



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

CIMM • NUMBER 056 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, May 8, 2007

—
Chair

Mr. Norman Doyle

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

Tuesday, May 8, 2007

•(1210)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, CPC)): Order, please.

Here we are, to consider notices of motions. We have four notices of motion, the first one submitted by Mr. Karygiannis on May 3, 2007.

I'll go directly to Mr. Karygiannis to do his motion for us.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Which one do you want me to deal with?

The Chair: “That the CIC officials...” is the first page I have here. Do you want to go to that one first, the one submitted on May 3?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, when we met with CIC officials, there were a lot of questions left lingering. One of the individuals said they were instructed to delay citizenship cases, and when she was asked by whom, there was no forthcoming answer. I'd like to get the officials back here to get to the bottom of this.

The other thing is that they said the RCMP has been asked to expedite citizenship cases for lost Canadians. After checking with the RCMP and some of the lost Canadians who are affected, I don't see that this is the case.

I'd like to get answers to those questions. As well, the bureaucrats did not finish testifying before us and giving us the complete picture.

One thing is that we were told by the minister that there are 467 cases. When the bureaucrats were here, they said that 400 cases were held behind to see what would happen with the Joe Taylor decision. Clearly, that's not the picture the minister or the deputy minister gave us, so we need to get clarification of that.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Karygiannis.

Are there any further comments on Mr. Karygiannis' motion? Mr. Siksay.

Mr. Bill Siksay (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Chair, this may be just a question to Jim.

Given what you've just said, Jim, would it not be more appropriate to put those questions to the minister and the deputy minister, given that we weren't successful in getting those answers from the officials? If they aren't providing the appropriate information, then it seems to me we'd go back to their boss and ask the questions of that person.

The minister is coming to the committee, I believe, on May 29, and we could put those kinds of questions.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: The minister is coming, I believe, on May 29, and she's splitting her time. She's here for two hours and she's splitting her time, an hour for estimates and an hour on lost Canadians.

As a result of the performance we got from the minister and the deputy minister last time, on the advertising question in one case and in the other on the question of how many, we didn't get to the bottom of this. I think we need to question the bureaucrats more, if you want to call them that—the people who are specifically involved with that particular department—in order to find out what things are happening, before we question the minister and the deputy minister.

We didn't get clear information. The minister and the deputy minister will only give us part of the picture that the people below them are giving them.

The Chair: Madame Faillle.

[Translation]

Ms. Meili Faillle (Vaudreuil-Soulanges, BQ): I would simply like to indicate to members of the committee that since the appearance of the officials, our offices have been inundated with letters from Quebec citizens about the Taylor case. I believe that the officials must give us some answers, because when they last appeared, they gave vague answers concerning the procedures that were being followed. I find it quite surprising that we have been receiving letters since their appearance.

[English]

The Chair: Okay, that's it. Did anyone else have a hand up? Mr. Komarnicki. Oh, I'm sorry, and Andrew.

We'll hear Mr. Komarnicki first, then Andrew.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): If we had a raft of department officials here.... There was an opportunity to ask questions, and I would think that if there are further questions one wants to put to a particular person or to the minister, that's fine, but I don't think that, as a minimum, we should get all of the people back. I don't see the utility in that.

Secondly, dealing with the specific comments relating to the motion, we have Mr. Karygiannis indicating something that the RCMP may have indicated to him. If he's interested in putting that before the committee, then we should be calling somebody from the RCMP who would specifically contradict the comments, but not call the witness back because of a phone call Mr. Karygiannis may have made. I don't think it's appropriate to call that witness back on that specific purpose, in that regard.

Then with respect to the number of cases being held pending the Taylor appeal, the fact is that the witness was clear that there were some cases pending, in terms of decision-making, on the basis that the appeal from Taylor was not in. How many numbers we have there isn't a particular issue. If he wants to pursue that with the minister when she's here, that's fair enough, but I don't think it's worthwhile for us to call all these people back, or even the two particular people, for that small, narrow reason.

First of all, if you want to call at least Rosemarie Redden, I think you would first call somebody from the RCMP or put something before this committee to show specifically that this would be contradicted.

I would be opposed to the motion for those reasons.

The Chair: I have my speaking list here, but do you want to address that one directly, Jim?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Yes, I would like to address that issue.

The RCMP will only act upon the request of CIC that they expedite files. I did not get any sense—I did not even get any reassurance—that this has been done.

In order for RCMP to expedite matters, CIC will have to write to them and ask them to segregate these files and expedite them. There has to be a protocol set between CIC and RCMP that states the following: you put a marking on the envelope that says you're a lost Canadian before we expedite.

