



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 030

Wednesday, April 29, 2026

Chair: Julie Dzerowicz



Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

Wednesday, April 29, 2026

• (1630)

[English]

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

[Translation]

Welcome to meeting number 30 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format. To ensure an orderly meeting, I would like to make a few comments for the benefit of witnesses and members.

[English]

For those who are joining us on Zoom, please click on the microphone to activate your mic, and please mute yourself when you're not speaking. As you all know, for those who are joining us virtually, you can select the appropriate channel for interpretation: English, French or floor. Of course, for those who are in the room, you can use the earpiece that is attached and select the desired channel.

For those who are speaking, as well as for the questioners, I will let everyone know when you have one minute left.

[Translation]

Kindly wait until I recognize you by name before speaking.

I want to remind everyone to kindly not speak over each other, as it will be hard for our interpreters to translate, and it makes their job difficult.

[English]

Of course, please ensure that all your comments are addressed through the chair.

Members, please don't forget to raise your hand if you wish to speak. The clerk and I will manage the speaking order as best we can.

[Translation]

Thank you for your co-operation.

[English]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted by the committee on September 16, 2025, the committee is resuming its study of Canada's immigration system.

[Translation]

I would now like to welcome our witnesses for today.

[English]

As an individual, we have Dr. Kelly Sundberg, professor from Mount Royal University. Online, we have Mr. Joshua Eisen, who's in-house counsel of FCJ Refugee Centre, a wonderful centre in downtown Toronto. From the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, we have Tracey Maulfair, representative in Canada, and Azadeh Tamjeedi, senior legal officer.

I warmly welcome all of you.

Up to five minutes will be given for opening remarks, after which we'll proceed with rounds of questions.

Welcome, Professor Sundberg. I'm going to ask you to begin with your opening remarks for five minutes. You can begin right now.

• (1635)

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg (Professor, Mount Royal University, As an Individual): Thank you, Madam Chair, vice-chairs and members of the committee, for the opportunity to appear before you today.

I'm Dr. Kelly Sundberg, a criminologist and professor at Mount Royal University in Calgary. Before entering academia, I served for more than 15 years with what is today the CBSA.

From the outset, I want to be clear that I firmly believe in lawful immigration and refugee protection, and that I take great pride in our nation's long-standing commitment to supporting those who generally seek refugee protection from Canada. Nevertheless, our immigration system cannot remain credible if it's not competent, enforceable and aimed at building public trust.

Over the past two years, our government has clearly recognized that our systems are under great strain. We've seen changes to international student permits, temporary resident volumes, visa requirements, refugee eligibility rules and border integrity measures. These changes echo what many practitioners have been saying for years: Capacity and enforcement matter.

Recognizing the problem is not the same as fixing it. Canada's immigration and refugee system remains under great pressure. We see this in refugee backlogs, limited screening and delayed removals. Moreover, we see this in strains being transferred to provincial and municipal governments, which are left to absorb downstream costs in housing, schooling, health care, policing and social services.

Most concerning is the widening gap between what federal immigration policy promises and what the system can actually deliver. Unfortunately, this gap is contributing to growing public frustration and a deeper erosion of confidence in our federal institutions.

The Immigration and Refugee Board's own numbers are alarming. In fiscal year 2024-25, the refugee protection division finalized more than 78,700 cases while receiving approximately 170,000 asylum claim referrals. As of March 31, 2025, more than 175,800 claims were ready to be heard, with another 105,500 claims incomplete because of pending security screening and other outstanding requirements. These numbers don't describe a timely or adequately resourced system. They describe an overwhelmed one. When these systems are overwhelmed, everyone suffers. Genuine refugees wait too long for protection. Weak or disingenuous claims remain unresolved. Enforcement actions are delayed. Provinces and municipalities carry the burden, and public confidence erodes.

To this point, I believe both sides of the current debate have part of the truth but not the whole truth. Our government is right in speaking about sustainability, integration and protecting Canada's humanitarian commitments. Those words mean something only if the system can competently screen, process, decide, support and, where necessary, remove people in a timely and fair manner. The opposition's critique is also valid in terms of identifying enforcement, removal, social service pressures and public confidence as serious issues.

These are not imaginary concerns. Nevertheless, we must not treat refugees or newcomers as the problem. Frankly, the problem is not refugees or immigrants. It's system failure.

My research has found that approximately 12.5% of executed terrorist attacks and approximately 50% of publicly known thwarted plots involved individuals who entered Canada through asylum pathways or who were seeking asylum. Importantly, my research also shows that the overwhelming majority of asylum seekers are peaceful, law-abiding people who simply want safety and a better life. Nevertheless, the data clearly shows that asylum pathways are being exploited by a small but high-consequence cohort of bad actors. This distinction matters. Weak screening does not protect refugees. It harms them. When security failures occur, public anxiety rarely stays focused on the individual offender. Rather, it unfortunately spills into generalized resentment toward refugees, immigrants, international students and other newcomers. While this is clearly unfair, it is also sadly predictable.

For these reasons, I urge the committee to consider six practical areas.

First, Canada needs better, risk-informed, intelligence-led screening, especially of those seeking entry from failed states, hostile regimes or areas of civil war, terrorism and organized crime.

Canada cannot rely on a system predicated mostly on self-declaration.

Second, Canada must recognize where and when refugee claims are made. As a general principle, refugee claims should be made abroad or immediately upon arrival at a port of entry. Inland claims must remain possible, of course, but they should be exceptions and require clear justification.

Third, Canada must improve immigrant supports, including an increased investment in language and skills training, foreign credential recognition, civic orientation and education on Canadian laws, rights, responsibilities and expectations.

• (1640)

Fourth, Canada must improve its intelligence, investigation and enforcement capacities so investigations are more comprehensive and removals more timely, with a greater foreign fugitive apprehension capacity and stronger inter-agency coordination, including better global information sharing.

Fifth, Canada must fix removals. Once due process is exhausted, removal must actually occur. If removal orders aren't enforced, the law loses credibility.

Finally, sixth, Canada should consider consolidating its immigration and border security, overseas liaison efforts, immigration and customs intelligence, exit tracking and maritime border integrity within a single integrated national security-focused agency. In essence, I suggest transforming the Canada Border Services Agency into a Canada border security agency.

The Chair: Thank you, Professor Sundberg. You are way over time.

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: Oh, I'm sorry.

The Chair: I've been very kind to you. I just wanted you to get through your recommendations.

Thank you very much.

Next, we go online to Mr. Eisen from the FCJ Refugee Centre.

Your five minutes start now.

Joshua Eisen (In-house Counsel, FCJ Refugee Centre): Good afternoon.

My name is Joshua Eisen. I'm in-house counsel at FCJ Refugee Centre in Toronto. We're a community-based organization that works with refugee claimants and other precarious migrants.

Today, I'm going to focus on two urgent concerns: first, the need for regulatory exceptions to the new ineligibility provisions introduced by Bill C-12, and second, the extraordinary and unjustifiable delay for humanitarian and compassionate applications, which, according to IRCC, now stands at more than 10 years.

I'll begin with Bill C-12.

Under Bill C-12, individuals who wait more than a year after arriving in Canada before making a refugee claim are ineligible for a refugee hearing. Instead, they are diverted to a pre-removal risk assessment, which offers fewer procedural protections. The one-year bar disproportionately harms some of the most vulnerable claimants: LGBTQ individuals, survivors of domestic violence and human trafficking, and people whose risk arises only after they have arrived in Canada due to changes in conditions in their country of origin.

Importantly, these cases are not exceptional. I regularly meet with clients who have been delayed in filing a claim because of trauma, structural barriers and other reasons beyond their control.

Under Bill C-12, these individuals lose their right to make a refugee claim, simply because more than one year has passed since their arrival in the country. That is not a fair or logical system. It punishes delay without examining the reasons for the delay. It ignores trauma, fear, coercion and changing global conditions.

For that reason, regulatory exceptions must be created for vulnerable groups, including LGBTQ claimants, survivors of domestic violence and human trafficking, and *sur place* claimants, so these individuals can benefit from a guaranteed oral hearing before the refugee protection division, along with the robust procedural protections that entails.

My second point concerns IRCC's disturbingly long processing times for applications for permanent residence on humanitarian and compassionate grounds, commonly known as H and C applications. Section 25(1) of the IRPA gives decision-makers discretion to grant permanent residence to individuals who do not qualify under other streams when there are sufficient humanitarian and compassionate considerations to justify relief. H and C applications are a critical safeguard. They exist to ensure that cases that would otherwise fall through the cracks still have a pathway to permanent residence. These applications are vital because they prevent some of the most complex and compelling cases from being lost in what can otherwise be a rigid and bureaucratic system.

The best way to understand the importance of H and C is through actual cases.

One of my clients was born in the United States while his mother was in transit to Canada from Haiti. He arrived in Canada as an infant, and his mother made a refugee claim. Her claim was accepted, but his was refused because he held U.S. citizenship. When his mother lost her refugee status after briefly returning to Haiti to attend her own mother's funeral, my client was left without any clear pathway to permanent residence in the only country he has ever re-

ally known. Now 20 years old, he faces removal to the United States, a country he has not been to since he was a baby, where he knows no one and to which he has no meaningful connection.

