



THE CANADIAN
BAR ASSOCIATION
L'ASSOCIATION DU
BARREAU CANADIEN

August 15, 2017

Via email: Minister@cic.gc.ca

The Honourable Ahmed Hussen, P.C., M.P.
Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada
365 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, ON K1A 1L1

Dear Minister:

Re: Citizenship and Immigration Committee Report on Immigration Consultants

The Immigration Law Section of the Canadian Bar Association (CBA Section) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Citizenship and Immigration Committee's recent Report on Immigration Consultants.¹ We discussed the issue of immigration consultants in our meeting with you during the CBA National Immigration Law Conference in Toronto on June 10, 2017.

The CBA is a national association of over 36,000 members, including lawyers, notaries, academics and law students, with a mandate to seek improvements in the law and the administration of justice. The CBA Section has approximately 1,000 members practicing all areas of immigration law. Our members deliver professional advice and representation in the Canadian immigration system to thousands of clients in Canada and abroad.

The CBA Section applauds the Report's emphasis on the importance of protecting individuals who want to immigrate to Canada, as well as the integrity of Canada's immigration system. We also agree that the current regulatory framework for immigration consultants has failed to adequately protect vulnerable applicants from abuse by ghost and other unscrupulous representatives.

However, the Committee's recommendations have missed the mark in a number of key areas, and fail to adequately address the fundamental issues that led to the successive failure of two regulatory bodies for consultants, most recently the Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council (ICCRC). Neither proved able to deliver on their mandate to regulate consultants in the public interest – to ensure accountability, competence and effective enforcement of ethical and competence standards – and we see no indication that could change.

¹ House of Commons Citizenship and Immigration Committee, *Starting Again: Improving Government Oversight of Immigration Consultants* (June 2017), [online](http://ow.ly/P0G030eq6cB) (<http://ow.ly/P0G030eq6cB>).

We maintain our recommendation that the best interests of the public are served if only lawyers are authorized to act as paid representatives in IRPA.²

In the attached submission, we discuss some of our concerns with the Committee's recommendations, and offer some practical recommendations for the government in addressing the issue of immigration consultants. These include the supervision of immigration consultants by lawyers.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our comments on immigration consultants. Whatever action the government takes, the process must be transparent. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with you or a member of your staff to discuss these important issues further.

Yours truly,

(original letter signed by Kate Terroux for Vance P. E. Langford)

Vance P. E. Langford
Chair, CBA Immigration Law Section

cc: Borys Wrzesnewskyj, M.P.
Chair, Citizenship and Immigration Committee (CIMM@parl.gc.ca)

Encl.

² Canadian Bar Association, *Immigration Consultants* (March 2017), [online](http://ow.ly/ulPI30eq6hi) (http://ow.ly/ulPI30eq6hi). Canadian Bar Association, *Immigration Consultants letter* (May 2017), [online](http://ow.ly/OQ1B30eq6lh) (http://ow.ly/OQ1B30eq6lh).



THE CANADIAN
BAR ASSOCIATION

L'ASSOCIATION DU
BARREAU CANADIEN

Response to Citizenship and Immigration Committee Report on Immigration Consultants

**CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION
IMMIGRATION LAW SECTION**

August 2017

PREFACE

The Canadian Bar Association is a national association representing 36,000 jurists, including lawyers, notaries, law teachers and students across Canada. The Association's primary objectives include improvement in the law and in the administration of justice.

This submission was prepared by the CBA Immigration Law Section, with assistance from the Legislation and Law Reform Directorate at the CBA office. The submission has been reviewed by the Legislation and Law Reform Committee and approved as a public statement of the CBA Immigration Law Section.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Response to Citizenship and Immigration Committee Report on Immigration Consultants

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND PROTECTION OF APPLICANTS	2
III.	PROPOSED GOVERNMENT BODY OVERSIGHT MODEL	2
IV.	GOVERNMENT MESSAGING ON IMMIGRATION LAWYERS	4
V.	ROLES OF IMMIGRATION CONSULTANTS AND PARALEGALS.....	6
VI.	STARTING AGAIN.....	8
VII.	CONCLUSION	11
VIII.	SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	11

Response to Citizenship and Immigration Committee Report on Immigration Consultants

I. INTRODUCTION

The Immigration Law Section of the Canadian Bar Association (CBA Section) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Citizenship and Immigration Committee's recent Report on Immigration Consultants.¹

The CBA is a national association of over 36,000 members, including lawyers, notaries, academics and law students, with a mandate to seek improvements in the law and the administration of justice. The CBA Section has approximately 1,000 members practicing all areas of immigration law. Our members deliver professional advice and representation in the Canadian immigration system to thousands of clients in Canada and abroad.

