



Canadian Association of Professional Immigration Consultants  
L'Association Canadienne des Conseillers Professionnels en Immigration

## *From the Bottom Up*

*A Newsletter for CSIC members about their issues.*

**Issue #249**

**JULY 27, 2010**

*Welcome to our Newsletter **From the Bottom Up**. Our articles and postings will cover immigration matters that affect your business and lives.*

*In this issue:*

# **Towards a Better Regulator**

## **Part 2 of 3**

### TOWARDS A BETTER REGULATOR

Part Two:

#### **THE REAL RISKS**

Reading the submissions from the CBA and the Paralegal Society of Ontario, itself regulated by the LSUC, one thing stands out. The only recommendation from the PSO is that the definition change to "any member in good standing of a provincial law society" from a "member in good standing of a bar of a province". This would open the door to paralegals to practice immigration, AND would open the door for Law Societies to set up their own consultant regulatory body in each province. The CBA uses the same terminology.

So instead of one Regulator, we could have 11, without any action being taken on the Notice whatsoever!

Again, you may read from the CBA submission that they agree with us on the problems with CSIC, but basically say that there is no solution that involves consultant self-regulation. Just a little self-serving, but clever!

However, this will not occur for some very good reasons:

1. If this was the Minister's intent we would not be going through the process of the Notice or even the provisions of Bill C-35. The Minister could have simply changed the definition and set up 10 or 11 competitors to CSIC. Fees would

probably drop by half, causing many new members and those frustrated with paying high CSIC fees to choose the Law Societies, and CSIC would have to drastically cut costs or go out of business - in short, the free market would force it to sink or swim. In doing so they would inadvertently also authorize regulated paralegals, which CIC does not want to do because there is no comfort whatsoever in having paralegals practice immigration, given that they have limited or no training whatsoever on immigration.

2. The Notice clearly states that a new Regulator must have the respect of the Profession, and there is little support for Law Societies amongst consultants.

3. As immigration is federal, the preference would be for a national regulator, although if that was so important, we would have a national regulator for lawyers as well.

In conclusion then, the only way the Law Societies would be considered would be because there was no other option.

So would this happen?

The answer is no.

### **Tomorrow: Part Three - WHAT WILL HAPPEN NEXT**

=====

**Renew YOUR CAPIC MEMBERSHIP OR JOIN TODAY**  
**[Online application](#), by [email](#) or by fax (416-309-1985)**

Follow us on  and 

**CAPIC: Lobbying - Information - Education - Recognition: For You!**

### **From the Bottom UP is a CAPIC - ACCPI Newsletter**

245 Fairview Mall Drive, Suite 602

Toronto, ON. M2J 4T1

Phone: 416-483-7044

Fax:

416-309-1985

[www.capic.ca](http://www.capic.ca)

**Our sponsor:**



[Forward email](#)

✉ **SafeUnsubscribe®**

This email was sent to info@capic.ca by [info@capic.ca](mailto:info@capic.ca).  
Instant removal with [SafeUnsubscribe™](#) | [Privacy Policy](#).

Email Marketing by



CAPIC | 245 Fairview Mall Drive, Suite 602 | Toronto | Ontario | M2J 4T1 | Canada