April 21, 2026

The Honourable Joseph Schow
Minister of Jobs, Economy, Trade and Immigration
Government of Alberta
Legislature Building
10800 97 Avenue NW
Edmonton, Alberta T5K 2B6

RE: Bill 26, *Immigration Oversight Act* — Constitutional Concerns Regarding Provincial Licensing of Federally Regulated Immigration Consultants

Dear Minister Schow:

I. INTRODUCTION

On behalf of the Canadian Association of Professional Immigration Consultants (CAPIC/ACCPI) and the more than 4,000 Regulated Canadian Immigration Consultants (RCICs) and Regulated International Student Immigration Advisors (RISIAs) we represent nationally, I write to register serious constitutional, statutory, and operational objections to Bill 26, the Immigration Oversight Act, introduced in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta on April 1, 2026.

CAPIC–ACCPI is the sole association recognized by the Government of Canada as the national voice of regulated immigration professionals. Founded in 2005, CAPIC was instrumental in the enactment of the College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants Act, S.C. 2019, c. 29, s. 292 (the “College Act”), which established a modern, exhaustive federal regulatory framework governing immigration consultants across Canada. Our members practice daily within this framework, serving clients in every province and territory.

CAPIC notes that Bill 26 forms part of a broader initiative by the Government of Alberta to assert provincial control over immigration—an initiative that includes the announced referendum of October 19, 2026, which proposes five questions directed at gaining increased provincial authority over immigration policy, restricting eligibility for provincial services, and imposing residency-based conditions on non-permanent residents. Bill 26 must be understood within this broader political context.CAPIC wishes to acknowledge at

the outset that several of Bill 26's stated objectives align directly with CAPIC's own longstanding advocacy priorities. The Bill's focus on combating unauthorized practitioners, protecting vulnerable temporary foreign workers from exploitative recruitment practices, and increasing transparency in immigration services are objectives that CAPIC has actively championed for over two decades. Bill 26's recognition that unregulated actors pose the greatest risk to consumers in the immigration sector is correct, and CAPIC commends the Government of Alberta for directing attention to this pressing problem.

Where CAPIC parts company with Bill 26 is in its application to practitioners who are already subject to exhaustive federal regulation. The provisions requiring provincial licensing of RCICs and RISIAs—professionals who hold federal licenses, are bound by a federal code of conduct, and are subject to federal complaints and discipline processes—raise fundamental constitutional concerns under the Constitution Act, 1867, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and the doctrine of federal paramountcy. These provisions risk creating impermissible regulatory duplication, imposing conflicting obligations on federally regulated practitioners, and paradoxically, undermining the very consumer protection the legislation purports to advance.

This submission is of national concern. Bill 26's licensing requirements would apply to any RCIC or RISIA who advises or represents a client in connection with Alberta—regardless of where that practitioner is located. A federally licensed RCIC in Ontario, British Columbia, or any other province who serves even a single Alberta-based client would be captured by the provincial scheme. The extraterritorial reach of these provisions affects the entire national membership of CAPIC.

This submission sets out CAPIC's constitutional analysis, identifies specific conflicts with the existing federal regulatory framework, addresses Charter concerns, and offers constructive recommendations to achieve Alberta's stated policy objectives through constitutionally permissible means.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK: IMMIGRATION IS A FEDERAL JURISDICTION

A. The Division of Powers

Immigration in Canada is governed by section 95 of the Constitution Act, 1867, which confers concurrent federal-provincial jurisdiction over immigration, subject to an express federal paramountcy clause: provincial immigration laws have effect "so long and so far only as [they are] not repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada." This constitutional

architecture is dispositive: where Parliament has enacted legislation occupying the field, any conflicting provincial enactment is inoperative to the extent of the inconsistency.

The regulation of who may represent and advise people in immigration and citizenship proceedings is a matter that falls squarely within exclusive or paramount federal authority under multiple constitutional heads of power:

As Professor Hogg observed in his 2018 opinion, the provincial legislatures are subject to inherent territorial limitations on their power. The sections of the Constitution Act, 1867, allocating power to provincial legislatures (ss. 92, 92A, 93, and 95) open with the words "[i]n each province," and each class of subjects in section 92 contains the phrase "in the province" or an equivalent territorial limitation. Bill 26's attempt to regulate the professional activities of RCICs located in other provinces, who advise clients in connection with Alberta immigration matters from outside Alberta, presses against these constitutional boundaries.

