touch system is a “terrible” system. You seem to have a different opinion.

Was he lying? Where's the misunderstanding?

**Aaron McCrorie:** I don't think he's lying. One of the things that really impress me about the one-touch system is that, as I noted, it was developed based on the recommendations of frontline staff who are dealing with the issues at the port of entry.

**Brad Redekopp:** And yet the union leader is telling me that it's a terrible system.

**Aaron McCrorie:** He's entitled to his opinion. Certainly, one-touch is a change, and a lot of people don't like change. What I think is really great about it is that staff looked at it: How could we do things better? How could we do things differently? You know, there's always a tendency to want to throw money at a problem. Here, folks came up with a solution that made us more efficient and as effective, if not more effective. I think it was a really great innovation in terms of people from the ground up coming up with a solution.

Change is hard, but I think we've come up with a good approach.

**Brad Redekopp:** I understand that. What I don't understand, though, is that there's a major difference here. In discussions with him, he said that the person clicks, does the app and they're in the country. They have to report in 45 days. You're telling us they actually see a person. I'm not understanding which of you is correct here.

**Aaron McCrorie:** Well, there is no app. I think Bill C-12 contemplates a single online application portal, but in terms of—

**Brad Redekopp:** The one-touch system is not an application.

**Aaron McCrorie:** No.

**Brad Redekopp:** What is it?

**A voice:** What does it do?

**Aaron McCrorie:** Pardon me? I'm sorry.

**Brad Redekopp:** What is one-touch?

**Aaron McCrorie:** For one-touch, the idea is that it has limited the number of touches we have on a person rather than pushing a button. The idea is that an individual shows up at a port of entry. They are assessed by a border services officer, who goes through a series of mandatory questions, collects biometric information and does a risk assessment. On the basis of that, they will make a decision on whether or not the person is eligible for the administrative portion of the assessment to move inland. That's when the individual will enter tombstone data in a website—

**Brad Redekopp:** You're saying that this person actually talks to a person and there is no application. This is the exact opposite of what we were told by the union leader. He doesn't know what he's talking about: that's what you're telling me.

**Aaron McCrorie:** I can't comment on what he said. What I will tell you is—

**Brad Redekopp:** Do you have problems with the union right now?

**Aaron McCrorie:** Actually, I'd say that on a file like immigration detention, for example, we have fantastic relations with the union. We have ongoing dialogue with them. We're really working together to address the challenges we have in immigration detention to ensure that our employees are safe.

• (1600)

**Brad Redekopp:** One of the other things he said, and you said this too, was that there's a 45-day process afterwards. You have to come and do some things. Mr. Weber told us that about 10% of those people never show up. Is that correct, in your opinion?

**Aaron McCrorie:** I'd have to confirm the data. There is a timeline in which people have to enter the data.

**Brad Redekopp:** Is it approximately correct? Does it sound about right?

**Aaron McCrorie:** It's hard for me to say definitively. I wouldn't want to mislead you by guessing.

**Brad Redekopp:** It's not zero.

**Aaron McCrorie:** No, it's not zero.

**Brad Redekopp:** People do not show up sometimes.

**Aaron McCrorie:** It's no different from people who don't show up for their IRB hearing down the road.

**Brad Redekopp:** That means we have people who have gotten into Canada who are just here. We can't track them. You've lost track of them. That's—

**Aaron McCrorie:** I would suggest that this isn't an issue with one-touch. This is an issue we confront just generally. It's not a product of one-touch.

**Brad Redekopp:** You referred to these as low-risk claimants, yet we have people who aren't showing up. We have an unfortunate situation right now where we have criminals who have gotten into the country. I mean, I understand that most people who come into our country are not criminals, but we do yet have them in our country. They're getting through the system somehow. Is this a smart thing to do?

**Aaron McCrorie:** I would suggest that, first of all, and I've tried to convey this impression, we don't rely on a single layer of defence.

No single layer of defence is going to be perfect. We rely, first of all, on that initial assessment by our border services officers, guided by strict mandatory questions that guide their risk assessment, including the collection of biometric information. Based on the available information they have at that moment in time, they make a decision.