The CBA Section applauds the Report's emphasis on the importance of protecting individuals who want to immigrate to Canada, as well as the integrity of Canada's immigration system. We agree that the current regulatory framework for immigration consultants has failed to protect vulnerable applicants from abuse by ghost and other unscrupulous representatives.

However, the Committee's recommendations have missed the mark in a number of key areas, and fail to adequately address the fundamental issues that have led to the failure of two regulatory bodies for consultants – the Canadian Society of Immigration Consultants (CSIC) and the Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council (ICCRC). Neither designated entity has proven able to deliver on their mandate to regulate consultants in the public interest: to ensure accountability, competence and effective enforcement of ethical and competence standards.

We discuss some of the CBA Section's concerns with the Committee recommendations, and make practical recommendations for the government in addressing the issue of immigration consultants. Whatever action the government takes must be transparent.

¹ House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, *Starting Again: Improving Government Oversight of Immigration Consultants* (June, 2017), available [online](http://ow.ly/DtNL30e9bMS) (<http://ow.ly/DtNL30e9bMS>).

II. ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND PROTECTION OF APPLICANTS

We endorse recommendations 10, 15, 18, 19 and 21 of the Committee Report, which would improve access to justice and reduce the vulnerability of applicants. These recommendations would do so, for example, by reducing language barriers and increasing the likelihood of complaints by applicants against consultants, without jeopardizing their applications. They would also increase fines and sentences for ghost consultants, as well as provide better funding to the RCMP and CBSA to expand their ability to investigate and lay charges against authorized or unauthorized immigration consultants.

We also support recommendation 11 and 12, which would give more financial support to settlement agencies that offer basic immigration services, and clarify that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) would not be subject to sanctions for offering these services. The CBA Section suggests as well that settlement agencies seek to have these services supervised by a lawyer, perhaps on a pro bono basis.

While the Committee's intent is well placed in recommendation 17, which would give applicants the opportunity to correct errors and misrepresentations made by unscrupulous consultants, it is inconsistent with existing case law finding applicants responsible for the misrepresentation of a consultant made without their knowledge.² It could also have the unintended negative consequence of conferring a false sense of security on consultants that any errors made by them will have no consequence to the applicants they are serving.

III. PROPOSED GOVERNMENT BODY OVERSIGHT MODEL

Our most significant concern is the recommendation that a government oversight body model be adopted as the framework to regulate immigration consultants and paralegals. The Committee set out the parameters for this framework in recommendations 1-6, 8 and 9 of the Report. It describes the proposed regulator as "*an independent public-interest body empowered to regulate and govern the profession of immigration consultants.*" This would be a government-regulated body, accountable to a Minister other than the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship to avoid apparent conflict of interest.

With this proposal, the federal government could still be in an actual or perceived conflict of interest: the federal government, through Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada

² See for example, *Hosseini Sedeh v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2012 FC 424 (CanLII), available [online](http://canlii.ca/t/fr183) (<http://canlii.ca/t/fr183>).

(IRCC), would be tasked with adjudicating applications submitted by immigration consultants, who in turn would also be regulated by the federal government (albeit through a different Minister). There would also likely be overlap and tension between the functions of the proposed regulator and those of IRCC, CBSA and the RCMP. Finally, the potential magnitude of costs to the Canadian public in establishing and administering a government regulated oversight body for immigration consultants would be significant.

We are also concerned with recommendation 5 of the Report, which would introduce a tiered licensing system for immigration consultants, with the highest level permitted to practice before the IRB. Appearances before the IRB amount to the practice of law, and require competent representation by professionals with litigation experience, education and practical training to deal with complex legal issues, including *Charter* challenges. We continue to stress that these appearances should be restricted to lawyers, similar to the Federal Court Rules, to protect applicants from adverse outcomes.

