



July 3, 2020

Ottawa Citizen
1101 Baxter Road
Box 5020
Ottawa, ON

Dear Editor:

I am writing to you in regard to an article written by Isaac Gazendam titled “Canada must toughen its lacklustre regulation of immigration consultants”, which was featured in the *Ottawa Citizen* on July 2, 2020. We share your paper’s concern for the safety and well-being of temporary foreign workers, especially those who are providing essential labour in Canada during the COVID-19 pandemic.

I wish to address several issues with the author’s portrayal of immigration consultants and our profession in the piece. Your paper did a disservice to its readers by not clarifying the author’s bias (as a law student) in favour of immigration lawyers or the competing services immigration lawyers and immigration consultants provide. Immigration consultants are committed to regulating non-authorized representatives acting in bad faith. However, the article’s focus on immigration consultants ignores the instances when immigration lawyers have caused tremendous harm to clients. The piece fails to supply specific, substantial facts to bolster the claims made by the author.

The article mentions other national models Canada should follow to reform its immigration practices but does not mention CAPIC’s position on these existing models. CAPIC agrees with and supports existing industry best practices. CAPIC supports the Australian model mentioned in the article, in which immigration lawyers and immigration consultants are equally regulated under the same governing body.

This piece displays a fundamental misunderstanding of the regulatory changes that have already occurred in our profession. Under the College act, immigration consultants are regulated. Authorized Representatives are providing excellent service to clients. The author lumped Authorized Representatives together with “unscrupulous consultants”. However, the non-authorized representatives, on whom the author bases these claims, are already forbidden from representing potential immigrants under Canadian Law. This is a serious omission in the article, and it tarnishes the work and reputations of Authorized Representatives and our profession.

We request a retraction of the false claims in the article as well as an opportunity to respond to this piece in your publication. Please feel free to reach us at any time at communications@capic.ca.

Sincerely,

Dory Jade, C. Dir.
Chief Executive Officer
CAPIC-ACCPI