There are subsequent layers of defence. That's where our centre for immigration national security screening—

**Brad Redekopp:** I'm sorry. I'm running out of time here.

Another thing Mr. Weber said that was a little bit disturbing was that he essentially accused management of being more about service than security. On that note, are CBSA executives' pay bonuses based on service metrics, such as processing times and things like that, or security in terms of not allowing criminals to come into the country?

**Aaron McCrorie:** I can't comment on people's performance pay generally. What I will say is that as an agency, that is the inherent tension that we have. We want to move legitimate goods and people into the country quickly and efficiently, and we want to stop bad people and bad things from coming into the country. The fundamental nature of my job is enforcement.

**Brad Redekopp:** Are bonuses based on—

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Redekopp and Mr. McCrorie. Time is up.

Next is Ms. Salma Zahid for five minutes.

**Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair.

Thanks to the witnesses for appearing again.

I'll continue my round of questioning with Mr. McCrorie.

You have answered some of the questions raised in the testimony from Mark Weber, the national president of the Customs and Immigration Union, that were very worrying. Can you please clarify the steps when someone lands? Take the example of Pearson airport. Can anyone, whether a Canadian citizen or permanent resident or asylum seeker, land at Pearson airport and enter Canada without interacting with any real person?

**Aaron McCrorie:** That's a pretty broad question.

If you're contemplating somebody flying into Pearson airport, there will be a number of different ways they will come in. They may do an advanced declaration or they may present themselves at a kiosk. On the way out of the kiosk, they will present themselves to a border services officer, so, yes, there will be an interaction with a person.

For somebody claiming asylum at a port of entry, 100% of them will spend a considerable amount of time with a border services officer to do that initial risk assessment.

**Salma Zahid:** Can you please clarify whether anyone can claim asylum at a kiosk?

**Aaron McCrorie:** No, not at all.

**Salma Zahid:** Can you explain what the steps are when someone goes to the kiosk to complete their declaration?

**Aaron McCrorie:** You complete your declaration. If you're going to make an asylum claim, it will vary between a land port of entry and an airport. You'll present yourself and indicate that you want to make an asylum claim, and then you'll be taken into secondary and go through a different process.

Again, that's where I suggest our first step is to do the risk assessment to understand who you are, assess whether you're admissible into the country and eligible to make a claim, and establish your identity. We have mandatory questions to guide that, with a face-to-face interview as a part of that process. We collect biometric information. We run your name and biometric information against our databases and policing databases.

It's a very rigorous process. Is it perfect? No. There is no perfect system, and that's why we have subsequent layers of defence. We will allow you to move to the one-touch process only if you're deemed to be a low-risk asylum claimant. As suggested, you will complete the administrative portion of the assessment inland.

A novel and important feature is that the process requires the claimant to enter data into the system, rather than wasting the time of a highly trained and highly experienced border services officer by doing data entry. One-touch is one of two or three different ways we'll do an asylum claim, but if you do not meet that low-risk threshold, you will go through the full assessment process at the port of entry. You may still enter the country and proceed with your claim, but the process will be completed at the port of entry.

• (1605)

**Salma Zahid:** If someone is coming to Canada as a landed immigrant for the first time, have they already undergone security screening?

**Aaron McCrorie:** I should let my colleagues from IRCC start with that process, because we worked together on it.

**Salma Zahid:** This is if they are coming as a PR.

**Tara Lang:** Yes, they would have already completed the security screening.

**Salma Zahid:** Okay.

I have one quick question. We have heard from a lot of witnesses that this new one-year ineligibility for asylum claimants introduced

by Bill C-12 would disproportionately impact women and minority communities, individuals and other survivors of gender-based violence.

Can you please tell us if IRCC has looked at how different groups like these will be impacted by these provisions? Are you confident that minority groups will be protected under this legislation?