The regulation of who may represent and advise people in immigration and citizenship proceedings falls within exclusive or paramount federal authority under the following constitutional heads of power:

Section 91(25) – Naturalization and Aliens: The exclusive federal power over naturalization and aliens encompasses the regulation of those who advise and represent aliens and applicants in immigration and citizenship matters. As Professor Hogg noted in his analysis of *Mangat*, "The Supreme Court held that Parliament had the power to create and regulate administrative processes to determine whether would-be immigrants were admissible to Canada and whether individuals claiming refugee status were refugees. The federal law was upheld under s. 91(25) and the conflicting provision of the British Columbia Legal Profession Act was declared inoperative under the paramountcy doctrine."

Section 91(27) — Criminal Law: Parliament has exercised its criminal law power to create offences for unauthorized immigration representation (IRPA, s. 91; Citizenship Act, s. 21.1). Bill 26's quasi-criminal penalty regime, including fines of up to $1,000,000 for individuals and $1,500,000 for corporations, plus imprisonment, encroaches directly on this exclusive federal domain.

Section 95 — Concurrent Jurisdiction with Federal Paramountcy: Even where provincial legislation addresses immigration matters within the concurrent space, federal law prevails in any conflict. As Professor Peter W. Hogg confirmed in his 2018 legal opinion

commissioned on this precise issue: "if a new federal statute was passed regulating immigration consultants, it would render any conflicting provincial legislation inoperative." That federal statute now exists: the College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants Act.

B. The Mangat Decision: Binding Supreme Court of Canada Authority

The Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Law Society of British Columbia v. Mangat*, 2001 SCC 67, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 113, is directly on point and binding on all courts in Canada. In *Mangat*, the Court held that federal legislation authorizing non-lawyers to appear as representatives in immigration proceedings rendered conflicting provisions of British Columbia's *Legal Profession Act* inoperative under the doctrine of federal paramountcy. The Court articulated two distinct bases upon which paramountcy operates:

(i) Operational conflict: Where simultaneous compliance with both the federal and provincial enactments is impossible, that is, where a person authorized by federal law to provide immigration representation services is simultaneously prohibited or additionally restricted by provincial law from doing so.

(ii) Frustration of federal purpose: Where provincial regulation, even if not creating a direct impossibility of dual compliance, nonetheless frustrates Parliament's purpose in enacting the federal scheme; in this case, the purpose of ensuring accessible, affordable, and nationally uniform immigration representation.

Professor Hogg's analysis is particularly instructive on the second branch. He noted that "A more restrictive provincial law can, however, frustrate the federal purpose if the federal law provides a positive entitlement." The College Act and IRPA section 91 together confer precisely such a positive entitlement: they authorize CICC licensees to represent and advise persons in immigration matters across all Canadian jurisdictions. Bill 26's provincial licensing requirement restricts this federally conferred entitlement and thereby frustrates Parliament's purpose.

It is CAPIC's submission that Bill 26 engages in both forms of conflict. An RCIC duly licensed and regulated by the College under federal law would, upon the coming into force of Bill 26, be required to obtain a separate provincial license, comply with a separate provincial code of conduct, submit to separate provincial investigative processes, and face separate provincial penalties, all in respect of the same professional activity that is already subject to exhaustive federal regulation. This constitutes a textbook case of the very conflict the Supreme Court addressed in Mangat.

C. The Hogg Opinion: Provincial Legislation Cannot Survive Federal Paramountcy

The late Professor Peter W. Hogg, C.C., Q.C., one of Canada's pre-eminent constitutional scholars and author of Constitutional Law of Canada, provided a detailed legal opinion in 2018 addressing the precise question now before the Alberta Legislature: whether provincial legislation purporting to regulate immigration consultants can survive in the face of a federal regulatory scheme. His conclusions are unequivocal:

"The doctrine of federal paramountcy establishes that where there is a conflict between federal and provincial legislation, the federal legislation prevails and the provincial legislation is rendered inoperative to the extent of the conflict."

Professor Hogg further confirmed that both categories of conflict articulated in Mangat, operational conflict and frustration of federal purpose, would render provincial immigration consultant licensing requirements inoperative.