This view is supported by evidence of Paul Aterman, Deputy Chair of the Immigration Appeal Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada in his appearance before the Committee on March 6, 2017.³ He observed that,

[T]here's a big distinction between the litigation work we see and the kind of work that involves assisting a client to fill in applications. Lawyers go through three years of law school, through an articling period. They have to be called to the bar. It's a more rigorous regime than the one that's expected of immigration consultants...

...The IRB is the main forum in which consultants can litigate, and litigating requires very particular skills. Counsel in a hearing needs to know the difference between evidence and argument. Counsel needs to know what the right legal test is, what the best litigation strategy is, how to examine or cross-examine a witness. They have to be able to think on their feet. They have to be persuasive.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. The CBA Section recommends that the federal government not proceed with the proposed government oversight body model.**
- 2. The CBA Section recommends that appearances before the IRB be restricted to lawyers to better protect applicants from adverse outcomes.**

³ House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, *Evidence, Meeting Number 060, 1st Session, 42nd Parliament* (March 6, 2017), available [online](http://ow.ly/AUBa30e9c5P) (<http://ow.ly/AUBa30e9c5P>).

IV. GOVERNMENT MESSAGING ON IMMIGRATION LAWYERS

As highly skilled, regulated professionals and officers of the court, immigration lawyers play an important role in protecting vulnerable applicants and the integrity of Canada's immigration system. However, a number of recommendations in the Committee's report reflect a troubling oversight in the government's messaging on the essential role of lawyers in Canada's immigration system.

These include recommendations 13, 14, and 16, which call for IRCC to direct applicants to the proposed new regulatory body for immigration consultants, provide a public list of suspended registered consultants, explain the risks in using unregistered consultants, and notify applicants of the assistance available from non-governmental organizations. They also call for IRCC to work with Global Affairs Canada to develop public education campaigns in local and foreign markets on registered immigration consultants to counter misleading and inaccurate information.

While the absence of any mention of immigration lawyers in these recommendations may have been inadvertent, it remains troubling, and reflects ongoing concerns that the CBA Section has voiced over the marginalization and negative portrayal of lawyers on government websites.⁴

An overview of IRCC web pages reveals the overall tone of messaging about representatives, including lawyers, is consistently one of caution. Lawyers are usually listed after consultants on these pages in a way that downplays their education, training and professional standards to the point of misinformation, without presenting an accurate description of the benefits lawyers can offer applicants. These benefits include, for example, that lawyers can offer clients solicitor-client privilege and appear in Federal Court if a decision on an applicant's file requires judicial review.

Of even greater concern, is that lawyers are included in warnings of potential fraudulent activities by representatives. For example, on one website applicants are informed: *"You are not obliged to hire a representative, including a consultant, lawyer, Quebec notary or paralegal regulated by a law society, to apply for a visa or for Canadian citizenship, but if you do, choose*

⁴ Canadian Bar Association, *Depiction of Immigration Lawyers on Federal Government Websites* (June 2010), available [online](http://ow.ly/6e9u30e9cfm). (<http://ow.ly/6e9u30e9cfm>).

*carefully.*⁵ This is akin to the government warning people not to go to their family doctor when they are sick for fear of malpractice. Lawyers have a duty not to bring the administration of justice into disrepute, and the government's ongoing misrepresentation of lawyers reduces trust in the Canadian legal and immigration systems, and has a chilling effect on access to justice.

Although IRCC's focus on unscrupulous representatives likely emanates from an attempt to protect the public, potential applicants who view these pages are ultimately left without sufficient information on the role of representatives, and how they can provide guidance in navigating the immigration system. To address these concerns, the CBA Section recommends replacing current information about representatives on IRCC websites with more balanced materials, which we would be pleased to assist in drafting.

Information on these websites should:

- Reflect that IRCC websites and call-centres provide valuable information on the immigration system, but are not exhaustive resources;
- Provide more information on what is involved in the assessment of applications, and what types of evidence are required;
- Convey the need to make an independent and informed decision about hiring a regulated representative, and provide links to assist in finding one; and
- Portray immigration lawyers positively, and distinguish them from other types of representatives. This can be accomplished for example, by highlighting their education, training and professional standards, as well as the fact that only lawyers can offer solicitor-client privilege and appear before the Federal Court.