Another case involves a young couple who fled violence in their home country and sought refugee protection in Canada. They were represented by a fraudulent ghost consultant who mishandled their claim and disappeared with their money, causing their refugee claim to be abandoned. During that time, they had a daughter. For nine years they lived underground, without status, trying to build a life and protect their family. Recently, they were located by CBSA, which initiated removal proceedings. Deportation would mean forcing their nine-year-old daughter, a Canadian citizen, to leave the only home she's ever known and relocate to a country she has never seen and where she does not even speak the language.

In both of these cases, the only realistic pathway to stability and permanent residence is an H and C application. Unfortunately, that safeguard is now effectively dead. IRCC's current processing time for H and C applications exceeds 10 years. During that time, applicants often remain without status or the right to work, and they live under the constant threat of removal. In many cases, removal defeats the purpose of the application; by the time the decision is made, the harm the H and C process was meant to prevent has already happened.

If H and C is to remain a meaningful tool, there must be revisions to the government's immigration levels plan, at least as it applies to these applications. Under the current plan, more than 50,000 H and C applicants are competing for 1,100 spaces this year. The number of applicants will only continue to rise, while the number of spaces is actually set to decrease in the coming years.

H and C applications cannot function as a meaningful safeguard if applicants are expected to spend a decade in limbo before receiving a decision. If we are serious about fairness, compassion and the integrity of our immigration system, this must change. Otherwise, H and C is little more than window dressing, allowing Canada to maintain the illusion that there is an exceptional pathway for hardship cases, when in reality that pathway has been blocked.

Thanks for your time.

● (1645)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Eisen.

We'll now go to Ms. Maulfair, from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Ms. Maulfair, you have the floor for five minutes, starting now.

[English]

Tracey Maulfair (Representative in Canada, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees): Madam Chair and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear today on this study of Canada's immigration system.

Today I'm going to focus my comments on two areas: asylum and asylum systems.

It's noteworthy that I am speaking in a year when we marked the 75th anniversary of the 1951 refugee convention. In the aftermath of World War II, the convention was a landmark commitment by states to ensure that people fleeing persecution would never again be left without protection. Marking this anniversary is not simply an occasion for reflection. It's also an occasion for states to reaffirm their promise to uphold its principles at a time of increasing forced displacement due to war, conflict and persecution.

At its heart, the refugee convention affirms a simple but powerful idea: that those forced to flee have the right to seek asylum and that protecting them is a shared responsibility.

In today's world, defined by conflict and fragmentation, this commitment is being tested. As of mid-2025, 117.3 million people were forcibly displaced worldwide, 8.4 million of whom were asylum seekers.

Behind every statistic is an individual forced to flee in order to survive, carrying with them the hope for safety and dignity. It's important to note that asylum has never been an act of generosity. Rather, it's an expression of courage—the courage of those who flee and the courage of societies that welcome them, even when it demands effort, resources and political will.

Today, the global asylum system is under strain. Responsibility for hosting refugees continues to fall disproportionately on countries closest to the conflict: 71% of refugees are hosted in the countries neighbouring their own, most of them low- and middle-income countries. This imbalance erodes protection, fuels irregular and dangerous journeys, and leaves far too many people in prolonged uncertainty.

Canada has a vital role to play in this through its asylum system and by maintaining an example to the world of how to properly assess asylum applications. This means ensuring fair and efficient asylum procedures and access to due process. Timely decision-making is essential, not only for public confidence but for the people whose lives remain on hold while they wait. Fairness and efficiency are not competing goals; they are mutually reinforcing pillars of a credible system.

Right now, Canada receives less than 2% of the world's asylum applications, and that number continues to decline. Now is the perfect time to look at ways to increase efficiency, innovate and improve on the tools already at its disposal, such as the Immigration and Refugee Board, whose expertise is well recognized internationally. The best way to address system backlogs and integrity concerns is by processing cases in a timely manner, not by deterrence measures.

In discussing these complex realities, which are often of a technical nature, we have a shared responsibility to work together to en-

sure that the conversation about asylum and refugees remains objective and balanced. It should be based on sound legal analysis and facts rather than populist rhetoric. Asylum systems must be flexible to address changes in the patterns and profiles of asylum seekers. This ensures public confidence in the integrity of the system while safeguarding against returning people to persecution.

Internationally, Canada's responsibility extends beyond emergency humanitarian assistance. Durable solutions require supporting host countries. Resettlement remains a powerful expression of international solidarity. Canada's leadership in this area sends an important signal at a time when safe pathways are narrowing globally, forcing people to make perilous journeys along irregular routes. However, resettlement cannot replace asylum. Both are essential, complementary components of a robust international system and fully aligned with the spirit and letter of the refugee convention.

As we mark its 75th anniversary, we are reminded that the convention is not a relic of the past. It's a living commitment, and Canada has both the credibility and the capacity to lead where we're going at this critical moment.

• (1650)

UNHCR stands ready to work with the government to advance a critical and principled response to the displacement.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Thanks to all of you for your remarks.

We're now going to begin our rounds of questions.

Our first round will be for six minutes, and we begin with Mr. Redekopp.

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

Thank you to the witnesses for being here today. I appreciate it.

Mr. Sundberg, Bill C-12 was recently passed, and it's being implemented as we speak. One of the provisions, of course, prevents asylum claims that are longer than a year. I've heard that might create as many as 30,000 new removal orders for CBSA.

Can the current CBSA staff handle 30,000 new removal orders?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: No, it can't. It's very difficult to get data, but CBSA has roughly 420 officers nationally. When we think of the officers who would be tasked with a lot of this work, they're doing many other things. Frankly, with the volumes we're seeing, we need to have comparable staffing to process this in all components, from processing the applicants to enforcing this.

A lot of individuals came here as students over the last few years, and tens of thousands have made refugee claims and are going to add to that backlog. When you only have a handful of officers... If we trust the government's own analysis of the officers' happiness or job satisfaction, the CBSA is on the lower end of that spectrum. It's—

Brad Redekopp: I'm sorry to interrupt, but I have very limited time.

You talked to CBSA officers. What's the government telling them, then, if there are all these people to process and they don't have the capacity? What is the government telling them to do?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: I do speak with the union and with officers. The question they have is, "If we have this cancellation of a lot of the status, why are we not seeing them going to PRRA, the pre-removal risk assessment process?"

Brad Redekopp: Why aren't they going to PRRA?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: I don't know, maybe resourcing. It's a—

Brad Redekopp: You brought up the pre-removal risk assessment, or PRRA. It's one of the ways an asylum claimant can delay their removal from Canada.

Does PRRA effectively bar CBSA from removing someone?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: Yes.

In addition to speaking to CBSA officers—of course, I'm coming to this from a criminological perspective—I speak with members of various police departments across the country. They are becoming more and more frustrated with the fact that when they apprehend somebody for an alleged breach of the law, the refugee claim is then used as a means of delaying both the criminal process and the removal. It is a system that is definitely not efficient or effective, and it is also very disjointed.

This is unfair to everybody, but it's coming from a part of the country where this is increasingly a growing concern.

• (1655)

Brad Redekopp: When someone gets a removal order and they know they can do a PRRA, they don't have to do that. Is that correct? They can self-deport. Does that happen very often?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: Self-deportation is increasing, for those allowed to leave.

Brad Redekopp: Is it a large or a small percentage of people? What's your guess?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: It would be a guess, because, again, the data is very difficult to nail down.

The delay is so incredible for these that we see some who are leaving on their own. It also depends on whether they're in custody or not.

The PRRA has become a bottleneck in the system, as has the H and C actually, as the other witness mentioned. The time delay is just—

Brad Redekopp: You spoke about the integration of different departments. We have IRCC, CBSA and the IRB, and then we have local law enforcement. When IRCC has information about admissibility or fraud concerns, is that information consistently or quickly shared with CBSA?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: No.

Brad Redekopp: When the IRB hears a refugee claim, does it always have the security information it needs from the CBSA or the IRCC?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: No.

Brad Redekopp: I've heard before from others that these organizations don't work well together. Is that what you're hearing as well? How does that work?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: That is probably the number one issue I hear.

Brad Redekopp: What's the solution to that?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: As I said in my opening remarks, I do believe that we... I was one of the people who worked in this city after 9/11. I believe we need to coordinate so that the Canada Border Services Agency is the agency that's responsible for the security and integrity of this program. That is not to say that I believe in the policing or militarization of our immigration programs, but I do believe that to have a valid program, we need to have security for that.

My research, which is focused on terrorism and counterterrorism, clearly shows that a disproportionate number of individuals who have been apprehended in the plotting of terrorist attacks in this country have entered this country through those streams. I attribute that to a lack of screening and a lack of commitment to security.

In the 15 years of my time as an officer with what is the CBSA, I have arrested and removed people who have done heinous crimes. The amount of time—

The Chair: Thank you, Professor Sundberg. We are way over time.

