

Nature and Determinants of Changes in Immigration Flows to Canada, 1992-2012

A Thesis Submitted to the College of  
Graduate Studies and Research  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of Master of Arts  
in the Department of Political Studies  
University of Saskatchewan  
Saskatoon

By

Inna Sadovska

© Copyright Inna Sadovska. December 2012. All Rights Reserved

## PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Graduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department of Political Studies or the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies and Research. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of material in this thesis in whole or part should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of Political Studies  
University of Saskatchewan  
9 Campus Drive  
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N5A5  
Canada

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to ascertain the nature and determinants of changes of immigration flows to Canada during the past two decades. It tries to determine the volume, source, and classes of immigration flows as well as the factors that have influenced changes in these flows.

In examining the factors that have influenced the immigration flows, the principal focus is on how they have been influenced by the roles and the interests of the Canadian federal and provincial governments, and to some extent also by some factors within the international political and economic systems. The analysis of domestic determinants of the flows is approached primarily from the state-centric perspective, which postulates that one of the major determinants of the nature and causes of immigration flows to Canada are the interests, imperatives and preferences of the federal and provincial governments.

The major findings of the thesis are that although the federal government performs a key role in determining annual immigration flows, over time the provinces have also been performing an increasingly significant role largely through their respective immigration programs. The most influential province has been Québec. Other provinces have followed Québec's lead, albeit to a less significant extent. The thesis further reveals that the sizes of immigration flows have been growing significantly during the past few decades. The source countries of immigrants and the number of immigrants arriving through the economic class, rather than the family and refugee classes, have changed substantially. These changes are the result of the political and economic trends that have affected the "push" and "pull" dynamics of immigration flows, and the policy preferences of the federal and provincial governments.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of organizations and people that I would like to extend my sincere gratitude for their assistance in completing this thesis. The process of writing my thesis was an incredible challenge that I was only able to complete with their support. I would like being by thanking the Department of Political Studies, the College of Graduate Studies and Research,, and the Phebe Winifred Rowles Memorial Scholarship for providing financial assistance for my graduate studies and for this project.

I would like to acknowledge the valuable guidance and support of my thesis supervisor, Professor Joseph Garcea, in framing, researching and revising the thesis. His mentorship in the thesis production process provided me with many valuable opportunities to develop my academic skills. I would also like to acknowledge the invaluable contribution of the other two members of my advisory committee, Professor Hans Michelmann and Professor Bohdan Kordan, in reviewing and editing this thesis project. Special thanks are extended to Professor Hans Michelmann who, in his capacity as Graduate Program Chair, gave me timely advice and support in undertaking and completing this project. I would also like to thank the external examiner, Professor Terry Wotherspoon for his helpful comments and suggestions.

Special thanks are also extended to Carl Hydomako and Tara Longmire, who were the first people to encourage me to think about graduate school at the University of Saskatchewan, as well as to my colleagues at graduate school who never refused to help me. I would also like to thank my friends and faculty at Chernivtsi National University for their support.

Finally, I would like to express my profound appreciation to my parents and husband who have been the major source of inspiration and support throughout my academic career.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERMISSION TO USE .....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background and Focus of Thesis.....	1
1.2 Objectives, Research Questions, and Theoretical Approach of the Thesis .....	6
1.3 Information Sources .....	8
1.4 Importance of Thesis .....	9
1.5 Organization of Thesis .....	9
CHAPTER 2: The Nature and Determinants of Immigration Flows of the 1990s.....	11
2.1 Introduction.....	11
2.2 Trends in Immigration Flows in the 1990s.....	12
2.2.1 The Volume of Flows .....	12
2.2.2 The Classes of Flows.....	13
2.2.3 The Source Countries .....	17
2.3 The Role and Interests of the Federal Government in Setting Immigration Flows in the 1990s.....	20
2.3.1 The Federal Government Role in Setting Immigration Flows.....	20
2.3.2 The Federal Interests in Setting Immigration Flows .....	22
2.3.2.1 Political Interests .....	22
2.3.2.2 Demographic Policy Interests.....	23
2.3.2.3 Economic Policy Interests .....	25
2.4 Roles and Interests of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows in the 1990s.....	25
2.4.1 Roles of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows.....	25
2.4.2 Interests of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows .....	28
2.4.2.1 Political Interests .....	28
2.4.2.2 Demographic Policy Interests.....	29
2.4.2.3 Economic Policy Interests .....	31
2.5 Summary and Concluding Observations on the Size and Determinants of Immigration Flows in the 1990s .....	32
CHAPTER 3: The Nature and Determinants of Immigration Flows of the 2000s.....	33
3.1 Introduction.....	33
3.2 Trends in Immigration Flows in the 2000s.....	34
3.2.1 The Volume of Flows.....	34
3.2.2 The Classes of Flows.....	35
3.2.3 The Source Countries .....	38