**Jason Hollmann:** In developing the measures, we did a full gender-based analysis plus. Generally, it found that specific vulnerable groups would benefit from faster access to protection, which we hope to be able to provide for those who merit it.

The pre-removal risk assessment process that those impacted by ineligibility would be directed toward has guidelines and training for officers in relation to dealing with minors, gender considerations, cases involving sexual orientation and specific cases of vulnerability. They can also reference the same guidelines that are available to the IRB officers.

**Salma Zahid:** Is there anything else with regard to the eligibility criteria and the processes involved that you would like to highlight?

**Jason Hollmann:** I would come back to the earlier question about the benefits beyond those I already explained back in the opening statement. One of the key things we want to achieve by those measures is the deterrent effect. We are hoping to deter misuse of the system by those looking to extend their stay or those looking to evade the safe third country agreement.

Besides the operational impact and the protections we want to make sure we have for people who really need protection, we are hoping to discourage—

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

Thank you, Ms. Zahid.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe, you have the floor for two and a half minutes.

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

I'd like to quickly come back to one point. Mr. McCrorie, I understand very well that you don't want officers to start patrolling the border in place of RCMP officers. That makes a lot of sense. However, the president of the union representing border services officers told us that if they learned that something suspicious was happening at the border, for example, they could intervene more quickly. Rather than calling the RCMP, which would take six hours to get there, border services officers could be called, and they could be there in half an hour. Right now, they don't have that power.

Why don't you allow that? Not only is this a matter of logic and efficiency, but it would also respond to a request from the union representing border services officers, and it would even help RCMP officers do their job.

[*English*]

**Aaron McCrorie:** Thank you for the question.

I guess what I'd come back to is really making sure that both organizations, and other organizations involved in law enforcement, are making the best use of the resources they have—the most efficient, most effective use of the resources they have.

CBSA does collaborate quite extensively with law enforcement, especially in an inland enforcement context, but also in criminal investigations. Right now, in terms of the best use of our resources at a port of entry and the best use of RCMP resources, the RCMP hasn't come to us saying that they need more help in that regard.

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** No, but your members are asking you for it, though. This stonewalling is unbelievable when this request is documented and comes from the union representing the officers. In short, I invite you to remain open to this type of request. It could be beneficial for border security.

I have a question for the Department of Justice officials.

A lot of people tell us that, if Bill C-12 is passed as currently drafted, we'll end up with a host of legal challenges from a number of migrant advocacy groups, among others, and that will clog up the courts.

So what do you expect? Do we have the necessary resources to deal with such a backlog in the courts?

• (1610)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Give a quick response in 30 seconds, please.

**Karen Hamilton (Senior Counsel, IRCC Legal Services, Department of Justice):** I think it's fair to say that new amendments often bring challenges before the courts, but I would note, for example, that in terms of the new ineligibilities, while a person may seek leave and judicial review of the court of a decision to refuse their PRRA application, this is also the case for anyone who reaches the end of the IRB process. Once they reach the end of the IRB process, they also have equal access to seek leave and judicial review of the courts.

I'm not able to speak to the relative volumes. I think it's fair to say that there will be court challenges, but in terms of—

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Hamilton. I'm sorry. That's time.

Our next five minutes are with Ms. Rempel Garner.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Thank you, Chair.

I want to go back to the mass cancellation powers. In earlier testimony, you outlined that these powers could be used in cases of fraud. Do you plan on using them, should the bill pass, to address cases of fraud? Are there any active cases that you would use this on?

**Tara Lang:** We don't have any active plans to use it—no.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** There are no active plans at present to use the power whatsoever.

**Tara Lang:** No.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Then why did you propose it?

**Tara Lang:** We proposed it on the tail end of experiences that we learned through COVID, where we saw that there could have been a need to have a mass power to extend or pause documents—applications—and we thought it was a good idea to be able to respond to crises and emergency situations in a nimble manner.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Ms. Lang, if we're sitting here 18 months from now and I pull up this testimony and I'm doing ATIPs on you guys, there's nothing that you would have been planning to use these powers for, absolutely nothing...?