Thank you, Mr. Redekopp.

Next, we have six minutes for Mr. Fragiskatos.

Peter Fragiskatos (London Centre, Lib.): Thank you to the witnesses for being here today.

Professor Sundberg, I'll begin with you. I might actually just stay with you. There's a second round, but I wanted to ask you first, sir. A number of points came up.

First, there is your research on refugee claimants. If I understood you correctly, you said that the research indicates that the vast majority of refugee claimants are here on legitimate grounds.

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: Absolutely.

Peter Fragiskatos: Do you have numbers to that effect?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: The percentage is well into the 90%.

To clarify, I research terrorism and national security issues. Those are my areas of research. It just happens that when I look at the cases of those who engage in terrorist acts or attempted terrorist acts, I do look at their backgrounds and how they came here or to our Five Eyes partners.

When I do speak with groups, the group that is probably one of the loudest and most concerned is newcomers to our country, who are often exploited by other newcomers who are exploiting them for gain.

The RCMP has indicated that we have 4,000 different organized crime groups that work in this country. We start looking at how the various groups come into our country, remain in this country and then exploit other newcomers. That's what I'm getting at. You have to have a system where you're protecting immigrants, and that requires enforcement. When you have only 420 officers who are specifically tasked with this at a national level, it's window dressing.

• (1700)

Peter Fragiskatos: You left us with a few recommendations. If I understood you correctly, one was on the administrative side in terms of the public service. You're calling for the CBSA to come together with the IRCC.

Can you just go over that again so we're clear?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: When we think of the different agencies—and I'm speaking on the enforcement side of the programs—we have the RCMP, CSIS and the CBSA. There is lack of coordination among these. The RCMP is tasked with doing border security in some of our provinces. The provincial governments have implemented their own border patrols and that sort of thing. The disconnect between.... Even within the federal government, with the RCMP and the CBSA, we're just not seeing the working together, the coordination and the moving forward.

I suggest we follow what the Australians have done: have one agency that's responsible for the integrity and enforcement of the program, and staff it so that it's able to actually do its job. Of course, we have to have the immigration department driving this, but we need to have an enforcement component that is effective. We're a huge country, so having a number of agencies that have a little bit of responsibility here and there.... By having it in one, it will be more efficient and effective. At the end of the day, we'll see that others that are engaged can do other jobs, such as the RCMP looking at federal policing matters.

It's really an efficiency issue. There's been very good success in Australia with this approach. I think we should probably follow that.

Peter Fragiskatos: You talk about enforcement; what you're really talking about is deportations, when it's determined that an individual should no longer be here. You're saying that in Australia they have an agency that's responsible for this specific objective.

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: It's the Border Force. I actually believe the best thing we could do as a nation would be to put our focus

abroad so that we could actively engage in helping. We have a proud peacekeeping tradition. We have very limited foreign intelligence, unfortunately. Among the Five Eyes, when I meet with members of that, we're referred to as the "lazy eye", out of Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States. We do not have the staffing abroad or the intelligence capacity to address these issues, to identify the risks, and to—

Peter Fragiskatos: I don't mean to cut you off, sir, but my time is limited.

Can you talk more about the Australian example? We can look it up, of course, but this agency is recent, I take it. What is this agency specifically tasked with?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: They are, in essence, the immigration and customs border services. They work hand in hand with the Australian foreign intelligence service, ASIO. They're working with the administrative components for Australia, but their focus is very much preventative and looking abroad. They have officers who are abroad. It's a good model. It's more prevention-focused as opposed to reactive. I think it's a very good model.

Now, as with anything, I'm not saying that all aspects of the Australian system are great, but they do have some components that I think are great.

Peter Fragiskatos: I think there is a great deal of utility in looking to G7 partners and Five Eyes allies to see what they're doing. It's not about copying, to use that term, because there's a context here that's unique to our country, but we can certainly learn from examples.

Thank you very much for sharing that.

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fragiskatos.

Thank you, Professor Sundberg.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simard, you now have the floor for six minutes.

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Before I begin, I want to make sure that the interpretation is working properly for the witnesses and that they can hear my voice clearly. That seems to be the case.

Mr. Eisen, I really appreciated the reference you made to actual cases in your opening remarks. I would say that all members are certainly able to provide you with plenty of actual cases. For my part, I'm thinking of a Salvadoran family back home in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean. They were asylum seekers who waited five years to get a response. That response was ultimately a removal order. We understand all the distress this can cause for these people who have built a life for themselves, settled down and, overnight, found themselves threatened with being uprooted. Fortunately for them, that story ended well because we managed to come to an agreement with Minister Fraser.

I'm telling you this because, often, the failures of the immigration system turn into a source of misery for asylum seekers. You have surely seen that for yourself. However, there may be a solution. I would like you to talk about one aspect in particular, which is a better distribution of asylum seekers. Statistically, when we look at the figures, we realize that Quebec received a disproportionate influx of asylum seekers in 2023. It received 45% of the total asylum claims in Canada. That figure was 30% in 2025. I would also point out that Quebec's demographic weight is 22% of Canada's total population. This disproportionate influx has happened and created pressure on public services. You can easily understand that.

I'd like you to talk about the potential solution of a better distribution, a slightly fairer distribution across the whole of Canada. Perhaps there could be mechanisms inspired by what we're seeing right now in Europe. In sum, if we had distribution mechanisms, could we ensure better protection of refugee rights and, perhaps, more sustainable management of the asylum seeker system across the country?

• (1705)

[English]

Joshua Eisen: First off, I'm not an academic. I don't study comparative immigration. My thoughts are based on my own frontline experiences. I don't think there is an obvious connection between where claimants end up and how effective the processing of the claims is in terms of speed, efficiency, etc. That could be relevant in terms of integration, and it depends on economic concerns. However, those don't have a direct bearing on the process of assessing claims.

There are three divisions at the refugee protection division: the eastern office, the central office and the western office. I'm not exactly sure how many claims go to each office, but I assume and believe that they're resourced based on how many claimants there are in each region.

At the end of the day, people gravitate towards large cities, where they see more economic opportunity, where there are members of their diaspora community and where they feel a sense of connection that allows them to feel more at home. It's very complicated to centrally direct where people are going to end up. I just see some issues with that.

[Translation]

Mario Simard: I understand.

The reason I bring this up is that community organizations like yours are in direct contact with asylum seekers. The reality in Moose Jaw isn't the same as in Quebec or the Maritimes. The public services aren't the same. They don't have the same capacity to integrate and welcome asylum seekers. If we had a better distribution across the country, it might reduce the pressure on the public services and community organizations that help integrate and welcome asylum seekers. They could be more efficient.

I don't know if you notice this within your organization, and I'm not blaming anyone here, but the services offered to asylum seekers are certainly not uniform across the country.

• (1710)

The Chair: There are 30 seconds left.

[English]

Joshua Eisen: I support clients from all across Canada. It is certainly the case that people move to other provinces outside of Ontario and to smaller communities in Ontario for economic reasons. Certainly, it is harder for them to access various kinds of services, including finding legal representation. That is an ongoing issue, and there is definitely something to what you are saying there.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Eisen.

Mario Simard: If there were a mechanism—

The Chair: Mr. Simard, your six minutes are up. Thank you.

Mario Simard: Sorry, Madam Chair. I have a quick point of order.

Since the beginning of the meeting, I haven't been able to hear the interpretation when you speak.

The Chair: I'm sorry. Can you hear me?

Mario Simard: I can't currently hear you.

The Chair: That's a problem.

Mario Simard: No. I can hear the witnesses, but I can't hear you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Can you hear me?

Mario Simard: I can talk like this all day, if you like.

[English]

The Chair: We'll get IT to fix it.

Your time is up.

[Translation]

Mario Simard: I can't hear you, but I understand that my time is up. I don't understand English, but I do understand sign language.

The Chair: Ha, ha!

Thank you, Mr. Simard.

[English]

We are now going to our second round, where people will have five minutes.

We will start with Ms. Rempel Garner for five minutes.

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

I'll direct my question to Ms. Maulfair.

You have criticized recent Canadian measures in Bill C-12 aimed at faster processing and eligibility rules. Can you point to any other major resettlement country that grants unfettered access to asylum claims filed more than a year later or made from irregular crossings? Could you explain why Canada should have a different standard than a country like Australia?

Tracey Maulfair: Thank you.

I'd just like to clarify. We have not criticized the measures. We have offered ways that we thought they could be improved on, moving forward, and I would respectfully say so.

In that—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Okay. I have very little time.

The other question I wanted to ask is.... Your organization has been very vocal about the need for...about your organization wanting Canada to take on more refugees. I'm wondering why the UNHCR has been far less vocal about asking wealthy non-western states such as the Gulf Cooperation Council countries, which host virtually zero refugees under the 1951 convention. I know they're not part of it, but why haven't you advocated for more refugees for them, given their significant resources?

Tracey Maulfair: We actually advocate for the right to asylum to be recognized worldwide and for people who are fleeing from persecution and conflict to be accepted—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Do you think the GCC countries should take more than they do right now?