3.3 The Role and Interests of the Federal Government in Setting Immigration Flows in the 2000s.....	41
3.3.1 The Federal Government Role in Setting Immigration Flows.....	41
3.3.2 The Federal Government Interests in Setting Immigration Flows .....	44
3.3.2.1 Political Interests .....	44
3.3.2.2 Demographic Policy Interests.....	46
3.3.2.3 Economic Policy Interests .....	48
3.4 Roles and Interests of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows in the 2000s.....	50
3.4.1 Roles of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows.....	50
3.4.2 Interests of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows .....	54
3.4.2.1 Political Interests .....	54
3.4.2.2 Demographic Policy Interests.....	55
3.4.2.3 Economic Policy Interests .....	56
3.5 Summary and Concluding Observations on the Size and Determinants of Immigration Flows in the 2000s .....	59
 CHAPTER 4: Summary and Conclusions .....	 60
4.1 Introduction.....	60
4.2 Summary of Findings on Immigration Flows.....	60
4.2.1 Summary of the Volume of Flows.....	60
4.2.2 Summary of the Classes of Flows .....	61
4.2.3 Summary of the Source Countries.....	62
4.3 Summary of Findings on Determinants of Immigration Flows.....	64
4.3.1 Political Interests of the Federal and Provincial Governments.....	64
4.3.2 Demographic Interests of the Federal and Provincial Governments.....	65
4.3.3 Economic Interests of the Federal and Provincial Governments.....	65
 APPENDIX 1.....	 67
APPENDIX 2.....	68
APPENDIX 3.....	69
APPENDIX 4.....	70
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 71

## CHAPTER 1:

### Introduction

#### **1.1 Background and Focus of Thesis**

Human migration has been important since the dawn of civilization. It has continued more intensively in response to different factors: wars, slavery, the Crusades, and the quest to find better economic, social and political conditions. In the modern world migration has been increasing due to a range of political and economic factors, becoming a mutual international process. Migration today is a movement of a person or group of persons across one or several administrative or political borders. The term “migrant” refers to a person who voluntarily or for personal reasons moves from his/her place of origin to a particular destination with the intention of establishing a residence indefinitely or temporarily (IOM, 2012).

There are two main factors that make people migrate: “push” and “pull” factors (Ritzer, 2011: 182-83). The “push” factor refers to unfavourable conditions in the home countries of immigrants that cause their citizens to leave for another country. The “pull” factor refers to the positive characteristics of countries that attract immigrants regardless of living conditions in their home countries. Frequently, migration results from a combination of “pull” and “push” factors. These factors influence migration and are reflected in the changes of volume, source, and category of migrants.

Immigration is a counterpart of migration, which involves the crossing of international borders and results in a change in the legal status of the individual concerned with the intention of settling permanently (IOM, 2012). According to United Nations (UN) Statistics the traditional “immigration countries” continue to be popular today. In much of the period since it was founded, the Canadian state has made immigration a priority.

Immigration has been since Confederation a fundamental element of Canada's economic and population growth (CIC, 2005: 7). Canada's legacy in the field of immigration has been and remains valuable because it results from a policy that is designed to serve the needs of a federal system. Equally important is the fact that within the context of Canadian federalism, constitutional powers for immigration are divided between the federal and provincial governments. Therefore, both the federal and provincial governments have been involved in the field of immigration at various junctures in history. In recent years the provinces have become much more involved. This started with Québec followed by other provinces.

Regulation of migration is one of the necessary instruments of ensuring national security, as well as maintaining an optimum balance of labour resources to provide for sustainable economic growth. Canadian federal and provincial governments, like their counterparts in other countries, have to ensure that their immigration policy meets their needs. Governments must also look to improve and adapt policy over time to accommodate and manage change. Regional economic and geopolitical changes have had an effect on the volume and composition of immigration flows to Canada. While some of the changes have increased immigration flows from some regions they have conversely decreased flows from others.

A country's immigration policy is an important tool in managing flows. Migration flow refers to the total number of people moving from one country to another. On the federal level the Department of Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) develops immigration policy and the Parliament of Canada implements it. At the same time CIC monitors, sets, and processes immigration flows. Its immigration policy is developed with Canadian national interests being given first priority, and international interests receive secondary consideration.

Canada has always dealt with a great number of immigrants. Its flexible immigration policy is one of the factors why Canada continues to be popular among potential immigrants.



Immigrants enjoy the transparent conditions and opportunities associated with Canada's immigration procedure. The way the immigration policy of Canada works has become an example to many other countries.