The Report also recommends a working group with members of the new regulatory body to explore ways to simplify processes and reduce the need for third party assistance, with no mention of including representatives from the legal profession in the group. The CBA Section has engaged in an ongoing, constructive dialogue with IRCC for many years, through stakeholder committees such as the Citizenship and Immigration Canada and Immigration Practitioners (CICIP). Our experienced members can add significant value to these

⁵ Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, *Immigration Fraud – Protect Yourself!* Available [online](http://ow.ly/yqMI30e9chd) (http://ow.ly/yqMI30e9chd). For other examples see IRCC, *You don't need to hire a representative!* available [online](http://ow.ly/zMMY30e9cmw) (http://ow.ly/zMMY30e9cmw), and IRCC, *Do I need a representative to help me apply?* available [online](http://ow.ly/nGer30e9crF) (http://ow.ly/nGer30e9crF).

discussions, and should be engaged in this and other working groups as key stakeholders as we have been in the past.

The focus of the proposed working group should be on improving client experience, with the objective of making immigration processes fairer and more transparent, as well as improving communication. Important national security and public interest issues aren't necessarily conducive to simpler processes, and given the rights and liberties at stake, applicants should not be discouraged from seeking representation, regardless of how simple or difficult immigration processes are.

RECOMMENDATIONS

3. **The CBA Section recommends that current information about representatives on IRCC websites be replaced with balanced messaging that does not discourage applicants from hiring authorized representatives, and accurately portrays the role of lawyers in the immigration system.**
4. **The CBA Section recommends that multi-stakeholder committees like CICIP, which include lawyers as valued stakeholders, be maintained. The focus of these committees should be on improving client experience, with the objective of making immigration processes fairer and more transparent, as well as improving communication.**

V. ROLES OF IMMIGRATION CONSULTANTS AND PARALEGALS

Another troubling trend that runs throughout the language of the Committee report is an apparent misconception about the respective roles and interaction between immigration consultants and paralegals in the current regulatory framework.

Immigration consultants are authorized under the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* (IRPA) and Regulations to work exclusively in a limited scope in the area of immigration. Paralegals may work in many areas, such as family, wills and estates, business or employment, or may choose to work in a specific area of law – again with limited scope and often under the supervision of a lawyer. Immigration consultants are federally regulated; paralegals fall under provincial authority through subsection 92(13) of the *Constitution Act, 1867*.⁶

Despite these distinctions, immigration consultants and paralegals are frequently referenced together in the report. For example: “*Canada’s current regulatory body that governs*

⁶ *Supra* note 3.

immigration and citizenship consultants and paralegals is unable to serve its purpose." A more concerning example: "*Abuse and Exploitation by Immigration and Citizenship Consultants and Paralegals*" erroneously extends evidence of complaints against consultants presented to the Committee to paralegals working in the immigration field. While there is some overlap in function – in the current system, paralegals may also be registered as immigration consultants if they meet the registration requirements for the designation, and vice versa – they are not one and the same.

In the Report's conclusion the Committee recommends introducing a tiered licensing system that would, "*consolidate the profession of consultants and paralegals,*" and recommendation 2 suggests that paralegals would be removed from the list of authorized paid representatives in section 91 of IRPA while immigration consultants would remain.⁷ Whether and how to regulate paralegals is an active issue in several provinces and territories. In Ontario, paralegals have been regulated by the Law Society of Upper Canada since 2007. The Law Society of British Columbia does not directly accredit or regulate paralegals, but recently established rules on the supervision of designated paralegals by lawyers. The Barreau du Québec has established a committee to consider the regulation of "*techniciens juridiques.*" Conflating the roles and professions of immigration consultants and paralegals would add complexity and confusion to the debates underway in Canada's provinces and territories, and would fail to bring clarity to the federal regulatory framework.

It is also important to ensure that language surrounding the 'practise of law' be restricted to lawyers. Using this terminology when referring to immigration consultants is not only incorrect, it is also confusing and misleading to the public. For example, the Report includes the statement, "*The ICCRC has provided the framework in which consultants practise immigration and citizenship law since it was designated six years ago.*"

In *Law Society of British Columbia v Mangat*, the Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) noted that its judgment "should not be interpreted as granting a broad right to practise law in all matters concerning aliens and immigrants without being a member of the Law Society," and limited the issue at hand to paid services by representatives that were specifically included in IRPA.⁸ The respondent immigration consultant in that case indicated to the Law Society of British Columbia that he had never practiced law in the province, or held himself out as

⁷ *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, S.C. 2001, c. 27.