I did not get any reassurance that the protocol has been set. I did not get any reassurance that CIC has approached RCMP. RCMP will only act if CIC instructs them or asks them to do that.

So I'd like to find out from officials what protocol they've set in place in order for the RCMP to expedite things. And I want to see the letter that went over there.

•(1215)

The Chair: Okay, two more—Andrew and Barry—and then we will vote on the motion.

Andrew.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi (Kitchener—Waterloo, Lib.): Thank you very much.

It's important for us to do a little more digging. I found the last meeting quite unsatisfactory. Some of the witnesses we asked to appear did not appear. A number of witnesses, including Melba—I can't remember her last name—who we asked specifically to appear did not appear. Melba was one of them; a lot of questions went to her from the lost Canadians. They were kept away. I would suggest that we get those people back.

Also, if we want to get down more to the level of where decisions are actually made, I suggest that Davidson not be asked to come back. We don't want him answering the questions; we want to be talking to some of the policy analysts and some of the people who make the initial decisions and recommendations. I think that would allow us to get a better feeling for what's going on in a situation where the results have been more than unsatisfactory.

So I would suggest, Jim, as a friendly amendment—if you would take it as such—that you take out Davidson. We have had him here many times, and it's hard to....

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Fine.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: As another friendly amendment—this could be voted on separately—I think we really should be swearing in the witnesses, because we have not been getting fulsome answers. Quite frankly, Davidson was very combative at the committee when he came.

So I would make that as a friendly amendment. Or would that be a friendly amendment?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Definitely.

The Chair: Barry, are you still on? No?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, I think what Mr. Telegdi was saying was that he wants the individuals who are in the unit making these decisions, or the individual who heads the unit, in CPC Sydney to also appear before us.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: Yes, I wanted the witnesses we asked to appear and who did not appear.

I also want to drop Davidson from the witness list. We don't want Davidson back.

The Chair: I've kind of gotten thrown off here. Do we have two amendments?

We do. Okay.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Samy Agha): So in the first one, we would insert the words “except Mark Davidson” after “Committee”.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: The other one is that the people who were asked to come, and who didn't come, be invited.

Mr. Omar Alhabra (Mississauga—Erindale, Lib.): How about we say that these were officials “that were invited” instead of officials “that appeared”?

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: Okay, the ones that were invited.

Mr. Omar Alhabra: Yes, invited initially.

Does that make sense?

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: Yes.

The Chair: Are we ready for the question...?

Okay, Barry.

Mr. Barry Devolin (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): I have a question on the swearing in.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: We're dealing with this one first.

Mr. Barry Devolin: Okay, I can hold this until later.

The Chair: They're separate amendments.

Are we ready to vote on this?

An hon. member: What's the amendment?

The Clerk: Mr. Chair, I'll read it out: “That the CIC officials that were invited to the meeting of Wednesday, May 2, 2007, be reintroduced to appear before the Committee, except Mark Davidson, specifically regarding”, etc.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: Okay, the second one.

The Clerk: The second one is to add at the end, “and that the witnesses be sworn in”.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: And, “and they be so notified”.

The Clerk: Yes, “and they be so notified”.

The Chair: We have a question.

● (1220)

Mr. Barry Devolin: On the swearing in, I've only been here for three years and on the committees I've been on I haven't seen people sworn in before. Do you think the people who were here were saying things that weren't true? Is that...?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: You've got it.

Mr. Barry Devolin: Because what you said is that you thought they weren't directly answering your questions, or they were being vague. But swearing in doesn't fix that, does it?

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: I think if you look at the public accounts, where we have the top leadership in the RCMP sworn in on a regular basis, plus all the witnesses who are appearing, we would undertake a similar process. So it's not something that doesn't get done. It gets done.

Mr. Barry Devolin: No, I appreciate it gets done. I was just curious if you had a particular... You could swear in all the witnesses every time. You must have some particular reason why you want to swear these ones in.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: I think it adds some more urgency to what we're doing, and I think it also gives some cover to the witnesses who end up saying things that their superiors might not like.

Mr. Barry Devolin: It was a very specific list of people you had here from different places. Did you pick them for some particular reason? Did you have some particular reason that they weren't going to tell the truth?

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Where did you get that list from, Andrew?

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: A lot of the list came from input from the lost Canadians who have been dealing with those people over time.

The Chair: Mr. Karygiannis.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, just for clarification, in the first amendment did we state that we will invite people from the unit at CPC Sydney, as I stated? I'm not sure if that made it in.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: We have had them in for the—

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: No, but there were people who were actually missing.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: I know.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Besides the people who were missing, also the director of CPC Sydney, Ernest Smith, wasn't here last time.