Canada has experienced five immigration waves. The first major wave of immigration occurred as a result of the American War of Independence from 1775 to 1783. During that war, British loyalists, citizens and soldiers alike, were ostracized in the USA. Approximately 35,000 to 40,000 loyalists, including disbanded soldiers, came to seek asylum in Nova Scotia, Upper and Lower Canada (Walker, 2008: 41).

The second wave began with the War of 1812 between the USA and the British Empire and continued throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. The main source countries of immigration to Canada were England, Ireland and Scotland. This trend strengthened the British influence in Canada. The situation changed with the proclamation of the Dominion of Canada and subsequent adoption of the first *Immigration Act* in 1896 by the Conservative Prime Minister Sir John A. MacDonal, who encouraged immigration. The Liberal governments that came to power thereafter continued stimulating immigration with an aim to settling the West with immigrants (Marchildon, 2009: 159). Changes to the *Immigration Act* were implemented in 1906 and 1910 to eliminate "undesirable" immigration. Racism was evident in the new provision requirements. During and after the First World War, immigration selection was based on cultural and ideological compatibility. (In the post-Second World War era, the Canadian government continued to apply discriminatory immigration requirements despite an international atmosphere of increasing ethnic tolerance and declining discrimination.)

The third wave of immigration originated mostly from continental Europe and peaked prior to the First World War between 1911 and 1913. Following the third wave, Canada experienced a decline in immigration. This decline in the volume of immigration to Canada

occurred between 1919 and the end of the Second World War. Thereafter the policy of “open borders” resulted in greater ethnic and national diversity among immigrants. This “open borders” policy created social problems highlighted by ethnic tensions and conflicts. As a result additional regulations were implemented.

The implementation of the *Citizenship Act 1947* precipitated the fourth wave of immigration. The economic need for labour in the 1950s resulted in further liberalization of immigration legislation. This opened the door for a major increase in immigration that reached its climax by the end of the 1950s. The first Points System that reduced the discrimination in the immigration criteria appeared in 1967. This made Canada a more multicultural country with a substantial non-English, non-French Canadian population, originating mainly in Asia (D’Costa, 1986: 117). The *Immigration Act 1976* based on the Points System was compatible with all the requirements of *UN Refugee Convention 1951* and the *Protocol relating the Status of Refugee 1967*. Between 1976 and 2002 the *Immigration Act 1976* was the main legislation regulation.

Characterised by a radical increase in immigration, the fifth wave started in the early 1990s and continues to the present. Research will focus on this fifth wave. But before accounting for this increase it is important to mention that CIC classifies immigrants according to temporary and permanent resident categories. The three classes of permanent resident category are family class (immigration for social purposes), economic class (immigration for economic purposes), and refugees and those in refugee-like situations (immigration for humanitarian purposes) (Becklumb, 2008a: 4). Unlike permanent residents, temporary residents are in Canada for a limited time and are required to leave the country after their visas expire. This category consists of classes of foreign workers, foreign students and “other”, which includes visitors and all individuals who cannot be categorized as foreign workers or foreign students. Between the 1990s and 2000s, the average rate of permanent resident (PR) immigration to Canada was 200,000 to

250,000 persons per year. The average annual temporary resident (TR) immigration rate reached almost 500,000 in the 1990s and started to increase by approximately 50,000 a year in the 2000s. The increase was evident in 1990 when the total number of TRs (including initial entries, re-entries, and residents) for the first time exceeded the rate of 500,000. During the rest of the decade these volumes remained rather stable. Since 1999 the extraordinary acceleration of the TR volumes' growth has been observed (CIC, 2010b: 3, 52-53). This trend developed further during the 2000-2010 period.

Within immigrant flows, changes took place with respect to the categories and their classes as well as source countries. Our research describes the nature of the changes brought about within both permanent and temporary resident categories. This thesis will focus on the volume of immigration, the classes, and the source countries of immigrants.

Over time the environment of migration changes and even well designed policies and institutions need to be reformed. Bill C-11, the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA)*, and its provisions, was implemented on June 28, 2002. IRPA is a federal immigration statute that regulates immigration to Canada and grants the protection to migrants who are displaced, persecuted or in danger. IRPA replaced the *Immigration Act 1976* with a more comprehensive and coherent statute designed to achieve the social, humanitarian and economic goals of the immigration program. It meets the challenge of balancing a variety of needs, such as: speeding up processes and making procedures more equitable, welcoming families, and providing a safe haven for persons needing protection, while preventing the entry into Canada of those who pose a threat to the health and safety of Canadians.

Ideally, national legislation should develop laws and policies in accordance with international rules and norms:

“International migration policies should respect the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals as set out in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*, the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* and other pertinent international instruments. In keeping with these documents, receiving countries should adopt measures to safeguard the basic human rights of all migrants in their territory and to ensure the respect of their cultural identity” (UN, 2006: 117).

