Canadian immigration: New challenges, new policies

DANIEL HIEBERT
GEOGRAPHY UBC,
METROPOLIS BRITISH COLUMBIA
Metropolis 2011
Immigration: Bringing the World to Canada
Sheraton Vancouver Wall Centre
March 23-26 2011

Metropolis 2011
Immigration : Le Canada s’ouvre au monde
Sheraton Vancouver Wall Centre
23-26 mars 2011
Outline

- Overview of Canadian immigration
- Major policy challenges
  - The economic paradox
  - The geographical paradox
- Policy responses
  - Devolution and the multiplication of actors
  - Stepwise visas
    - Proposed legislation on mass arrivals of refugee claimants
- Conclusion: policy coherence or dissonance?
  - Is there sufficient information for decision making?
Part 1: Overview of Canadian immigration
Overview of Canadian migration

- Historical background
- Political climate
- Selection policy
  - Permanent immigration
  - Temporary migration
- Integration policy
Overview

- **Historical background**
  - Nation building & economic motivations
- **Post-war period**
  - 1960s: internationalization of immigration
  - 1980s: shift from economic to demographic logic
- **Political climate**
  - Favourable public opinion
  - All-party consensus: ’untouchable issue’
  - Concerns about ’ethnic vote’
Canada – Permanent residents, 1860 to 2009
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World
Place of birth of recent immigrants to Canada, 2006

Top 10 places of birth
1. People's Republic of China
2. India
3. Philippines
4. Pakistan
5. United States of America
6. South Korea
7. Romania
8. Iran
9. United Kingdom
10. Colombia

World data: World Countries (Generalized), ESR1 Data & Maps, 2006.
Aside on sources of Permanent Residents

- Canada admitted individuals from more than 175 countries in 2009
  - ... nearly ‘all corners of the earth’
  - Pattern: high numbers from countries with educated populations
The Canadian population, with and without immigration

- **Estimate**
- **Projection**
- **Net Immigration**
- **Natural Increase**
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Immigration and the demographic ‘soft landing’

Chart 3.1

Population observed (1981 to 2005) and projected (2006 to 2056) according to six scenarios, Canada

In thousands

Source: Statistics Canada, Demography Division.
Population Projections 2000 to 2050

NORTH AMERICA CURRENT POPULATION = 416 MILLION

NORTH AMERICA PROJECTION = 618 MILLION

CANADA

170 MILLION

409 MILLION

Mexico

100 MILLION
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USA

285 MILLION

Population Projections 2000 to 2050
Overview

- **Historical background**
  - Racial selection and political-economic motivation
- **Post-war period**
  - 1960s: internationalization of immigration
  - 1980s: shift from economic to demographic logic
- **Political climate**
  - Favourable public opinion
  - All-party consensus: ‘untouchable issue’
  - Competition for ‘immigrant vote’
Immigration is popular

- **Polling Data (June 2006, IPSOS-Reid)**
- Overall, would you say immigrants are having a good influence or a bad influence on the way things are going in your country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection policy

- Permanent admissions
  - Economic (~60%), family (~25%), refugee (~15%)
- Evidence that the mix is related to public approval
- Different admission categories, different global circuits
- Rapid evolution of selection policy
  - Explored later...
Temporary migrants

- **Three major categories**
  - Temporary foreign workers (2009: 178,500)
    - Must have an offer of a job that would not ordinarily be taken by a Canadian (weak test for employers)
  - International students (2009: 85,000)
  - Asylum seekers on temporary visa (2009: 34,000)
    - Move through refugee determination system
    - May apply for work visa
    - Entitlement to minimal social assistance
Temporary migrants to Canada

Canada – Total entries of temporary residents by yearly status, 1985 to 2009

- Foreign workers
- Foreign students
- Humanitarian population
- Other
Stock of temporary residents

Canada – Temporary residents present on December 1st by yearly status, 1985 to 2009
Integration policy

- *** applies only to permanent immigrants ***
- **Framework of multiculturalism**
  - Principle of integration that enables both intercultural interaction and cultural distinctiveness
- **Settlement services**
  - Content: language, orientation
  - Additional services for resettled refugees
  - Funded by the national government (~$3,200 p.c.)
  - Administered by federal or provincial gov’ts
  - Delivered by NGOs
    - Competitive allocation systems
    - National standards
Part 2: Major policy challenges

- NOT public opinion or divisive politics
- NOT concerns about attachment of newcomers to Canada (it is high)
- The economic paradox
  - ‘frontburner’ issue
- The geographical paradox
  - ‘backburner’ issue
  - But impacts policy
Economic paradox

- Immigrants are needed
- The average level of education and pre-migration labour market experience of immigrants is high
- Public opinion is favourable
- Laws have been enacted to protect immigrants and members of minority groups from discrimination

- But...
## Employment rates (25-54 years old)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Canadian born</th>
<th>Recent immigrants (0-5 years in Canada)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Earnings and Incomes of Canadians Over the Past Quarter Century, 2006 Census

Low income (poverty) rates by immigration status, 1980-2000 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Canadian-born</th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
<th>Recent immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Picot and Hou, 2003
The geographical paradox

- Immigrants gravitate to the areas of Canada with the most expensive housing and the most competitive labour markets
- Extremely uneven geographies of settlement
- Similar to all countries...
Top 10 Census Metropolitan Areas in Canada by Recent Immigrant Arrivals, 2001 to 2006

- Toronto: 40% of Canada's Recent Immigrants, 9% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Montreal: 15% of Canada's Recent Immigrants, 5% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Vancouver: 14% of Canada's Recent Immigrants, 7% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Ottawa - Gatineau: 6% of Canada's Recent Immigrants, 6% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Calgary: 5% of Canada's Recent Immigrants, 3% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Edmonton: 3% of Canada's Recent Immigrants, 3% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Winnipeg: 2% of Canada's Recent Immigrants, 4% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Hamilton: 2% of Canada's Recent Immigrants, 3% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Kitchener: 2% of Canada's Recent Immigrants, 4% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Windsor: 1% of Canada's Recent Immigrants, 4% of the CMA Population, 2006