**Tara Lang:** We have no plans to use the power. We're not going to turn around if the bill passes and start submitting an order in council. I mean, there are going to be areas of the department... There could be groups that come to us to say, "Hey, maybe we should look at this." There are emerging threats on a daily basis—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I don't understand why it's in here, then.

**Tara Lang:** Because we don't know what's around the corner. We need that flexibility.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I also don't understand why you couldn't use legislation.

**Tara Lang:** Because legislation takes a super long time to pass.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** This is a pretty big power that you're asking for. Shouldn't it require—

**Tara Lang:** It's a big power with a significant amount of checks and balances. It's not one—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Because you don't come to Parliament through this. Is that right?

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** On a point of order.

I love my colleague Ms. Rempel, but I have to intervene to protect the health and safety of our interpreters, who are having trouble doing their job right now.

[*English*]

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I guess what I'm trying to understand here is that if you have no plans to use this and there wasn't really a circumstance in the past where you needed it, why should we devolve these powers to you without any parliamentary oversight? You're not making the case for me here, and I'm honestly on the fence.

Mr. Zuberi has raised some points about defining the powers. Why would we give you these powers if you don't plan to use them? Give me an example.

**Tara Lang:** An example is that six months from now we have intelligence that a country called "Mike" is planning foreign espionage, and we have received an uptake in applications. We see that there's something weird going on. Instead of looking at these one by one and allowing these people to come into the country, tying up border offices, we could put in a recommendation to the order in council to say that "this cohort of applications with the name Michelle Rempel Garner, coming from Mike country, applied here". We will pause and we will review them, and we will try to build a case to see whether or not this is a risk to Canada.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Don't you have that power already today?

**Tara Lang:** We don't have that power already today.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** You do under ministerial discretion, though.

• (1615)

**Tara Lang:** We do not have the ability to pause any kind of processing of applications—en masse, case by case....

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I think you do, actually.

**An hon. member:** I think you do, too.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I think you do. I think, if you look through it, you do.

I don't think you guys have made the case, and that concerns me. I feel like you guys are hiding something. The fact that you haven't defined the powers, that there's no reporting requirement.... I think you guys kind of swung and missed on this one a bit. I would encourage you to try to rectify that in the 48 hours that we have before we have to start amending this bill, because you haven't satisfied me, as a legislator. I think there are other people on this committee who feel the same way, across party stripes.

We don't trust you, so we need to have.... You said that there are checks and balances in this legislation. I don't think there are enough. I'll leave it at that.

Did you provide any advice to the minister on any other measures to reduce incentives to abuse the asylum system, measures that weren't included in this bill?

**Jason Hollmann:** I can't comment on advice to the minister.

We're here to talk about the measures that are being studied by the committee. We look at how the system—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** You can, though. Actually, that's a valid question for the committee to ask.

Did you provide any advice to the minister, yes or no, on ways to reduce the abuse of the asylum system, ways that aren't included in this bill?

**Jason Hollmann:** We look at the system all the time in terms of how it is working and what we can do to improve it, whether that's procedural—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** What's not included in this bill that could reduce the incentives?

How about, let's say, restricting the access to federal benefits to emergency health care for failed asylum claimants? Would that reduce the incentives to abuse the system?

**Jason Hollmann:** There are many things that could be explored. There are also pros and cons to each of those. Individuals, such as failed claimants who are here and potentially subject to challenges with removal, may find themselves in health emergency situations and require support.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** That's what I said: emergency benefits.

What about the pre-removal risk assessment process? Did you recommend limiting pre-removal risk assessment appeals or new pre-removal risk assessments to when there's substantive, new, circumstantial change?

**Jason Hollmann:** The pre-removal risk assessment process—

**The Chair:** Be very quick. You have 15 seconds.

**Jason Hollmann:** —for those who already have had an Immigration and Refugee Board decision, only looks at new evidence that has occurred since—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Like what...?

**The Chair:** Ms. Rempel Garner, I'm sorry. That is time.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** We have to go to Ms. Sodhi.