The Chair: Yes.

The Clerk: He wasn't invited.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: No, he wasn't invited, but as for the other ones, we have plenty there to invite.

The Chair: Okay, the question is on the second amendment, to have witnesses sworn in.

(Amendment agreed to)

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

The Chair: The second motion, in the name of Mr. Karygiannis, reads: “That the Committee on Citizenship and Immigration invite Ken Sandhu and Lois Delia Figg to appear before the Committee regarding their appointments to the Immigration and Refugee Board.”

Mr. Karygiannis.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, we have invited people who were appointed to citizenship on IRB before. In keeping with that practice, I think that it's due diligence for this committee to invite these two individuals and put questions in front of them.

The Chair: Okay.

Barry.

Mr. Barry Devolin: Why these two in particular? Is there some—

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: They were just appointed.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Now, the next one on the list here is a motion by Mr. Alghabra.

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to move the motion. Do you want me to read it into the record?

The Chair: I think people have read it. Maybe you can just explain it or talk to it or whatever.

Mr. Omar Alghabra: The purpose of this motion is to basically reach a conclusion. The committee makes a conclusion based on the evidence that we heard on the recent discussion and debate of the so-called Harrison report, and the witnesses' and the stakeholders' feedback. I think it's appropriate that the committee express its opinion on this Harrison report, especially as the minister is examining it and considering adopting it; and also refer to the crisis situation in IRB and stress the point that the minister should move on in appointing vacancies.

So I think it's appropriate that the committee express itself on these two matters.

The Chair: Mr. Komarnicki.

● (1225)

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: I think these precise issues Mr. Alghabra speaks of were raised by the committee as a whole in dealing with the report, so this would be like a pre-report report. It seems to me that if the committee is already dealing with these issues in what will potentially be a report, there would be no need to have this additional motion.

For that reason, certainly, I would oppose it. It's going to be dealt with.

The Chair: Mr. Siksay.

Mr. Bill Siksay: Chair, given Mr. Komarnicki's comment, I think the crisis is such that we should do this motion and our report. This will get completed and reported to the House before our report is finished. Given the urgency, I think we should go ahead with this as well.

The Chair: Mr. Wilson and Madame Faillie.

Mr. Blair Wilson (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Is there any requirement that the minister of the department report back to us once this is passed or once this is tabled? Do we want to add something to the effect that the minister would report back to the committee? Will there be something in our report that the minister or the department will have to report back?

The Chair: Not that I'm aware of.

Mr. Andrew Kitching (Committee Researcher): Usually they do. I'm not quite sure about the House procedure on that, Samy, but to all the reports I've seen, they have to give a response.

The Chair: It seems appropriate.

Mr. Blair Wilson: Perhaps I could move a friendly amendment, then, to ask that the minister report back to the committee updating us as to her progress.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: There's a standing order, actually, dealing with reporting back. I think it would not be to report back on the progress, but it's a report back to the committee of the report that's filed. So whatever the standing order allows for is what it would be, if that's the amendment.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Ms. Faillie.

Ms. Meili Faillie: As a follow up to Mr. Wilson's comment, I believe that when we pass a motion, according to our rules and procedures, the minister has 45 days to let the committee know whether he or she accepts or rejects the committee's opinion. Perhaps the clerk could tell us whether this must be specified in the motion. Previously, we had done so for the Appeal Division and we had received an answer from the minister.

The Clerk: There are two ways to proceed. The first is under Standing Order 109.

[*English*]

Standing Order 109 stipulates that the government must respond to a committee report within 120 days.

Ms. Meili Faillie: Okay.

The Clerk: That's one option that I'm not sure Mr. Wilson clarified.

The second option is to state, as you said, that the minister report back to the committee with a response. It's up to the committee to decide what they want to do.

The Chair: Does the first option satisfy you?

Mr. Blair Wilson: No, I'd like to put a friendly amendment, to add in there a request that the minister—

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Do you want to put a date, a response within 30 days?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Meili Faillie: Okay. Perhaps we could grant her 30 days to answer.

[*English*]

The Chair: Andrew.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: I have a certain amount of discomfort, because we're working on a report. This thing essentially mirrors some of the conclusions of the report. Mind you, the report has stronger language because it talks about crisis. It would seem to me that we'd want to go through the report, because we're still collectively working on it and we haven't dealt with it. You have the whole issue of confidentiality, of not leaking the report, because we don't want to undercut the conclusions; we all want it to be released at the same time. I think it would be proper to wait for the report to be completed and have that tabled in the committee.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, in view of what Mr. Telegdi is saying, that we were in camera dealing with this report, right now we're in public and everything that we're saying is public. I would recommend two things: one, that everything we've said on this particular motion be back in camera, because we're dealing with the report itself; and two, until we finish the report, I think doing something like this would be premature.