Critically, Professor Hogg identified the very solution that Parliament subsequently adopted. He wrote that "the regulatory scheme in every province would likely benefit from a clear federal statute that provides a consistent framework for the regulation of immigration professionals across the country." The *College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants Act* is that statute. Parliament enacted precisely the national framework that Professor Hogg recommended, creating the CICC with plenary regulatory authority over the profession: licensing, discipline, codes of conduct, continuing education, and public accountability.

It bears emphasis that when Professor Hogg rendered this opinion in 2018, the College Act had not yet been enacted. The constitutional case against provincial encroachment has grown materially stronger since then. Every element that Professor Hogg identified as necessary for federal paramountcy to operate: a clear federal statute, a consistent national framework, and a designated regulatory body with enforcement authority, now exists. Bill 26 asks Alberta to legislate as though this federal framework does not exist. The constitutional analysis compels the opposite conclusion.

D. Additional Judicial Authority

The principles in *Mangat* are further supported by *R. v. Lewis* (1997), in which the court confirmed that provincial legislation cannot limit the range of persons qualified to work in a federally regulated profession. The *Reference re Firearms Act (Can.)*, 2000 SCC 31,

reinforces that where Parliament has occupied a field through the criminal law power, provincial regulation creating parallel offences is constitutionally suspect.

III. THE EXISTING FEDERAL REGULATORY FRAMEWORK ADMITS NO REGULATORY GAP

Bill 26 proceeds from the implicit premise that immigration consultants require additional provincial oversight to protect consumers. That premise is, with respect, unfounded. RCICs and RISIAs are among the most rigorously regulated advisory professionals in Canada, subject to a multi-layered federal regulatory architecture that leaves no gap for a province to fill:

A. The College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants Act, S.C. 2019, c. 29, s. 292

The College Act established the College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants (CICC) as the designated regulatory body for immigration and citizenship consultants. The CICC exercises the following authorities, each of which directly parallels or exceeds what Bill 26 proposes provincially:

Licensing and registration: Only persons licensed by the CICC may provide immigration consulting services for a fee (IRPA, s. 91(2); Citizenship Act, s. 21.1(2)).

Qualification standards: Entry-to-practice requirements include a Graduate Diploma in Immigration and Citizenship Law, passage of the Entry to Practice Exam, and completion of a Professional Responsibility and Ethics course.

Continuing professional development: Mandatory annual CPD requirements ensure ongoing competence.

Code of Professional Conduct: The CICC Code of Professional Conduct (SOR/2022-128) establishes detailed standards for client service, including consultation agreements (s. 23), conflict of interest rules, confidentiality obligations, and fee transparency requirements.

Complaints and discipline: The CICC operates a full complaints, investigation, and disciplinary process, including the authority to revoke licenses, impose conditions, and refer matters for prosecution.

Public register: The CICC maintains a public register of all authorized practitioners, accessible to any person wishing to verify a consultant's status.

B. The Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, S.C. 2001, c. 27

Section 91 of IRPA creates a closed, exhaustive system of authorized representation. Only three categories of people may represent or advise for consideration in immigration matters: members of a provincial law society, members of the Chambre des notaires du Québec, or licensees of the CICC. Any person who provides such representation or advice for consideration outside these three categories commits a federal offence punishable on summary conviction (IRPA, s. 91(1)). Parliament's intent is plain: the field of authorized immigration representation is fully occupied by federal law. There is no residual space for provincial supplementation.

C. The Citizenship Act

Section 21.1 of the Citizenship Act mirrors the IRPA framework for citizenship matters, further confirming Parliament's intention to occupy the field of immigration and citizenship representation regulation.

IV. SPECIFIC CONFLICTS BETWEEN BILL 26 AND FEDERAL LAW

CAPIC has identified the following specific heads of conflict between Bill 26 and the existing federal regulatory scheme. Each of these conflicts, standing alone, would be sufficient to render the impugned provincial provisions inoperative under the doctrine of federal paramountcy. Taken together, they present an overwhelming case of constitutional infirmity:

A. Impermissible Double-Licensing Regime

Bill 26 would require RCICs and RISIAs already licensed by the CICC under federal authority to obtain a separate provincial license before advising or representing any person in connection with Alberta immigration matters. This creates a double-licensing regime that is operationally conflicting within the meaning of Mangat: an RCIC authorized by Parliament, through IRPA section 91 and the College Act, to serve clients in any Canadian province would be prohibited from doing so in Alberta without separate provincial authorization. Compliance with both the federal entitlement and the provincial prohibition is impossible.