Tracey Maulfair: We think everybody should take refugees who show up at their borders. It's part of international humanitarian law.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: How come the UNHCR hasn't been more aggressive about asking the GCC countries to take more refugees? I don't see any statements calling on them. You frequently ask Canada to take more. Why not the GCC?

Tracey Maulfair: We advocate with all different governments. It's not something that we do publicly in the paper. It's working with governments, like we work very closely with Canada, with the IRCC and the IRB—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Right, but you do publicly for Canada, though. I mean, you come to committee and.... I've been on this committee for many years, and UNHCR has always publicly advocated for increased numbers. I'm just wondering why there's a dichotomy there.

Tracey Maulfair: There actually isn't a dichotomy. Wherever we advocate, we ask for refugees to be received in the country they're coming to. Refugees who come here, we ask to be received. Refugees who go to GCC countries, we ask to be received.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Just to be clear, the UNHCR's position is that GCC countries should take more refugees from you.

Tracey Maulfair: We think that refugees should be accepted wherever they show up, at anyone's border: GCC, Canada, Australia.

• (1715)

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Do you think the U.S. is a safe third country for people to make refugee claims in?

Tracey Maulfair: The safe third country agreement is an agreement between Canada and the U.S. that UNHCR was not actually involved in. We don't pronounce upon bilateral agreements. It's not really our place to make a pronouncement on that.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Do you think the U.S. is a safe third country? I mean, you ask the U.S. to take refugees. Do you believe that it's a safe country for refugees to go to?

Tracey Maulfair: We continue to ask the U.S. to take refugees, as we ask all countries.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Okay. Thank you.

The other thing is that in your opening statement you talked about making decisions not based on "populist rhetoric". Could you qualify that? Are you talking about public concerns about the impacts on housing, let's say, or social services costs? Would you consider those two elements populist rhetoric in decision-making?

Tracey Maulfair: Not in decision-making, no. I would consider that these are elements we keep hearing that aren't necessarily.... We don't hear the facts behind them most of the time.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Like what?

Tracey Maulfair: Like the fact that for both the housing crisis or situation here and the health care strains in the system, these aren't caused by refugees. Refugees are 1% of the population here.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Just a minute, I want to fact-check you on that. The government's interim federal health program has increased by 1,200% in spending. Who caused that, if not refugees?

Tracey Maulfair: That's not what's making the system under so much strain. It's a part of the system, but it's not—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: I don't understand. Somebody using the—

Tracey Maulfair: There's been scapegoating. Refugees are being blamed.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: No, no. This is what I think the dichotomy is. I want a fair and just refugee system, but when we have an organization like yours come in and call asking about the sustainability of social programs "populist rhetoric", it gets a lot harder for us to make the case for a sustainable refugee system.

I'd like to give you an opportunity to clear the record. Are you really telling the Canadian public that the amount of intake of asylum seekers and refugees doesn't have an impact on the 1,200% increase that we've seen in the usage and the cost of that program, which is designed specifically for that cohort?

Tracey Maulfair: No, that's not what I'm saying. I'm saying that refugees are not—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Just to clarify—

The Chair: Ms. Rempel Garner, your time is over.

I'm going to allow the witness to finish her answer, please.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Well, I actually had the microphone and you cut me off, so—

The Chair: Your time is over.

I want her to get a chance to respond, please, for 30 seconds. I'm the chair, Ms. Rempel Garner—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: No, no. I have a point of order on this. I have the time, and I feel that you—

The Chair: Your time is over.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Okay, but on a point of order, I feel like what you're doing right now is not in accordance with procedure. You are supposed to maintain neutrality, and I feel like you are giving the witness additional time because you want her to make a point against me from a partisan perspective. If the time is over, the time is over.

The Chair: Your time is over. I was going to give the witness a little bit of time to be able to respond.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: I am just going to call that I feel like you are making a partisan decision, and you're not making a neutral decision—

The Chair: I hear you. I heard you the first time, Ms. Rempel Garner, but I don't agree. I was giving the witness some time—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: For the record, I believe that you are cutting me off, and you're—

The Chair: No, your time is over. I'm allowing the witness to answer the question.

Can I give you just 15 seconds to finish your response, please, Ms. Maulfair?

Tracey Maulfair: Thank you.

No, I do not think that everything that's happening is populist rhetoric. What I'm saying is that we need to get to the facts of this, and refugees cannot be scapegoated for all of the ills in any society.

The Chair: Thank you so much, Ms. Maulfair.

Next, we have five minutes with Mr. Zuberi.

Sameer Zuberi (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to thank you for giving the witnesses a chance to complete their thoughts, as you did with Mr. Sundberg in his opening statement where he completed his recommendations, and just now you gave the chance to another witness to complete her thoughts. Thanks for that even-handed approach to the witnesses.

With respect, I'd like to start with the UNHCR witnesses, either one of you. You can both reply if you like.

Are you familiar with the spring economic statement and budget 2025, where our government made a commitment around providing permanent status to 115,000 protected persons in Canada? Are you familiar with this? Okay. There is some misinformation about what these measures mean when it comes to the federal government's commitment to provide permanent status to 115,000 protected persons.

Can you speak to that so that there is a clear understanding for all who are watching today?

● (1720)

Azadeh Tamjeedi (Senior Legal Officer, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees): I'll take this question.

The 115,000 who are going to be admitted into the permanent residence stream are individuals who have been accepted in Canada as refugees who came through the asylum system. Often, they have to wait a number of years, sometimes five or eight years, to get their permanent residence. This assists the department, IRCC, to clear up that backlog. Instead of having them wait a number of years to get their permanent residence, this will process their cases a little faster. They've already been screened, vetted and accepted as refugees in Canada.

Sameer Zuberi: Right now, is it the case that the partners of these protected persons aren't able to join their partners in Canada until they receive permanent residence? Is that currently the case?

Azadeh Tamjeedi: That would also assist in terms of family reunification. Once they obtain their permanent residency, they are able to apply for their family members to join them. The hope is that, once this backlog is cleared up a little bit, then it could assist them in bringing their family members to Canada.

Sameer Zuberi: To be clear, we're talking about protected people, which includes their spouses, their immediate family, their household.

Azadeh Tamjeedi: Yes, for family members, it's through a complementary pathway, as we call it, a family reunification pathway. The individual here in Canada is accepted as a refugee, and they could bring their family members, who may be refugees elsewhere or may have some kind of status in another country where they are in danger as well. This is why we support family reunification for recognized refugees in Canada.

Sameer Zuberi: Currently, the lack of reunification extends for a long time. Do you have knowledge of how long that extends?

Azadeh Tamjeedi: On average, it could take anywhere between four and eight years for family reunification to be complete. It could take a little longer with different levels plans that are now being implemented in Canada. That also impacts an individual's ability to integrate. Waiting for your family members to join you could be a little bit of a drain on an individual's ability to move on with their life with their family members. This is why we support family reunification.

Sameer Zuberi: I've seen the same thing you're speaking to in my own constituency office, where there's somebody who is a protected person here in Canada who has gone through all the vetting, and they're separated from their family for an extended period of time. It does create a lot of stress on the household.

Mr. Eisen, in the minute and a half that's left, how do you see this policy we just discussed with respect to 115,00 protected persons being given permanent status? How do you see that ameliorating the lives of the people in question? Could you speak to that, please?

Joshua Eisen: I don't know how much I can add on that specific question. I think it was handled pretty well by Azadeh.

Currently, even if something is ostensibly guaranteed administratively, people have to wait in this state of uncertainty, not knowing what's going to happen. Separation from family is a major issue as well. It's both of these things.

Sameer Zuberi: Thanks.

In the 40 seconds I have left, I'd like to go back to the UNHCR.

With respect to protecting these vulnerable people from fraudsters in the immigration system, do you have any suggestions?

Azadeh Tamjeedi: Do you mean—

Sameer Zuberi: I mean fraudsters, the people who take advantage of asylum seekers, etc.

Azadeh Tamjeedi: It's ensuring that they know what the system is, how to move through the system and how to make an application, and ensuring that they have access to legal aid, counsel and settlement services. All of that assists in ensuring that they are able to avoid being taken advantage of by anyone who wants to defraud them.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Tamjeedi.

Thank you, Mr. Zuberi.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simard, you have the floor for two and a half minutes.

Mario Simard: I'm able to hear your lovely voice again, Madam Chair.

I'd like to follow up on the conversation my friend Ms. Rempel Garner had with Ms. Maulfair. I agree that we must be careful not to make asylum seekers scapegoats, but we have to be doubly careful, since it's also important not to give asylum seekers expectations that are irreconcilable with the resources of host societies.

That's more or less the problem we saw in the case of Roxham Road. When we, the members of the Bloc Québécois, asked questions about that issue, people made us out to be somewhat opposed to immigration, when that isn't the case. Organizations that help im-

migrants told us that it was a source of misery and that some smugglers were taking advantage of people's vulnerability. We have to be very careful when attributing this kind of populist thinking to people, since it's quite a thorny issue.