These 10 CMAs account for 54% of Canada's 2006 population and 90% of the country's 2001-2006 immigrants.
Public discussion

- **Nationally**
  - Focused on the problem of mismatch between skills and employment for many immigrants
    - Generates a large ‘research industry’
- **Locally**
  - Questions around the relationship between enclave development and socio-economic marginalization
- **Combination**
  - Concern that ‘over-concentration’ locally may contribute to poor economic outcomes
Basic issue

- Immigration will only work as a ‘demographic fix’ if immigrants participate fully in the Canadian labour market and society more generally
  - ... economic and social integration
- What are the best policies to facilitate that process?
Part 3: Policy responses

- Current policy cycle began c 1985
- At the start of that period...
  - All core decisions about selection and settlement made in Ottawa (federal government)
    - Plus administration of settlement and integration programs in all regions
  - Historically low targets for permanent immigrants
  - Policy emphasis solidly on permanent immigration
    - Rigid separation between permanent and temporary systems (‘crossover’ actively discouraged)
    - Skilled Worker Class considered ‘gold standard’
Policy responses

- Increase the number of permanent immigrants admitted and then maintain that number
  - No reduction even during recessions
- Rebalance the mix of permanent admissions toward the economic class
- Increase the scale of temporary migration
- New temporary > permanent pathways (CEC)
Policy responses

- Agreement with Quebec for autonomous selection and settlement systems
- Other provinces have followed
  - All provinces (and 1 territory) have negotiated nominee programs
  - Three provinces now administer settlement and integration programs
  - Based on transfer of funds from Ottawa
Table 1: Immigration Levels Plan 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant Category</th>
<th>2011 Plan Target Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC CLASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally Selected Economic Class*</td>
<td>74,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants †</td>
<td>33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependants †</td>
<td>43,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincially Selected Economic Class*</td>
<td>76,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants †</td>
<td>31,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependants †</td>
<td>47,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Nominee Program</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants †</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependants †</td>
<td>26,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec-selected Skilled Workers and Business</td>
<td>34,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants †</td>
<td>14,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependants †</td>
<td>20,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Economic Class—Principal Applicants</td>
<td>65,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Economic Class—Spouses and Dependants</td>
<td>85,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Economic Class</strong></td>
<td>150,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY CLASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses, Partners and Children</td>
<td>45,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Grandparents</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Family Class</strong></td>
<td>58,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTECTED PERSONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-assisted Refugees</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately Sponsored Refugees</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Persons In-Canada</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents Abroad of Protected Persons In-Canada</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Protected Persons</strong></td>
<td>23,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian and Compassionate Grounds/Public Policy</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Holders</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other</strong></td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy responses

- **Increase funding for settlement and integration services (tripled since 2005)**
  - About 1/3 of this is transferred to provincial governments, the rest in direct contracts with service providers

- **Increase research intensity**
  - Inside government: new databases and surveys
  - Outside: Metropolis Project
Implications of new policies

- Most of the core policy elements of 1985 have been changed
  - Ottawa no longer has total control
  - Higher numbers
  - More temporary migration, and stepwise process
- These changes have accorded critical roles in selection to other actors
  - Employers drive temporary labour migration
  - Tertiary education institutes drive student migration
  - Quebec plus other provincial nominee programs
  - Provinces and integration programs
The big trade off: centralized vs. decentralized control

- **Responsiveness (devolved responsibility):**
  - To the labour market and the regional economy
  - To the needs of newcomers
  - To political sensitivities

- **Coherence (challenges with devolution):**
  - Potential for conflicting priorities (e.g., skill level)
  - Potential for opacity (for applicants and Canadians as well)
  - Challenges of monitoring and evaluation
  - Challenge of leadership (who fixes things?)
Outcome

- Canada may have the world’s most complex immigration / migration system
- Nearly 30% of permanent immigrants are ‘upgraded’ temporary migrants
Speculation from 2009 Auditor General Report

**Exhibit 2.5** CIC projections indicate a significant change in the immigration target levels of each category within the Economic class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2009 (minimum of the range)</th>
<th>2012 (projected)</th>
<th>Average Variation +/- %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Skilled Worker</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>-73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Skilled Worker</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Nominee Program</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal/Quebec Business</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in Caregiver</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Experience Class</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>426.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>140.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>133.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s (CIC) 2008 Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration and the Office of the Auditor General’s analysis on projections
Policy choices NOT taken

- NOT ... reduce admission levels in light of economic outcomes
- NOT ... Australian model of introducing pre-qualifications for language and skill recognition
Other policy issues

- Integration of temporary migrants
  - Currently ineligible for language and orientation programs
- ‘Welcoming communities’ discussion
  - Aka ‘reasonable accommodation’ in Quebec
- Proposed reforms to asylum
- Is there also a role for municipal governments?
Conclusion: policy coherence or dissonance?

- Towards greater complexity and increasing differences between provincial jurisdictions
  - Practices are borrowed across jurisdictions, but selectively
  - Extensive experimentation in programs ... but coherence?

- Provinces increasingly expect to be full partners in all aspects of immigration policy
  - Does Ottawa want this?
Conclusion: policy coherence or dissonance?

- Policy ‘hesitancy’: use of pilot programs ... Will they survive?
- All this is being done in the context of partial knowledge about the relationship between programming and outcomes
  - Programs -> data -> evaluation ... do they keep up?
- Big, big picture... devolution and ‘ownership’ of policy