**Amandeep Sodhi (Brampton Centre, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair. I will be splitting my time with my colleague, MP Fragiskatos.

My first question is for you, Ms. Lang, and it's with regard to the pre-removal risk assessment.

Has IRCC considered strengthening the PRRA process, for example, by guaranteeing access to hearing? How is the department preparing for potential backlogs or bottlenecks resulting from these new ineligibilities?

**Tara Lang:** I'll actually pass it to my colleague, Mr. Hollmann.

**Amandeep Sodhi:** Thank you.

**Jason Hollmann:** The department is trying to ramp up operational preparedness. We are looking at making sure we can move forward in delivering the pre-removal risk assessments as quickly as possible with trained officers, increasing the level of training that we're offering and being positioned to make sure that we can move forward quickly, should the bill pass.

**Amandeep Sodhi:** Thank you for your answer.

At this committee, we've also heard concerns that allowing the Governor in Council to cancel immigration documents in bulk goes too far, especially with public interest not clearly defined.

How do you respond to these concerns, and why does IRCC believe that this level of flexibility is necessary?

**Tara Lang:** As mentioned before, public interest is intentionally not defined in the legislation to allow maximum flexibility for the Government of Canada to respond in a range of unforeseen circumstances that threaten the public interest. The intent is to protect the public interest—including the integrity of our immigration system; the safety, security and health of Canadians; and the security of our border—or to respond to large-scale emergencies and other unforeseen circumstances. These are meant to be used exceptionally when needed and are not planned.

An example might include a pandemic, where the government may want to suspend visas for clients abroad in order to pause travel to Canada and protect Canadian public health. The suspension can then be lifted, for example, after the risk subsides or after clients provide evidence of a vaccine or a health test.

**Amandeep Sodhi:** Thank you.

I have about 30 seconds.

Witnesses have also told this committee that the PRRA process is less thorough than the IRB process and often doesn't include the opportunity to plead their case in person. Can you explain why IRCC considers the PRRA process a reasonable alternative for those who would be ineligible to make an asylum claim under Bill C-12?

• (1620)

**Jason Hollmann:** As I explained, in our perspective, the PRRA process is a robust process. It has been around for about 20 years. It has been subject to court challenges in the past. I think the rate of cases that are failed PRRA cases that go to the federal court and are sent back for redetermination is only about 5%.

In our view, officers do look at the same protection factors. They receive significant guidance and training in order to do that. Clients have access to legal representation, and they look at the same country conditions as the IRB process. We do offer the ability to have a hearing. It happens in cases of significant credibility where the decision may hinge on an individual's circumstances or story. Otherwise, the paper-based process is an efficient process.

As I mentioned earlier, country circumstances and the level of state protection may allow for an easy “yes” decision or, on reviewing an application and an individual's file, it may be straightforward to know that there's an internal flight alternative for that individual resulting in a negative decision.

**Peter Fragiskatos:** Thank you to officials for appearing. I do trust you, and I think we all do around the table, although there might be some exceptions on certain points. Thank you for the work that you do.

In my experience, officials, like politicians, are loath to give hypotheticals, but this would be an exception.

Can you give another example, Ms. Lang, on this point about cancellation of documents where you and the government believe that this would be relevant?

**Tara Lang:** A cybersecurity attack, where a vast number of fraudulent immigration documents are issued in the system, could potentially require a mass cancellation of the documents to ensure

that nefarious actors cannot use them to travel to Canada. Where large-scale fraud trends were to be observed, these authorities could also be used to cancel or suspend documents and applications for documents based on known fraud indicators. Such actions would not be country-based and are grounded in objective indicators linked to fraud.

These authorities can also be used to change conditions on temporary residents in Canada to respond to social or economic matters that concern the public interest. For example, IRCC could modify temporary residents' authorized length of stay or change employer-specific work permits to open work permits, allowing persons to work in different locations and fields across Canada where there is an increased public interest demand.

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

Thank you, Mr. Fragiskatos.