We're working on a report; I can understand some members of this committee wanting to move forward because of the trouble we're having, but this is why the report was undertaken. For everything that we have said on this particular item, I would urge the chair to get unanimous consent that it goes in camera. There's nobody in here right now; it should go in camera.

•(1230)

The Chair: Well, maybe—

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: If you want to consider this a motion and seek unanimous consent that everything we said on this be in camera, then I'm prepared to move it.

The Chair: We could do that, or we could just deal with the motion. There seems to be consensus that the motion should be defeated.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, I would say again that before we continue the conversation, things were said when we thought we were in camera. I'm seeking the chair's consent and the members' consent that everything that was said on this matter be dealt with in camera.

The Chair: Do you want to go in camera on this?

Mr. Bill Siksay: No. Chair, I don't see how we can backtrack, because it's been broadcast for one thing. It's out there, and other people are here who have been hearing the discussion. I don't think there's any secret that the crisis at the IRB is something we were working on towards our report. We had hearings on it, and we've been telling people that it's going to be part of our report.

I don't think there's any crisis of confidentiality. We're also considering this motion because of the urgency of the issue and the time it will take us to finalize our report. Again, I think it emphasizes the work that we've been doing as a committee, and I still strongly support dealing with this motion today.

The Chair: We'll have a final comment from Mr. Alghabra and Madame Faillie. We'll see if we can deal first with the amendment and then the main motion.

Mr. Alghabra.

Mr. Omar Alghabra: I hear some people saying this is something that's being dealt with in the report. I understand what they're saying. The report is dealing with various issues and various files, not only the IRB issue.

The committee has the opportunity now to express its opinion on the Harrison recommendation to the report specifically...nothing else that the report we're working on deals with. It directly responds and sends recommendations to the minister, based on recommendation 5 in the report.

The committee now has the opportunity to choose if they agree or not with recommendation 5. If they vote against it, basically that will say that the committee is okay with recommendation 5 and the Harrison report.

Thanks.

An hon. member: No, it doesn't say that at all.

The Chair: Madam Faillie.

[Translation]

Ms. Meili Faillie: I was wondering whether Mr. Alghabra would accept to wait for the next meeting, which I understand will be on Thursday, to discuss this motion, given that the report will most probably be passed at this meeting.

[English]

The Chair: I don't think Mr. Alghabra is in favour of doing that.

Are you in favour of that, Mr. Alghabra?

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Yes, that's fine.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Are you withdrawing the motion?

Mr. Omar Alghabra: I'm not withdrawing the motion, but delaying it until Thursday.

(Motion allowed to stand)

The Chair: Where is the other motion?

I'll go to Mr. Siksay.

Mr. Bill Siksay: Thank you, Chair.

Yes, I have tabled a motion to call the Minister of Public Safety before the committee to discuss the ever-increasing urgency of the situation at KIHIC and the hunger strike that Hassan Almrei is engaging in. I believe today is day 153 of his hunger strike.

I know all members of the committee are aware that Mr. Almrei has never been charged and never been convicted. He's indefinitely detained under provisions of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act that have been ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Almost all of the conditions of his detention, which we've done a report on, for the most part are still unresolved, and those are the reasons he began this hunger strike 153 days ago.

Chair, members will be aware that there are different kinds of hunger strikes. There's a dry hunger strike, they call it, where people

don't eat or drink any water, and that's not the kind that Mr. Almrei has been on. There's a total hunger strike where they drink nothing but water. Again, that's not the kind he's on. A partial hunger strike, which he has engaged in, where he's drinking nothing but orange juice and water at this point, is extremely dangerous at the time of 150 days. I guess the closest examples are from hunger strikers in the Turkish prison system, where many hunger strikers who were on a similar diet of lemon juice and water, and some salt as well, began to die at around day 150. So it is a very, very serious juncture in that.

The issue we raised in our report around solitary confinement is also an acute issue at this point, given that Mr. Almrei is the only prisoner detained at KIHIC. There is a lot of research on the effects of solitary confinement—and I think we would agree that isn't, in some sense, what Mr. Almrei is facing—or administrative solitary confinement, which happens for reasons other than discipline of the detainee. No matter what kind of solitary confinement it is, the psychological effects of that are extremely acute, particularly in the situation where the detainee doesn't know the charge against him, doesn't know the length of detention. Certainly that's the situation Mr. Almrei is in at the current time.

I think it's a matter of extreme urgency that we have the minister before us to put questions about this.