I'd like to come back to this, because I know that there are distribution mechanisms in Europe. In recent years, this issue has been discussed at length in Quebec. Quebec has received a higher percentage of asylum seekers than its demographic weight.

Do you not think it would be a good idea to have a system for distributing asylum seekers in Canada if we want them to integrate successfully and have public services that meet their expectations?

• (1725)

[*English*]

Tracey Maulfair: At the UNHCR, we are not opposed to such systems. In fact, we're working with governments in this region that are, I think, good examples of this: Brazil and Mexico. They're looking at where labour is needed in certain areas, and then they're working with refugees who voluntarily go there and work. They're helping society and integrating more quickly.

The same kind of thing could be looked at here. As I said, Brazil and Mexico, which are much closer than Europe, have good systems for this and could be something along the lines of what you're saying.

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Maulfair and Mr. Simard.

[*English*]

We have only about four minutes left, so I'm going to give two minutes to Mr. Redekopp and two minutes to Mr. Fragiskatos.

Mr. Redekopp.

Brad Redekopp: Thank you.

Mr. Sundberg, you might have heard the story—it's quite a big story in the news today—of Mehdi Taj, who was an IRGC commander. He was coming to Canada to watch some FIFA soccer. He was apparently given a temporary resident permit. He came to Canada, but then he was.... The government, I think, saw the light and decided that we shouldn't be letting IRGC terrorists into Canada, so it apparently turned him around and sent him back.

To me, this is a horrible example of incompetence within the security screening system. We clearly know that we don't allow IRGC terrorists into Canada, yet it appears that he was given a TRP to come to Canada. He landed in Canada.

Is this something you've seen before? What does that point to with regard to security lacking in our systems in Canada?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: I'm glad the port of entry did its work, but it comes to screening, and this is my point. If we have a proactive system with the resources abroad, we can identify high-ranking members of regimes who are seeking entry into this country.

When we think about issues of fraud or people who are taking advantage of refugees, one answer is to have enough officers to arrest and prosecute the people who do this. My view is that there's a balance here and we need to have a much stronger international presence.

Brad Redekopp: This is a quick question. It seems like he was given a temporary resident permit, which I understand is the back-up. If you fail the main system and you're detected and declined, you can always go to that one and they'll let you in.

Is that a common thing that you've seen?

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: Yes.

Brad Redekopp: That's not a one-time thing. The TRP is the back door into the system if you fail the screening that we do.

Dr. Kelly W. Sundberg: Yes, the TRP is the process that is used.

Brad Redekopp: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Professor Sundberg.

Thank you, Mr. Redekopp.

Next, we have two minutes for Mr. Fragiskatos.

Peter Fragiskatos: I think it is important to put things into context. First of all, the individual in question who was mentioned by our colleague is no longer in the country. He is on the way back to Iran, where he belongs.

As far as the CBSA and keeping the country safe are concerned, our government is investing, as we know, to ensure that exactly that happens. A further 1,000 individuals are being hired. That process has begun. I could turn partisan here and talk about previous cuts under a previous prime minister under a previous Conservative government, but that doesn't get us anywhere.

Professor Sundberg, I have only two minutes, and you were kind enough to engage in questions in the first round, so I'll turn to Ms. Maulfair.

Thank you very much, again, for being here. We have tremendous respect for the UNHCR and what it contributes. The narrative turn that we see in democracies on immigration writ large.... We could talk about refugees, but I'll say it's on immigration in general. We know how that turn has gone.

What advice do you have for parliamentarians—not just members on the governing side, but parliamentarians in general—on what we can do to be constructive when we talk about immigration?

• (1730)

The Chair: Answer in 45 seconds.

Tracey Maulfair: I don't think I'll take even that much time.

The answer is evidence-based statements and evidence-based policy. Let's use facts. Let's find out what they actually are and then let's use them. None of the things that have been said here today are

at odds with each other. It's about making sure that the right and true facts are the ones that get presented.

Peter Fragiskatos: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fragiskatos.

Thank you, Ms. Maulfair.

I want to thank all of the witnesses for their time and their excellent testimony, which will be part of our study.

We're going to suspend for five minutes or so to allow our current witnesses to leave, and then we will come back with the second panel.

• (1730)

(Pause)

• (1740)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

[*Translation*]

Welcome back, Mr. Deschênes.

[*English*]

I want to make a few comments for the benefit of the new witnesses.

As you will see, and as explained by our wonderful IT ambassador, at the bottom of your screen, you can select the appropriate channel for interpretation: floor, English or French.

I will let you know when you have one minute left in your opening statements.

Kindly wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. As a reminder, all comments should be addressed to the chair.

I would now like to warmly welcome our witnesses for our second panel today. We have everybody online. We miss having you in person, but we're glad that you could join us.

We have Herbert G. Grubel, emeritus professor of economics. Welcome.

We have H  l  ne Mayrand.

[*Translation*]

She is a professor at the Universit   de Sherbrooke.

Welcome.

[*English*]

We also have Patrick Chevarie, businessman and owner.

[*Translation*]

Welcome to you as well.

We will start with your opening remarks for five minutes, and we will then move on to questions.

[English]

I will invite Professor Grubel to begin, for five minutes.

Professor Grubel, your five minutes start now. Go ahead, please.

Herbert Grubel (Emeritus Professor of Economics, Simon Fraser University, As an Individual): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I travelled around the country for two years with the finance committee, so I'm very familiar with the atmosphere.

Most fundamentally, I welcome public hearings, as we are having now, on the design of our immigration policy. I hope it will get the deserved publicity and discussion in Parliament that have been needed.

On a personal note, despite my numerous academic publications in the field of immigration economics, I was never asked to participate in the discussions around the setting of official immigration targets and selection criteria, nor was I ever asked, as a member of Parliament from 1993 to 1997, to vote on these issues. Only once did the minister tell me privately to keep up my research and publications and hold his feet to the fire.

I believe that in the greatest need of change are policies determining the number and selection criteria of temporary residents who are admitted to work or study in Canada. Foreigners who fill seasonal or temporary labour shortages in the economy should be admitted in numbers at frequent, regular intervals set by a parliamentary committee.

There should be no foreign students attending elementary and secondary schools. They do not benefit Canada. They burden our schools' resources. Foreign students should be admitted to attend Canadian colleges, universities and graduate schools. They bring valuable benefits to the institutions and the economy, especially to the extent that they pay tuition. Foreign students who have completed degrees at these institutions should no longer be deferred candidates for permanent resident status. The government should adopt a policy to ensure that temporary workers and students leave Canada after their visas have expired.

On a separate issue, parents and grandparents should be granted only visitor super visas, which was practised before the changes initiated by the government in 2016. It makes eminent sense. If a foreigner does not want to come without his parents, he should just not come.

The system dealing with asylum seekers needs to be reformed, possibly fundamentally, much as it is in other western democracies. Such reforms may include the development of ways in which the backlog of applications for refugee status is reduced. I'm fully aware that this is one of the most difficult problems our foreign policy faces.

There are no easy solutions. There are trade-offs that involve fundamental human values, such as the suffering of immigrants, but also the suffering of Canadians who find their housing, access to medical care—

• (1745)

The Chair: You have one minute left, Professor Grubel.

Herbert Grubel: That's fine. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm done.

The Chair: Thank you, Professor. I appreciate that.

[Translation]

I now give the floor to Professor Mayrand for five minutes.

Hélène Mayrand (Professor, Université de Sherbrooke, As an Individual): Good evening, everyone. Thank you for taking the time to listen to me today, and for the work you do on this committee.

In my research as a law professor over the past 10 years, I have focused on how certain rules, adopted to preserve the integrity of Canada's immigration system and to make it more efficient, have actually had the opposite effect of these objectives, in addition to negatively affecting the protection of migrants' rights in Canada.

The purpose of my presentation today is, first and foremost, to convince you that adopting more rules—in order to send a strong political message that something is being done to address the problem of the immigration system's abuse—often doesn't have the desired effect. Second, we need to think more broadly about the effects of these new rules, so that they don't put even more pressure on other sectors and don't shift the problem, in addition to contributing to insecurity for both migrants and Canadian communities.

Let me give you an example—the famous Safe Third Country Agreement—which we've already discussed and which you've heard about a number of times. I could give you other examples during the question and answer period, if necessary.

I want to begin by emphasizing that I agree with other stakeholders who have pointed out a number of issues regarding the violation of the human rights of migrants returned to the United States through the application of the Safe Third Country Agreement. I also believe that the situation has been particularly concerning since January 2025.

The government should focus on this situation and consider suspending the application of the agreement. I know this is a controversial topic for some of you, but the message I want you to take away is that, in addition to the human rights issues affecting migrants, there are also repercussions on the system's effectiveness and on the sense of security of communities living along the border, which is directly related to the committee's consultation.

Since the Safe Third Country Agreement was extended to the entire land border and since the closure of Roxham Road, which we heard about earlier, migrants have turned to other routes to come to Canada. Thus, on paper, the statistics available on the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada's website indicate that irregular entries have decreased. However, in reality, clandestine entries by people who no longer present themselves to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the RCMP, as was the case before the closure of Roxham Road, have increased. This fact has actually been documented by the RCMP itself and reported in a number of media outlets.