Professor Hogg's analysis is dispositive on this point: a provincial licensing requirement that superimposes conditions on the practice of a federally authorized professional frustrates Parliament's purpose of establishing a unified, national regulatory framework for immigration representation. The federal scheme was designed to ensure that a single

license, issued by a single national regulator, permits practice across all Canadian jurisdictions. Bill 26 would fracture that national scheme.

B. Internal Inconsistency with Alberta's Regulatory Reduction Requirements

Bill 26 is also internally inconsistent with Alberta's own statutory framework governing regulatory growth. Section 1.1(1) of the Reduction of regulatory requirements**,**

"Where the making or enactment of a regulatory instrument results in an increase in the total number of regulatory requirements, as determined by the baseline count, a corresponding reduction in the number of regulatory requirements must be made in accordance with the regulations."

C. Conflicting Codes of Conduct

RCICs are already bound by the CICC Code of Professional Conduct (SOR/2022-128), which prescribes detailed requirements for consultation agreements, fee disclosure, conflict of interest management, record-keeping, and client communication. Bill 26 proposes a separate provincial code of conduct for immigration consultants. Where the two codes diverge, and given their independent development, divergence is inevitable; practitioners face an impossible choice between complying with federal or provincial standards.

D. Parallel Investigation and Enforcement Powers

Bill 26 grants provincial inspectors broad investigation powers, including the authority to enter premises, demand records, and compel testimony. RCICs are already subject to CICC investigation powers. The prospect of parallel investigations by both federal and provincial regulators, potentially into the same client matter, creates operational conflict, raises privilege concerns, and imposes unreasonable burdens on practitioners.

As recognized in *Chancey v. Dharmadi*, 2007 ONCA 365, communications between immigration consultants and their clients attract a form of privilege analogous to solicitor-client privilege. Provincial inspection powers that compel disclosure of client files risk violating this recognized protection.

E. Encroachment on the Federal Criminal Law Power

Bill 26 imposes penalties of up to $1,000,000 for individuals and $1,500,000 for corporations, together with potential terms of imprisonment. Penalties of this magnitude and character are quasi-criminal in nature and encroach upon Parliament's exclusive criminal law jurisdiction under section 91(27) of the Constitution Act, 1867. Parliament has

already exercised its criminal law power in this precise field: IRPA section 91 creates offences for unauthorized immigration representation, and the College Act provides regulatory sanctions, including license revocation. As the Supreme Court held in the Reference re Firearms Act (Can.), 2000 SCC 31, provincial regulation creating parallel offences and penalties in a field already occupied by federal criminal law is constitutionally suspect. A province cannot erect a parallel penal regime for the same regulated activity that Parliament has already subjected to criminal sanction.

V. CANADIAN CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS CONCERNS

In addition to the division-of-powers analysis set out above, Bill 26 raises discrete concerns under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part I of the Constitution Act, 1982:

A. Section 6 — Mobility Rights

Section 6(2) of the Charter guarantees every citizen and permanent resident of Canada the right "to pursue the gaining of a livelihood in any province." A provincial licensing requirement that prevents a federally licensed RCIC from advising or representing clients in connection with Alberta, unless that practitioner obtains a separate provincial license, constitutes a prima facie restriction on the right to interprovincial mobility. While section 6(3)(a) permits laws of general application providing for reasonable residency requirements as a qualification for the practice of a profession, this exception presupposes that the province possesses constitutional authority to regulate the profession in the first instance. Where the profession is already subject to an exhaustive federal regulatory regime, the province lacks the jurisdictional foundation upon which section 6(3)(a) depends.

B. Section 7 — Life, Liberty, and Security of the Person

Bill 26's penalty provisions, including the possibility of imprisonment, engage the right to life, liberty, and security of the person under section 7 of the Charter. Any deprivation of liberty must be in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice. A provincial penal regime that duplicates existing federal offences for identical conduct raises serious concerns regarding the principles against double jeopardy and the requirement of proportionality. Where Parliament has already prescribed sanctions for unauthorized immigration representation under IRPA section 91, the layering of provincial quasi-criminal penalties for the same conduct is constitutionally suspect.