•(1235)

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Siksay.

Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): I have a point of order, Chair. I just want to put on the record that I'm filling in for Mr. Telegdi, who unexpectedly had to leave, so I can participate as well, officially. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. Okay.

Mr. Karygiannis.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: I'm prepared to support it, but I'm just wondering if the clerk can find out what the latest is on Mr. Almrei's condition, or maybe we can ask that four members from each of the four parties do visit Mr. Almrei and get an update from him on what he's going through.

The Chair: Was that question to Mr. Siksay?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Yes.

Bill, would you...?

Mr. Bill Siksay: I've been in regular contact with Mr. Almrei.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Would you entertain a friendly amendment that the committee send four members to speak to—

Mr. Bill Siksay: I think that's a separate issue, Chair. If Mr. Karygiannis wants to entertain another visit there, we could discuss that, but I'd like to focus on getting the minister here about the issues right now.

The Chair: Okay. Is there any further comment on the motion?

Mr. Komarnicki.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: I understand, of course, it's the public safety minister who's responsible for the issues there. I understand he is appearing before the public safety committee next week, and certainly questions could be put to him there if that's what needs to happen.

We have obviously visited this issue on a number of occasions and we have various matters on our agenda. I think that with the minister already appearing before another committee in short order, and we won't get him before this committee sooner than that, if Mr. Siksay wishes to put the question to him, he should then use one of his members on that committee to put the very question he wants to bring before this group. Certainly we won't get it done any quicker, and I think our agenda would remain intact.

So I would say that this motion be opposed, but that Mr. Siksay be entitled to pursue the matter at the minister's appearance in the other committee. It really is a matter of public safety jurisdiction.

[Translation]

The Chair: Ms. Faille.

Ms. Meili Faille: Has the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration already written letters, for example to the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development or to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights? Given that the minister will appear before the Standing Committee on National and Public Security, would it be possible to ask her to answer this question? Perhaps we could send her the question and ask her to answer it at that time?

• (1240)

[English]

The Chair: Well, we could, but I don't believe that's the wish of Mr. Siksay. I mean, his motion is here before the committee, and I think we have to deal with that.

Mr. Karygiannis and Mr. Siksay.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, I was wondering if Mr. Siksay would fill in for the NDP member on that committee where the minister is appearing and pose the question. If there's no satisfactory answer, maybe he can reintroduce the motion next week.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Siksay.

Mr. Bill Siksay: Mr. Chair, I don't agree to those suggestions. I believe that we can't abandon our responsibility and the work that we've done on this issue already.

Clearly, the security certificate process under which Mr. Almrei is detained is in the jurisdiction of this committee, given that it's a piece of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. This committee has done excellent work, I believe, on this issue. We're familiar with the situation at KIHIC, unlike any other committee of this Parliament, because we are the ones who visited there on two occasions. I think that for us to say these questions should be raised in other committees and not here would represent dropping the ball in our case.

They should be raised at the public safety committee. I agree 100% that the minister should be grilled thoroughly on these issues when he gets there, but I also believe he needs to come to this committee and answer important questions about the situation there and the circumstances of Mr. Almrei. I don't think there's any excuse for us not pursuing this further, given the stand we have taken as a committee on this and the work we have already done.

The Chair: Mr. Alghabra.

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to agree with Mr. Siksay. This committee has done extensive work on this issue. We just tabled the report last month. I think there's an interest on behalf of this committee to hear from the minister not only on Almrei's case but about his feedback or his response to the report that we tabled last month. We can ask him various questions about this issue. So I think it's a good opportunity for the committee to ask the minister those questions based on the study that we've extensively conducted.

The Chair: After Madame Faille, I'm going to call the question.

[Translation]

Ms. Meili Faille: I have a question for the clerk.

The report that we tabled was directed to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Was it sent as well to the Minister of Public Security?

The Clerk: I honestly don't know.

Ms. Meili Faille: So the Minister of Public Security will not give any answer to our report.

The Clerk: Under Standing Order 109, there was no request for an answer.

[English]

There was not a formal request for a response from the government pursuant to Standing Order 109.

[Translation]

I know that there was a reference to the Minister of Public Security, Mr. Day, in our report, but it was sent to the House and not to a minister in particular.

Ms. Meili Faille: So neither the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration nor the Minister of Public Security have a responsibility to give us an answer. Did I understand correctly?

The Clerk: That's it.

Ms. Meili Faille: For this reason, I believe that the minister should appear before us, before our committee.

[English]

The Chair: We'll vote on the motion now.

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

The Chair: That completes our meeting for today.

The meeting stands adjourned.

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

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

**Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.