Just because we have limited time left, with everyone's permission, I'll give four minutes to Mr. Menegakis, four minutes to Mr. Fragiskatos and one minute and a half to Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe.

Go ahead, Mr. Menegakis.

**Costas Menegakis (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you to our witnesses for appearing before us.

I'm trying to get a handle on why you need the massive power of mass cancellations. You seem to have some concern, or maybe disrespect, I might add, although that's a hard word to accept, I know, about doing this through legislation. You commented that legislation takes a long time. There's a reason that legislation takes a long time; it requires parliamentary oversight, debate, review and a lot of detail before we get to a point where we have a piece of legislation in front of us to discuss.

Here we are today with a piece of legislation that, quite frankly, we were not expecting. We do have it before us. You don't want to go through the legislative process. You want this massive power that can override what parliamentarians as legislators are really elected to do, which is represent the people.

Please explain why you cannot respect what's been done already so far, the legislative process, and now you want this massive power where you can say, “This is good enough reason for me, country Mike or country Susan, whatever. I want to be able to have the power to do it without asking any elected official of the people to have an opinion.”

**Tara Lang:** I think we have seen that, in recent times, the world has changed, and we have seen such different emerging threats, whether they're health, safety, security or fraud.

The minister of IRCC does not have this power unilaterally. The decision rests with the Governor in Council, who acts on behalf of cabinet. On the advice of cabinet, the Governor in Council would consider—

• (1625)

**The Chair:** You have one minute.

**Tara Lang:**—all of the views of the Government of Canada collectively. It ensures broad scrutiny and alignment with overall government priorities, and it has a system of checks and balances.

**Costas Menegakis:** You only have one minute, as you heard from the chair, so let me just get in on this a little.

These are new regulatory executive powers. The minister does have that authority because it's the minister who is going to prepare that memorandum to cabinet and is going to go in there, asking for the sweeping power without coming back to Parliament, at a time when—as Mr. McCrorie has testified before this committee—there are already 30,000 people in the country whom they can't find and at a time when we're talking about a one-touch system. He has a different opinion than the elected person of the union of the employees under Mr. McCrorie's direction. They came here with a voice as well. Their morale is down. They're not happy. They're not satisfied.

Mr. McCrorie, you may want to paint a different picture today because you may be at odds with what Mr. Weber says, but the fact of the matter is that you represent the same people.

For us to overlook all of that and say to give the sweeping powers to the minister—the seventh minister in 10 years—so you can say, “You know, we want this, Minister. Go ahead and get it for us in an order in council and ignore Parliament and the will of the Canadian people”.... You understand how difficult that is for us as legislators to accept, do you not?

**Tara Lang:** I really do think that the use of these powers could be handled in the public interest. The order in council process, with a whole-of-government approach, taking in considerations from all equal members, is part of our government process. I think the checks and balances and the transparency are present in order to help this—

**Costas Menegakis:** I would argue that it would be in the public interest to not have people with criminal records walking around the streets while waiting to complete their 45-day term so that they can finish their screen—

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

Thank you Ms. Lang.

We now go to four minutes with Mr. Fragiskatos.

**Peter Fragiskatos:** Thank you Madam Chair. I'll be splitting time with Ms. Sodhi to make up her time that she gave to me.

Ms. Lang, can you continue to give examples or expand on the ones that you've given?

I go back to this point because I think it is absolutely central to this bill. Cancellation of documents is something that, understandably, has raised questions among advocates, including, as you see, members on this committee. I think the examples can do the talk-

ing. Please continue and let us know as a committee, through those examples, how this would ultimately improve Canadian security.

**Tara Lang:** Thank you for that.

When threat actors are engaged in certain activities, they generally seek to disguise their intent and enter Canada singly to better avoid detection. It is plausible that scenarios may arise that involve large cohorts—for instance, a foreign national naval or research vessel seeking access to Canadian waters and ports, an academic or trade business delegation or a large cohort of temporary visa holders entering Canada for a specific project or work in a specific sector.