I have begun a research project with a doctoral student examining how the Safe Third Country Agreement and increased border security have significant humanitarian and security implications for the cross-border community of the Regional County Municipality, or RCM, of Coaticook, in the Eastern Townships. Our preliminary data indicates that there has been an increase in illegal border crossings in the region. As you may have heard in the media, a person was even found dead in the woods. The news was reported this past March, but the person died last year. This type of incident had never occurred before 2023. It puts additional strain on local resources, in addition to creating a sense of fear among the population.

The fact that Canada, under Bill C-12, which you have heard about, is unilaterally removing the 14-day rule for locating immigrants only amplifies this phenomenon. This is a glaring example of an attempt to reduce pressure on the asylum system and protect its integrity, but which, in reality, adds pressure asymmetrically: Rules are added at the federal level, but the pressure is felt locally, within the RCM. This pressure is also felt in terms of the resources and security measures put in place at the border and in border communities, while increasing insecurity for both the community and migrants.

A number of stakeholders have highlighted bureaucratic issues, such as a lack of coordination and delays in application processing. The previous panel talked about that. I think these are the real issues that need to be addressed.

• (1750)

The Chair: You have one minute left.

Hélène Mayrand: Okay. Thank you.

With regard to asylum seekers, the solution, in my opinion, does not lie in increasing the grounds for inadmissibility of their claims, as the government is trying to do through Bill C-12 and certain amendments. In my view, and in the view of a number of stakeholders, it lies in reducing application processing times and creating alternative migration pathways.

Thank you very much. I look forward to your questions.

The Chair: Thank you, Professor Mayrand.

I will give the floor to Mr. Chevarie for five minutes.

Patrick Chevarie (Businessman and Owner, Gestions P. Chevarie inc.): Good evening.

My name is Patrick Chevarie, and I have been a businessman for over 30 years in the Îles de la Madeleine. I am here today to talk to you about the Îles de la Madeleine. It's a small archipelago located in the middle of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, in eastern Canada. It's a beautiful little island that you should add to your list of places to visit.

The day you come to the islands to see us—it will be a wonderful day—you will notice as you arrive by boat that there are almost no Madelinots working on board anymore. The Madelinots are us, the people of the Îles de la Madeleine. There are very few Madelinots; they're all people from outside.

You'll also see, as you eat our delicious crab and lobster from the islands, that it's now all Mexicans processing crab and lobster, as

there are very few Madelinots left to work in the factories. You'll also notice, while having a good cup of coffee at Tim Hortons, just how popular it is because that's where people socialize. You'll also notice that all of the very smiling people who work there are Filipinos. They arrived in 2023 to help us keep the business open.

Why am I telling you all that? Because we live on an island. We're isolated. We're far away. We're not even a rural community; we're out on the water, out at sea. So we're very far from everything. Our population is aging. There are hardly any young people left in high schools and elementary schools. Their numbers are declining, as is the case pretty much everywhere in Quebec. According to the statistics, for every 100 people retiring in the Îles de la Madeleine, there are 43 to replace them. We're losing people, ultimately.

The reason I'm here is a bit personal. I mentioned the Tim Hortons restaurant, where you'll be getting your coffee in a few months. If you visit us in the fall, you will realize that it doesn't exist anymore. It will be closed because of changes to laws here in Canada, since September, that prevent us from renewing the permits of our Filipino workers, our international workers. You might say that it's just a Tim Hortons, that it's just the Îles de la Madeleine, and that it's not a big deal. However, for our community, it's a lot, because it's the social hub. It's where everyone gathers. It's important to the people of the islands.

If I go a little further, I can tell you that, in the Îles de la Madeleine's restaurant sector, most establishments are closed several days a week owing to a lack of staff. Many foreign workers also work in co-operatives, day care centres and the health care system.

I am the largest employer of foreign workers in the islands. Very few people want to work in a field like mine.

A number of Filipinos have come to the islands with their families. Their children are in school, and the family members have open visas that allow them to work for us. This enables us to provide excellent customer service.

I think special attention must be paid to remote regions. As I said, the situation in the Îles de la Madeleine is unique, as we are a small island in the middle of the ocean. However, in remote regions, we have difficulty finding employees—local people—to work in our businesses.

We've had to turn to temporary foreign workers for help. It's unfortunate. As a business owner, I have invested a lot of money to bring in these people, to get the business back on its feet after the pandemic. All the money invested was supposed to pay off over 10, 20 or 30 years, but now it may only pay off over three years. Our workers have to leave and, ultimately, we'll have to close the business.

This is a situation I am sharing with you today, but there are many other similar situations in Quebec and likely across Canada. I don't know about other regions; I know about ours, on the islands. That's why I'm here today. I want to give you an update on our situation and the situation of many other business owners who are going through the same thing.

Thank you.

• (1755)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Chevarie.

We will begin the first round of questions.

[*English*]

Mr. Menegakis, please go ahead.

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

Thank you to all of our witnesses for appearing before us today.

I'd like to start my questions with you, Professor Grubel. Do you believe the Liberal government considered the impact on things like health care, housing and jobs prior to letting in the largest number of immigrants they've allowed in over the past decade?

Herbert Grubel: I wouldn't know. It turns out, whatever they did, it was very bad for Canada.

Costas Menegakis: Would you agree that there are diseconomies of scale when letting in so many people at once? The costs may actually be higher than if immigration was done in a slower, more sustainable manner.

Herbert Grubel: Exactly. It turns not into a positive for the country as a whole, but a negative. I have great sympathy for gentlemen like.... We heard from the island that there is a labour shortage, but if we bring too much of anything, suddenly you will have adjustment problems. It was more than adjustment problems. It was killing our economy.

Costas Menegakis: You make a very valid point there, sir.

Do you think it has an impact on the ability of newcomers to Canada to have successful outcomes when so many are coming? Of course, it creates a problem with finding jobs, finding a residence to live, getting health care and so forth. Do you think it is an environment that is conducive to their being able to succeed in Canada as newcomers to our country?

Herbert Grubel: I'm not in contact with immigrants, but I read a lot about what is going on in the economy. I hear that the recent immigrants are a strong lobby for reducing the rate of immigrants. They are the ones at the front who feel this problem, as well as our own less skilled young people whose jobs are being taken.

Costas Menegakis: Do you think the government should be in the business of providing accommodations, housing for example, to asylum seekers, refugees and newcomers?

Herbert Grubel: My commentary on this controversy continuing here, which was going on before, with the asylum seekers is that the more benefits we offer, the more we will have asylum seekers who may or may not have legitimate claims but are getting benefits from doing so.

Costas Menegakis: Thank you for that.

Herbert Grubel: A famous economist, Milton Friedman, a colleague of mine when I was teaching in Chicago, said it's incompatible to have a welfare state and free immigration. In the last 10 years, we have been moving more and more towards free immigration. That prediction that it is impossible, we're paying for.

• (1800)

Costas Menegakis: Along those lines, sir, I don't know if you have heard, but the government ran into quite a bit of controversy because there were booking hotels and putting people in hotels across the country, just housing them there at exorbitant cost. Now, to get away from that controversy, they created a new program, and recently we found out that they gave the City of Ottawa \$40 million to outright purchase a hotel so they can house these people, so they're not renting anymore. They house them now in a hotel that is owned by the City of Ottawa to house these people.

Yesterday, for example, I read an article about another \$27.35 million that was given to the town of Pickering here in Ontario to do the same thing, to purchase a hotel there.

There's \$40 million to Ottawa, and \$27.35 million to Pickering. Those are only two locations that we know of where they've done that so far. They have been very reluctant to be transparent and give us a list of how many municipalities they have given money to.

What do you have to say about that, sir?

Herbert Grubel: More generally, it will all be said in a book that I'm writing, "I Cry for You, Canada". I came in 1972, having a professorship with a tenure in the United States, because I love Canada and I love Vancouver. I'm now almost sorry for this country. I'm glad I'm 92.

Costas Menegakis: I will close by saying this. Thank you for appearing before us today. I hope that when I am 92 years old, somebody will ask me to come and present here—if I am fortunate enough to get there. Thank you for your service to Canada as a member of Parliament. We appreciate your presence here today.

Herbert Grubel: You're welcome.

The Chair: Thank you, Professor Grubel.

Thank you, Mr. Menegakis.

Next, we have six minutes for Ms. Sodhi.

Amandeep Sodhi (Brampton Centre, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would like to ask Mr. Chevarie my first question.

In budget 2025, the federal government introduced a new initiative: Over the next two years, we will provide permanent status to 3,300 workers in rural areas who have already applied for permanent residence. Can you tell this committee how this measure will support rural economies, such as that of your riding, to ensure that businesses can keep running and growing opportunities for local communities?

[Translation]

Patrick Chevarie: On our end, we work in French because we are from Quebec. Quebec's laws for obtaining permanent residence are much more complicated, much more difficult. The French language is very difficult to learn for people who don't know it. However, in my business, the workers are Filipinos who don't speak French. They speak English and the language commonly used in their country. They've been attending French classes for three years, ever since they arrived on the islands.