C. Section 8 — Unreasonable Search or Seizure

Bill 26 confers upon provincial inspectors broad powers to enter premises, examine records, and seize documents. Where these powers are exercised against the offices of RCICs, who hold confidential client files that attract a form of professional privilege analogous to solicitor-client privilege, as recognized in *Chancey v. Dharmadi*, 2007 ONCA 365, the exercise of such powers may constitute an unreasonable search or seizure contrary to section 8 of the Charter. The Supreme Court has consistently held that regulatory inspection powers must be exercised in a manner consistent with the reasonable expectation of privacy, and that heightened protection attaches to communications subject to professional privilege.

D. Section 2(d) — Freedom of Association

To the extent that Bill 26 imposes obligations or restrictions on the professional activities of RCICs that differ from or exceed the requirements imposed by federal regulation, it interferes with the constitutionally protected right of those professionals to organize their affairs in accordance with their national regulatory obligations. This concern is acute where Bill 26's requirements conflict with CICC standards, placing practitioners in the untenable position of choosing between compliance with the federal regulator and compliance with the provincial regime.

VI. UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES: UNDERMINING PUBLIC PROTECTION

CAPIC recognizes that the Government of Alberta has identified a genuine problem: vulnerable newcomers and temporary foreign workers in Alberta are being exploited by unscrupulous actors in the immigration services sector. The Second Reading debate on Bill 26 confirmed the Legislature's sincere concern for consumer protection, a concern CAPIC shares without reservation. However, CAPIC submits that applying Bill 26's licensing regime to federally regulated professionals, rather than focusing enforcement on the unauthorized actors who cause the harm, will produce the opposite of the intended effect. The practical consequences are foreseeable and adverse:

A. Deterring Regulated Professionals from Serving Alberta Clients

The burden of dual regulation: separate licensing fees, separate compliance obligations, separate codes of conduct, separate investigative exposure, and the attendant legal uncertainty, will deter RCICs across Canada from accepting Alberta-based clients. As noted in Section I above, Bill 26 captures any RCIC nationally who advises a client in connection with Alberta immigration matters. The practical effect is to reduce the pool of regulated, accountable immigration professionals available to Alberta's newcomers, workers, and

employers. CAPIC raised this identical concern during the consideration of Saskatchewan's *The Immigration Services Act* in June 2024, and it applies with equal force here.

B. Expanding the Operating Space for Unauthorized Practitioners

When regulated professionals withdraw from a market, unauthorized practitioners fill the resulting vacuum. These individuals operate entirely outside any regulatory framework, whether federal or provincial, and are the principal source of consumer harm in the immigration services sector. It is CAPIC's position that Bill 26 does not address the unauthorized practitioner problem; it exacerbates it by driving away the very practitioners who are subject to national regulatory accountability. The irony warrants emphasis: the legislation designed to protect consumers will, in its practical operation, reduce the number of regulated professionals and expand the operating space for the unregulated actors who cause the harm.

Professor Hogg identified a further dimension of this problem that is directly relevant to Alberta. He noted that "limits on extraterritorial jurisdiction make it extremely difficult for the provinces to deal with UAPs operating outside of Canada. Since only Parliament can enact extraterritorial legislation, it is only possible for a federal statute to extend to UAPs outside of Canada." Many of the unauthorized practitioners who exploit Alberta's newcomers operate from outside Canada. A provincial licensing regime is constitutionally incapable of reaching these actors. Only the federal framework, through IRPA, the College Act, and international enforcement agreements, has the jurisdictional reach to address offshore unauthorized practice. Bill 26's resources would be far more effectively directed at supporting and collaborating with the federal enforcement apparatus than at duplicating the regulation of already-regulated professionals.

C. Adverse Impact on Alberta Employers and the Provincial Economy

Alberta employers, particularly in the hospitality, agriculture, and energy sectors, rely on RCICs to assist with Labour Market Impact Assessments (LMIAs) and work permit applications under the Temporary Foreign Worker Program. Regulatory uncertainty and the prospect of dual compliance will increase costs and introduce delays for employers who are already contending with acute labour shortages. This outcome is directly at odds with Alberta's stated economic objectives and with the mandate of the Ministry of Jobs, Economy, Trade and Immigration.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

CAPIC respectfully submits the following recommendations to achieve Alberta's consumer protection objectives through constitutionally sound means:

Recommendation 1: Exempt federally regulated immigration consultants (RCICs and RISIAs) from the provincial licensing requirements in Bill 26, recognizing that these professionals are already subject to comprehensive federal regulation under the College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants Act, IRPA, and the Citizenship Act.