⁸ *Law Society of British Columbia v Mangat*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 113, available [online](http://ow.ly/2jBo30e9cKH) (http://ow.ly/2jBo30e9cKH).

practicing law. Instead, it would be more appropriate to refer to immigration consultants as providing consulting services in the area of immigration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5. **The CBA Section recommends that language about the ‘practise of law’ be restricted to lawyers. Using this terminology when referring to immigration consultants is incorrect, and misleading to the public.**
6. **The CBA Section recommends that consultants and paralegals not be consolidated in a tiered licensing system.**

VI. STARTING AGAIN

Immigration consultants have now failed in two attempts at establishing an effective regulatory body, and the CBA Section maintains our recommendation that the best interests of the public are served if only lawyers are authorized as paid representatives in IRPA.⁹

The immigration system and the laws that surround it are complicated, technical and frequently changing. Errors made by representatives can have devastating and costly consequences for applicants. Immigration lawyers have the education, training and experience required to navigate these complexities, and have a proven and longstanding track-record of self-regulation in the public interest.¹⁰

Lawyers are also more accessible and affordable than ever before. The immigration bar is large, with over 1000 CBA Section members across the country. Most practise on a fixed-fee basis so clients know in advance precisely what their cost will be. Law societies can assess the reasonableness of these fees, and *pro bono* legal services are often made available in times of need.¹¹ Lawyers offer solicitor-client privilege – important in the immigration context where vulnerable clients may be distrustful, and value the ability to speak in confidence without prejudice – and appear in Federal Court if a decision about an applicant’s file requires judicial review. They can also often save clients time and money by helping them avoid improperly completed or incomplete application, as well as advising clients not to appeal or refile an application when there is a limited likelihood of success.

⁹ Canadian Bar Association, *Immigration Consultants* (March 2017), available [online](http://ow.ly/pj6s30e9cNI) (http://ow.ly/pj6s30e9cNI). See also, Canadian Bar Association, *Immigration Consultants* (May 2017), available [online](http://ow.ly/owpz30e9cPo) (http://ow.ly/owpz30e9cPo).

¹⁰ For example, the Law Society of Upper Canada has effectively regulated and disciplined lawyers in Ontario since 1797. Law Society of Upper Canada, *About the Law Society*, available [online](http://ow.ly/chpX30arHRr) (http://ow.ly/chpX30arHRr).

¹¹ Canadian Bar Association, *Pro Bono Services Available in Canada*, available [online](http://ow.ly/xdGJ30alfu2) (http://ow.ly/xdGJ30alfu2).

We provide practical recommendations to assist the government in addressing the issue of immigration consultants more effectively below.

RECOMMENDATION

7. The CBA Section recommends that the best interests of the public are served if only lawyers are authorized as paid representatives in IRPA.

Supervision of Immigration Consultants by Lawyers

In its Report, the Committee recognizes that, “individuals who want to come or immigrate to Canada are often not aware of the difference between a regulated and unregulated consultant, paralegal, or lawyer, or what options are available to them in the event of misrepresentation or fraud.” One way to effectively combat this confusion, and ensure that applicants receive the best possible representation, is to amend IRPA section 91 to restrict paid representation in IRPA to lawyers. Lawyers, who are ultimately responsible to their law society or the Chambre des notaires du Québec, could then supervise certified immigration consultants working as specialized non-lawyer staff in law firms.

One benefit of this approach is that it would effectively address the issue of ghost consultants. Since the regulation of consultants was introduced, little progress had been made in eliminating ghost consultants, in part because regulated consultants have done little to assist the public in differentiating between a regulated consultant and an unregulated one. By authorizing only Canadian lawyers and law firms to represent applicants, the public and IRCC could easily recognize unauthorized representatives. This approach would allow consultants to continue working, while protecting the public and maintaining access to justice. Applicants would have reliable access to competently delivered immigration services provided at a lower cost.

Lawyers already supervise specialized non-lawyer staff in a variety of areas (such as real estate, immigration, family, insurance, corporate, wills, estates and trusts), subject to law society bylaws and rules of professional conduct. Generally, there are restrictions on the type of work that can be delegated to staff, and lawyers are responsible to ensure that staff have the training and competence required. Lawyers are responsible for any work performed, and are held accountable in the event of a complaint or insurance claim. They are usually required to maintain direct contact with clients and ensure that non-lawyers are clearly identified in any correspondence.