It's also plausible that foreign nationals could seek to enter Canada to participate in activities or events that constitute or contribute to threats to the national security or public safety. In these cases, the event or destination might be the key to identifying the cohort. The Governor in Council could issue an order in council to, for example, mass-suspend documents while investigations are completed. This would eliminate the risk that such nefarious actors could travel to Canada. This is one of the reasons it needs to be nimble and needs to be exercised in this manner. It's because it is on the spot and as it is happening.

Another way that these authorities could be used is to address, for instance, an immigration situation caused by a domestic natural disaster, such as an earthquake or wildfire. The authorities could, for example, mass-extend work or study permits or amend permits to allow for working or studying in another region if this became necessary. It could also be used to quickly facilitate extensions of stay for temporary residents in Canada following a natural disaster or armed conflict in a other country that make leaving to return to the home country difficult or impossible, or following, as mentioned, the COVID-19 pandemic or other health crises.

IRCC had to reissue several permits and documents to persons who had to stay in Canada longer than they had initially planned and who needed to work to support themselves and their families. These authorities could have been used to extend the validity of those work permits en masse, which would have avoided the significant backlogs that were accumulated in all lines of business post-pandemic, and they would allow us to continue to impact the economy in a positive manner.

• (1630)

**Amandeep Sodhi:** My question is for the IRCC officials. We've heard that the new one-year ineligibility for asylum claimants introduced by Bill C-12 could disproportionately impact women, marginalized communities and other survivors of gender-based violence.

Can you tell us if IRCC has looked at how different groups like these may be impacted by these provisions? Are you confident that minority groups will be protected under this legislation?

**Jason Hollmann:** Thanks for the question.

I indicated earlier that we did a gender-based analysis. Broadly, many of those groups would benefit from a fast asylum system. Regarding those directed towards the pre-removal risk assessment, we train people to take into account various vulnerabilities when dealing with sensitive situations as they go forward and interact with clients, so that the pre-removal risk assessment can take into account the specific circumstances a client might experience.

**Amandeep Sodhi:** Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

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

Thank you, Mr. Hollmann.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe, you have the floor for a minute and a half.

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** Thank you very much.

Are the officials who process asylum claims the same as those who conduct pre-removal risk assessments?

**Jason Hollmann:** Thank you for your question.

[*English*]

Generally, we have specific officers who work on the pre-removal risk assessments. They receive at least six months of training and mentoring, and—

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** So the officials who process asylum claims receive different training from the officials who conduct pre-removal risk assessments.

[*English*]

**Jason Hollmann:** In terms of IRCC's role on asylum claimants, we review eligibility—

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** I'm sorry, but I don't have a lot of time. They're trained differently. Is that correct?

**Jason Hollmann:** Decisions on regular asylum claims are made by another organization, the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada.

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** Okay, so these are different types of training.

As you said earlier, many more cases will be transferred for a pre-removal risk assessment. The volume of applications will therefore skyrocket in that area, but overall, the volume of applications won't change. It will simply be transferred from one organization to another. Also, because the training is different, there won't be enough officers trained to do the pre-removal risk assessments.

Do you realize that if Bill C-12 is passed as it is, not only will the overall volume of applications not change, but processing times will also greatly increase because of the lack of training?

[*English*]

**Jason Hollmann:** We have existing trained officers who are already implementing the pre-removal risk assessment program. They would be those who are working on—

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** You told us that the volume was going to skyrocket.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Monsieur Brunelle-Duceppe, please let him answer the question. Then it's time.

Answer in 15 seconds, please, Mr. Hollmann.

**Jason Hollmann:** Sure. Thank you, Madam Chair.

We are also increasing our operational capacity. We've already been working on increasing that capacity with additional training and additional staff capacity to make sure we're ready for the higher volumes.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

Thank you, Mr. Hollmann.

Thank you to all the witnesses today. It was really important for us to have you back today to answer a number of questions that came up over the last three days. Thank you so much for the work you do, and thank you for being here.

With that, I am going to suspend for five to 10 minutes so we can go in camera.

Thank you.

[*Proceedings continue in camera*]





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>