For people like our workers, the program you're implementing requires much more time and French classes; it's not just a matter of applying for permanent residence. Today, we are running out of time because the programs have been halted, all the laws have been changed, and our workers have to go back home.

[English]

Amandeep Sodhi: Thank you.

[Translation]

Patrick Chevarie: It may work elsewhere in Canada, but it's very difficult for Quebec because of the French language.

[English]

Amandeep Sodhi: Thank you for your answer.

Professor Grubel, I would like to go to you for just a second.

Recent data tells us that international student arrivals this year are down by 75%, that temporary worker arrivals are down by 71% and that asylum claims are down by 64%. These numbers are a result of policies that have been put in place by Canada's new government to reduce, stabilize and balance immigration levels across different programs.

From an economics perspective, can you tell us how this change will help bring stability and future long-term predictability to Canada's economy and labour market?

Herbert Grubel: We got ourselves into a mess. How we're going to get out of it is going to be very difficult.

I don't know what the right and optimal number is, but what we're doing here is the beginning of something that should take place every year. We need to ask both people who are employers who want more workers and those who understand that every time you bring a family of five from a Middle East country, they will put a burden on housing, hospitals and everything that government provides for free, and will impose a burden on the average Canadian, whom, in effect, we ask through our burden to subsidize the people who hire these workers. We need to have a discussion and to have a trade-off between these two benefits.

• (1805)

Amandeep Sodhi: Professor Grubel, you've also argued that Canada's housing affordability crisis is directly linked to immigration and that housing was stable at lower immigration levels. I know you mentioned a little bit about it in your previous answer.

Now that we have reduced the numbers and have done the consultations, do you believe that this is a step in the right direction for housing markets?

Herbert Grubel: Of course. How could it not be? It will be very difficult to adjust. Once we're in the mud, it's very hard to get out. You won't get out overnight.

Let me tell you something. Politicians who are promising that they will change the affordability crisis are either lying or ignorant. If you look at the level of prices in Canada for the last 50 years, you will see that there has never been a decrease in the price level. The Bank of Canada aims for increasing prices 2% every year. The same thing will be.... Houses are unlikely to fall significantly. The only solution is more housing being built.

Amandeep Sodhi: Perfect. Thank you for your answer.

Professor Mayrand, recently the federal government announced a new temporary public policy to facilitate short-term work permits to temporary workers already working in Quebec while they await permanent residence. Can you explain to this committee how the immigration system in Quebec differs from that in the rest of Canada? What recommendations do you have for Quebec's system on how it could be improved in collaboration with the Government of Canada?

Hélène Mayrand: I think those types of temporary working permits could help make sure that refugees or refugee claimants have the opportunity to work while they are awaiting a decision. I believe, however, that the problem is mainly the delays. As other people have intervened at this committee, the delays are so long as they await their decision that they need to work. The delays are really, really long. This is the case in Quebec, and this is the case in the rest of Canada. Allowing temporary permits is good as a temporary measure, but I think the delays are at the core of the problems.

In terms of—

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Professor Mayrand.

[English]

I'm sorry. We're way over time.

Thank you, Ms. Sodhi.

[Translation]

Mr. Deschênes now has the floor for six minutes.

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I'm very pleased to hear the Îles de la Madeleine accent here at the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration. I thank Mr. Chevarie for being here.

I want to talk about what has happened with temporary foreign workers. Yesterday, we learned from the economic statement that the number of temporary foreign workers in Canada has been reduced by 71% between early 2024 and today. However, we in the Bloc Québécois have always supported tightening temporary immigration, but we have insisted that this not be done haphazardly and that regional realities be taken into account. That is how we saw the Liberal government announce on March 13 that it would allow all temporary foreign workers in rural areas to renew their permits for one year, and that it would increase the quota from 10% to 15% for one year in rural areas for those who had remained at 10%.

Now, Mr. Chevarie, I want to hear your opinion on these measures, which were essentially intended to help you. Have they really helped you? Are they enabling your Tim Hortons restaurant in Cap-aux-Meules to continue to operate?

• (1810)

Patrick Chevarie: Thank you for your question.

The answer is no. We were very pleased on March 13 when the government gave us 12 more months to find a solution or to see if immigration rules would change, especially in rural areas.

However, what the government did not announce that same day was that families could not stay. So a worker who had been here for two or three years with his family was allowed to stay for an additional 12 months, as the government told us, but his family had to go back home. Of course, these people left everything behind to come work in Canada, to learn French, to help grow the economy, to contribute to society. Yet they are being told to leave with their families or to stay without them. That doesn't work. It doesn't make sense. These people won't do it because, from what I'm hearing from all the panellists, there are still human beings at the heart of this.

Alexis Deschênes: Mr. Chevarie, at your Tim Hortons, what percentage of your employees are temporary foreign workers?

Patrick Chevarie: Currently, 67% of them are temporary foreign workers with a closed or open permit.

Alexis Deschênes: That was made possible thanks to the simplified processing.

Patrick Chevarie: Yes, exactly. In 2023, when our workers arrived, the federal program allowed us to hire four. Then the provincial program, a simplified program, meant that we could finally hire the number of workers we needed. It always depends on our finances, too. So I hired eight more, for a total of 12 foreign workers. Then, the following year, four spouses arrived, so we were able to put together a work team to get the business back on its feet. The business had been half-closed for years because there were no local workers to staff it.

Alexis Deschênes: With the new measures announced in March, did you ultimately submit renewal applications for your workers?

Patrick Chevarie: I can't apply for a renewal because the workers who are there now know they're going to leave since they can't keep their families. For those who are single, we are above the 15% threshold. However, the 15% threshold means nothing to me, in Quebec, nor to many other companies in Quebec, as we are all at 40%, 50%, 60%, 70% or 80% because of the simplified program.

Alexis Deschênes: Had suitable changes been made to the policy, spouses, too, could have renewed their open work permit, even though the primary worker, if you will, could renew theirs for only a year.

Patrick Chevarie: Yes, that would have helped until such time as certain rules were changed for rural areas like ours and remote areas.

I'm listening to what's being said right now, and I can see how money is potentially being wasted all over the country. I can understand the government's frustration and its desire to cut down on immigration, but things are different in remote regions like ours. We have a labour shortage; we don't have enough local people to work in our businesses. Whether we are talking about supermarkets, shopping centres, pharmacies, factories, restaurants or hotels, we all have the same problem: remote areas don't have enough local workers to meet labour demands.

Alexis Deschênes: For anyone following these proceedings who doesn't know much about the Îles de la Madeleine, please explain how the situation there is unique in Quebec.

Patrick Chevarie: We're a small island of about 12,000 people. During the summer, for a period of eight weeks, we can have between 40,000 and 50,000 people on the island, even 60,000. It's a completely different place in the summer. Our population is aging, and many of our retirees work during the year. There are very few young people in the workforce, because we don't have many young people. People haven't had children in the past 30 years.

Then there's the unemployment situation in the Îles de la Madeleine. It's not something people talk about much. A lot of small businesses open in the summer. We call them unemployment clubs, because people work there for 14 weeks so they can collect employment insurance. They're happy after that, and they relax at home. Unfortunately, people work under the table as well, which means that year-around businesses like mine can't find local people to work, because of the employment system and—

Alexis Deschênes: I have just a few seconds left, Mr. Chevarie. What's going to happen to your Tim Hortons restaurant in the coming months?

Patrick Chevarie: We are going to have to close as our work permits expire in August and September. We'll be forced to close the restaurant, which will become another shuttered business in the middle of town.

• (1815)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Chevarie.

Thank you, Mr. Deschênes.

[English]

That ends our first round. Now we will start with our second round.

Our second round begins with Mr. Davies for five minutes.

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Professor Grubel, when I was looking at your impressive body of work over the years, it wasn't until later, after I read about some of the things you've been doing, that I saw you were a member of Parliament. That was a bit of a surprise to me. I'm happy to engage with you today.

In your policy history, you have tended to focus on fiscal responsibility, labour market competition, infrastructure constraints and selective, economically driven immigration.

I'm from the Niagara region in Ontario, and we see first-hand the pressures you have written about: housing shortages, strained infrastructure and employment, balancing labour needs with stagnant wages in key sectors. That lived reality raises a couple of fundamental questions.

I wonder if you could walk the committee through your framework for assessing what you refer to as the net fiscal impact of immigration. What variables matter most, and how should policy-makers interpret those results?

Herbert Grubel: The book you're referring to was published by the Fraser Institute, somewhat reluctantly, with a co-author—an American who had lived in Ottawa for a long time. It started off... Our attention was drawn to the following fact: Statistics Canada found that when immigrants enter Canada, they have an income that is below that of Canadian workers of the same age and education. This low income persists for the next 20 years and never goes completely away. I don't know whether it's discrimination or whatever. That's a fact. When we were writing our book, it was getting worse every five years. Statistics Canada has shown that it has gotten worse.