In provinces where the law society permits multidiscipline practices, lawyers could also enter into partnerships with consultants. Lawyers must still maintain effective control over the practice, must ensure that the consultant acts the appropriate level of skill, judgment and competence, and remains responsible for compliance with law society rules and ethical standards.

Other business arrangements that already exist include: lawyers contracting with registered consultants for professional services like consulting, marketing, translation or interpretation; registered consultants working for a company's legal department to provide services under the supervision of an in-house lawyer; or law firms purchasing the practice of a registered consultant.

We suggest a transition period where an effective federal training and certification program for immigration consultants is established. Immigration consultants would be required to be certified through this program, and to move their files under the supervision of a lawyer during this period.

ICCRC's 2016 Annual Report reports approximately 3,633 active practicing ICCRC members, the majority in Ontario and British Columbia.¹² The federal government would need to work closely with the law societies and the Chambre des notaires to determine how this could best be implemented in each jurisdiction. In Ontario, for example, the supervisory responsibilities of lawyers and paralegals for non-lawyers, as well as the scope of paralegal practice are set out in the Law Society's Bylaws and rules of professional conduct.¹³

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8. The CBA Section recommends that lawyers, who are ultimately responsible to their law societies or the Chambre des notaires du Québec, supervise certified immigration consultants working as specialized non-lawyer staff in law firms.**
- 9. The CBA Section recommends a transition period, during which an effective federal training and certification program for immigration consultants could be established.**
- 10. The CBA Section recommends that, during the transition period, immigration consultants would be required to become certified through this program, and to move their files under the supervision of a lawyer.**

¹² Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council, *Annual Report 2016* (June, 2016), available [online](http://ow.ly/VXva30aletQ) (<http://ow.ly/VXva30aletQ>).

¹³ Law Society of Upper Canada, *Bylaw 4*, available [online](http://ow.ly/BIs930alfcS) (<http://ow.ly/BIs930alfcS>). Law Society of Upper Canada, *lawyers' Rules of Professional Conduct* (Rule 6.1-1), available [online](http://ow.ly/vy0x30e9d3B) (<http://ow.ly/vy0x30e9d3B>).

VII. CONCLUSION

While the CBA Section agrees with the Committee Report's emphasis on the importance of protecting individuals who want to immigrate to Canada, as well as the integrity of Canada's immigration system, we also feel that it fails to effectively address the issue of immigration consultants.

We continue to recommend that only lawyers should be authorized as paid representatives in IRPA. This is the only way to avoid confusion over different types of representatives, close the door on ghost representatives, and ensure that applicants receive the best possible representation. Following a transition period, immigration consultants could continue working under the supervision of lawyers as specialized paralegals in law firms.

We would be pleased to offer further recommendations on how this could be accomplished.

VIII. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CBA Section recommends:

- 1. the federal government not proceed with the proposed government oversight body model.**
- 2. that appearances before the IRB be restricted to lawyers to better protect applicants from adverse outcomes.**
- 3. that current information about representatives on IRCC websites be replaced with balanced messaging that does not discourage applicants from hiring authorized representatives, and accurately portrays the role of lawyers in the immigration system.**
- 4. that multi-stakeholder committees like CICIP, which include lawyers as valued stakeholders, be maintained. The focus of these committees should be on improving client experience, with the objective of making immigration processes fairer and more transparent, as well as improving communication.**
- 5. that language about the 'practise of law' be restricted to lawyers. Using this terminology when referring to immigration consultants is incorrect, and misleading to the public.**
- 6. that consultants and paralegals not be consolidated in a tiered licensing system.**
- 7. that the best interests of the public are served if only lawyers are authorized as paid representatives in IRPA.**

- 8. that lawyers, who are ultimately responsible to their law societies or the Chambre des notaires du Québec, supervise certified immigration consultants working as specialized non-lawyer staff in law firms.**
- 9. a transition period, during which an effective federal training and certification program for immigration consultants could be established.**
- 10. that, during the transition period, immigration consultants would be required to become certified through this program, and to move their files under the supervision of a lawyer.**