Recommendation 2: Focus Bill 26's enforcement powers on unauthorized practitioners (UAPs) who operate outside any regulatory framework and who are the primary source of consumer harm. Bill 26's inspection powers, penalty provisions, and administrative enforcement tools are well-designed for this purpose. They should be directed at the actors who currently evade all regulations, not at professionals who are already accountable to a national regulator. CAPIC strongly supports provincial action against unauthorized practitioners and would welcome active collaboration on this shared priority.

Recommendation 3: Establish a federal-provincial information-sharing agreement between Alberta and the CICC, enabling the province to access CICC complaint data, disciplinary outcomes, and public register information for consumer protection purposes, without creating a duplicate regulatory structure.

Recommendation 4: Align any provincial code of conduct for immigration-related services with the existing CICC Code of Professional Conduct (SOR/2022-128) to avoid conflicting obligations for regulated professionals.

Recommendation 5: Remove the quasi-criminal penalty provisions as they apply to federally regulated immigration consultants, recognizing that penalty jurisdiction for regulated professional misconduct rests with the federal regulator and, for criminal conduct, with Parliament under section 91(27).

Recommendation 6: Engage in formal consultation with IRCC and the CICC before proceeding with Bill 26, consistent with the cooperative federalism principles endorsed by the Supreme Court of Canada, to develop a coordinated approach that respects constitutional boundaries while addressing Alberta's legitimate concerns. As Professor Hogg observed: "if all the provinces and territories were willing to fully harmonize with the new federal scheme, there would be no need to address the paramountcy doctrine as there would be no conflict between the statutes." Harmonization, not duplication, is the constitutionally sound path.

Recommendation 7: Model any provincial recruitment regulation on a collaborative framework with the federal government, consistent with the approach taken in other

provinces that have successfully addressed recruiter misconduct without creating constitutional conflicts with the federal immigration consultant regulatory regime.

VIII. THE SASKATCHEWAN PRECEDENT

CAPIC raised substantially similar constitutional concerns regarding Saskatchewan's *The Immigration Services Act* in June 2024. The arguments presented in that submission, grounded in the same constitutional principles, the same Hogg opinion, and the same *Mangat* jurisprudence, apply with equal force to Alberta's Bill 26. CAPIC's position is consistent: provincial legislation that purports to license federally regulated immigration consultants is constitutionally inoperative to the extent of the conflict with federal law.

CAPIC has shared its concerns with the CICC and will continue to advocate for a coordinated federal-provincial approach that protects the public without undermining the integrity of the national regulatory framework.

IX. CONCLUSION

CAPIC–ACCPI shares Alberta's stated objective of protecting newcomers, workers, and employers from exploitation by unscrupulous actors in the immigration services sector. The existing federal regulatory framework: the College Act, IRPA, the Citizenship Act, and the CICC Code of Professional Conduct (SOR/2022-128), was enacted by Parliament to achieve precisely this objective. That framework is exhaustive, it is enforceable, and it is operative.

The provisions of Bill 26 that purport to require provincial licensing of federally regulated immigration consultants do not strengthen this framework. They duplicate it, they conflict with it, and they risk undermining it. The constitutional analysis set out in this submission, grounded in binding Supreme Court of Canada authority, the authoritative opinion of Professor Peter W. Hogg, C.C., Q.C., and the express federal paramountcy clause in section 95 of the Constitution Act, 1867, leads to a single conclusion: these provisions are constitutionally inoperative to the extent of the conflict with federal law.

CAPIC respectfully but firmly urges the Government of Alberta to amend Bill 26 to exempt Regulated Canadian Immigration Consultants and Regulated International Student Immigration Advisors from the provincial licensing regime, and to redirect enforcement resources toward unauthorized practitioners—the actors who operate outside all regulatory frameworks and who are the genuine source of consumer harm.

CAPIC welcomes the opportunity to meet with you and your officials, to appear before the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future, and to contribute constructively to a

regulatory approach that protects the public interest while respecting the constitutional division of powers established by the Constitution Act, 1867.

Respectfully submitted,

Dory Jade, RCIC
Chief Executive Officer

cc:

Kate Lamb, Interim President CEO and Registrar, College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants (CICC)

Members, Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

The Honourable Lena Metlege Diab, P.C., M.P., Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Committee of the Whole – info@assembly.ab.ca / clerk@assembly.ab.ca / bills@assembly.ab.ca