At the same time, as they settle in Canada, they're entitled to all the government benefits we offer. We also have progressive income taxation, so these immigrants with low incomes are getting all the benefits that are not tied to income, while the taxes they pay are considerably lower because their incomes are lower. We calculated it. This was in the eighties. The several billion dollars' worth of costs that immigrants impose on the rest of Canada was never mentioned. Even then, it was disregarded. We were hated for pointing out these kinds of things. People went, "Oh, this is wrong." The numbers are there. Nobody refuted them. Of course, the popular media didn't like the idea, because the mood in Canada at the time was still, "Immigrants cannot do any wrong, and we need more and more."

The question is, do we all want to subsidize the small businessmen of the world? That's an issue we ought to discuss. At the time I was active in writing, these issues were never discussed. We ought to have people from both sides.

Let me say—

Fred Davies: Professor, I have limited time.

I wonder if—

Herbert Grubel: Yes. I expect you to interrupt; otherwise, I could keep going.

Fred Davies: Professor, critics say that your approach may underweigh long-term and second-generation benefits.

How do you respond to that? How should governments balance short-term fiscal impacts with long-term economic gains?

Herbert Grubel: That is another question we have to look at.

The Chair: You have one minute.

Herbert Grubel: It's not typical. In the longer run, it involves education. I don't know.

• (1820)

Fred Davies: In your view, how should Canada determine the right level of immigration each year? What economic indicators or capacity constraints should guide those decisions?

Herbert Grubel: Have a group of people, like this here, and listen to them—small businessmen, farmers and even the big companies and manufacturers that love cheap, imported labour. Listen to those, and listen to guys like me saying, "If you always have cheap labour available, society has no incentive to adopt labour-saving devices."

The Chair: Thank you, Professor Grubel.

Thank you, Mr. Davies. That is time.

[Translation]

We now go to Mr. Deschênes for two and a half minutes.

Alexis Deschênes: Thank you, Madam Chair.

My question is for Ms. Mayrand.

Let's talk about asylum seekers. In yesterday's economic update, the government revealed that the number of asylum claims had dropped by 64% between early 2024 and early 2026.

You said the number of clandestine entries had increased. That's precisely what we're hearing from groups on the ground.

What's your view of the situation? Do you think the 64% accurately depicts the reality?

Hélène Mayrand: That's actually the purpose of the research we're doing in the RMC of Coaticook. Certain realities aren't covered by the data, for instance, in relation to those who are hiding.

Let's go back in time and talk about Roxham Road. There was an influx of people in one place, but people would cross the border, report to the RCMP and apply for asylum.

The Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada's website showed a remarkable or significant increase starting in 2017. Since 2023, that number has been dropping, and it will continue to drop with all the new restrictions on people's ability to file a claim in Canada. As a result, people will choose other ways in. It will also encourage crime, because smugglers will take advantage of the situation. That's what we are seeing.

We're still collecting preliminary data and documenting how things are playing out on the ground. The RMC of Coaticook is a transboundary region that has never experienced this kind of situation, with people crossing there. They leave either clothes or backpacks. The RCMP is also present, making significant use of drones for border surveillance. Residents have been given pamphlets explaining how to report anything suspicious. In short, this isn't something the area has seen before.

The number of clandestine entries has indeed gone up. Are those people going to apply for asylum? Maybe not, since the rules are being tightened even further. What that does is shift the problem.

Alexis Deschênes: I want to follow up on that, because I understand that—

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Deschênes.

I'm sorry, but your two and a half minutes are up.

Mr. Joseph, my apologies for forgetting you.

You may go ahead for five minutes.

Natilien Joseph (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair. It's all right. As you know, I just got here and I'm new to the committee, so I'm not going to stand up on the table. It's not a big deal that you forgot me.

This is for Ms. Mayrand, because she talked about immigration and co-operation between Quebec and the federal government.

We all know that Ottawa shares a number of immigration responsibilities with Quebec. How would better coordination between Quebec and Ottawa reduce processing times and improve our ability to attract the talent we're looking for?

Hélène Mayrand: Better coordination would certainly improve the situation and wait times. It's like taxation. In Quebec, we have the privilege of having dual filing. The same is true of immigration. In Quebec, we have the privilege of having a dual system, with acceptance certificates and then federally issued permits. That can cause additional delays in the process, so some people are choosing to settle outside Quebec because of the delays happening in Quebec.

That said, I think we need better co-operation. There's a more political dimension at play here, so it's important to look at how the two governments can work together better. Quebec is very cautious when it comes to its jurisdiction over immigration, which it wants to hold on to. Better co-operation is needed in order to reduce the delays. I completely agree with your observation.

• (1825)

Natilien Joseph: How do we improve it, Ms. Mayrand?

Hélène Mayrand: It requires program coordination. Quebec creates its own programs with its own criteria. The issues Mr. Chevarie talked about also stem from issues that aren't of the federal government's making, so there are challenges currently outside the committee's scope.

How do we do things better? Perhaps by having the federal government and province talk more. Again, they have separate responsibilities. There is a political dimension, as I said. It would also be very ill-advised for the federal government to interfere in provincial jurisdiction and impose some sort of...

It's a complicated issue, but—

Natilien Joseph: Sorry to cut you off, but that's why I asked about opportunities for co-operation in the context of Ottawa and Quebec's shared immigration responsibilities.

I'm going to turn to Patrick Chevarie now.

Good evening, sir.

It's clear from listening to you how essential it is for foreign workers to continue working on your beautiful islands.

Patrick Chevarie: Yes, that's exactly right. It's crucial to understand that the situation on an island or in a remote area isn't the same as it is on the mainland. Things are different in major areas or big cities. It's another world.

Natilien Joseph: All right.

I have another question for you, Mr. Chevarie.

In some areas, the declining population is making the situation worse when it comes to the availability of workers.

How could immigration support economic growth and the ongoing delivery of local services?

Patrick Chevarie: The government has to be able to say that regions need different legislation.

I was expecting the government to put forward a grandfather provision.

The Chair: There's a minute left.

Patrick Chevarie: We've been able to use immigration successfully. We are putting people to work, we are opening businesses. A grandfather provision would allow us to keep doing what we are doing. The system isn't being abused in remote areas, like it is in cities and elsewhere, as was discussed.

Natilien Joseph: I'm going to take this opportunity to make a quick comment and tell the Îles de la Madeleine people that I too am from an island, Tortuga Island. It's a beautiful island in north-eastern Haiti. We don't have the same levels of employment on Tortuga Island.

I'd also like to congratulate Alexis Deschênes for being lucky enough to represent your beautiful island.

Thank you, Mr. Chevarie.

Patrick Chevarie: Thank you.

The Chair: Thanks to both of you.

[*English*]

Because we have only two minutes left, we have one minute for Mr. Ho and one minute for Ms. Sodhi.

Mr. Ho.

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Professor Grubel, Canada's productivity has been weakening over the last Liberal decade. Investment is fleeing the country like we've never seen before. This is taken out of the Liberal costly credit card budget from 2025.

My question is, can radically increasing immigration levels, at the rates the Liberals have done in the past few years, compensate for poor productivity, weak business investment and low capital formation?

Herbert Grubel: To the contrary, it reduces per capita income, unless they increase productivity. We don't have the productivity.

When California reduced the inflow of Mexican agricultural workers in the valley, everybody said it would kill California. Well, it didn't. Instead of tomatoes being picked by hand, they developed machines to pick the tomatoes. The tomatoes didn't taste as good as the ones they had before. What did they do? They genetically modified the tomatoes so they could stand being picked, and they tasted as good as the ones we had before.

That is—

• (1830)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Grubel. I'm sorry that we had so little time.

Thank you, Mr. Ho.

Now we have one minute for Ms. Sodhi.

Amandeep Sodhi: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Chevarie, I would like to give you 45 to 50 seconds to give the committee any recommendations you might have.

Patrick Chevarie: The recommendation I have is this: When you do your laws and recommendations, the fact is that you have to take care of the rural places. You have to take care of what's not in central Canada, where there's a lot of population, with immigration coming in. We don't have the luxury of having all those people to choose from for all of our local businesses, as workers. That's on the island, yes, but it's everywhere in rural communities. We don't have that luxury, so the government has to look at the fact that we are far away and not the same as cities and highly populated areas. It's a totally different kind of world.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Chevarie.

[*English*]

Thank you, Ms. Sodhi.

That concludes our second panel for today's study and meeting. I want to thank all the witnesses for their time and testimonies.

Colleagues, I want to let you know that on Monday, May 4, we will have Minister Diab and officials here for one hour to discuss the Auditor General's report and to complete our study of Canada's immigration system. For the second hour, we will have time in camera to give drafting instructions to the analysts and begin our discussions for our calendar until the end of June.

Do you have a quick question, Mr. Redekopp?

Brad Redekopp: I'm just wondering why she is only here for one hour on Monday. Wouldn't it normally be for one hour, and then officials for the other hour?

The Chair: We had the officials for an hour with the Auditor General. I think we had a full two hours. That's why. We still have an hour with the officials and Minister Diab.

Thank you so much.

This meeting is adjourned.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <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>