Canadian immigration policy is also arousing the interest of potential immigrants in that it is developed and implemented in relation to other key policies. Since 1977, the *Canadian Citizenship Act* has included the right of dual citizenship. As well, the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* of 1988 has been developed to “recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage”(Canada, 1988). These acts contribute to the Canadian “pull” factor. During the past two decades the following reforms were made: the organization of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) in 1994 and the implementation of IRPA in 2002. The Department of Citizenship and Immigration was created by combining Employment and Immigration, and Multiculturalism and Citizenship.

## **1.2 Objectives, Research Questions, and Theoretical Approach of the Thesis**

This thesis will focus on the nature and determinants of the annual immigration flows to Canada. The research seeks to determine the volume, source, and classes of immigration flows as well as the factors that have influenced changes in those flows during the past two decades. In conducting the research, my principal focus is on the roles and the interests of the Canadian federal and provincial governments. In this regard, the research questions that relate to the nature and determinants of immigration flow trends to Canada during the past two decades are as follows:

- How did the volume of immigration change?
- How did the sources of immigrants change?
- How did the classes of immigrants change?
- What were the federal-provincial roles and interests that influenced changes in immigration flows?

Responsibilities of the federal and provincial governments in the Canadian federal system are listed under section 95 of *Canada's Constitution Act 1867*. Although these governments have shared jurisdictional power for immigration, the federal government maintains paramount power. This means that in cases where federal and provincial legislation are not consonant, the former supersedes the latter. Historically, the different provincial governments have had different levels of interests and organizational capacities to deal with immigration. Each of the governments has particular goals and objectives related to immigration that affect the annual level of immigration. These goals and objectives are mainly reflected in governmental interests and imperatives that are transmitted in the form of policy issues.

This thesis explores existing policy and its influence on the development of immigration issues. The analysis of domestic determinants of the flows is approached primarily from the state-centric perspective, which, as described by Allan Cairns, underlines the central role of the state (Cairns, 1977: 700). The state-centric perspective postulates that among the major determinants of the nature and causes of immigration flows to Canada are the interests, imperatives and preferences of the federal and provincial governments. Cairns claims that Canadian immigration policy is shaped more by the interactions of the federal and provincial governments than by the interaction between state and societal interests (Cairns, 1977: 703). However, societal interests and forces are not entirely insignificant. The reason for this is that policy is a by-product of the state's attempt to maintain legitimacy among a welter of conflicting societal interests (Veugelers, 2000: 4). Furthermore, it is important to note that international forces and the policies of other countries also impact domestic policies in Canada. Thus, although the principal focus of the

thesis is on the effects of the interests of the federal and provincial governments, some attention is also devoted not only to domestic societal interests and forces, but also to international political, economic, and social factors.

### **1.3 Information Sources**

The information used for this thesis is both of a qualitative and quantitative variety. Preliminary research on the immigration literature reveals a range of available primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include official statistics, legislation, and government reports. The majority of the primary qualitative and quantitative sources for the thesis are located on the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and the Department of Justice websites. CIC publications include the following: *Immigration Statistics* (1990-1993), *A Broader Vision: Immigration Plan* (1995-2000), *Annual Immigration Plan* (1996-2002), *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration* (2002-2011), *Facts and Figures: Immigration Overview* (2003-2010). As well, statistical data compiled by Statistics Canada (StatCan), the United Nations and the International Organization for Migration are utilized.

Secondary sources include academic works and scholarly publications in the field of Canadian immigration policy, as well as materials from conferences and round tables. Joseph Garcea's doctoral dissertation "Federal-provincial relations in immigration, 1971-1991: a case study of asymmetrical federalism" provides an important historical background for the current research. Another important academic source is *The Making of the Mosaic: a History of Canadian Immigration Policy* by Ninette Kelley and Michael Trebilcock (2010), wherein the authors examine the ideas, interests, institutions, and rhetoric that have shaped Canada's immigration history as well as major events in the evolution of Canadian immigration policy. An additional important source is the *Canadian Immigration Policy for the 21st century* by Charles

M. Beach, Alan G. Green, and Jeffery G. Reitz (2003). It contains information on such related research topics as: immigration policy goals; the global context of immigration; the role of immigration in meeting demographic, occupational, capital market needs; the effect of immigration; the location choice of new immigrants; and public attitudes toward immigrants and immigration. *The Effects of Mass Immigration on Canadian Living Standards and Society* edited by Herbert Grubel (2009) is also a valuable secondary source, providing an overview from a range of authors with international perspectives while discussing economic, demographic, social, and political issues relevant to immigration to Canada. Finally, the invaluable work of Freda Hawkins is utilized, providing a historical discussion of those features that have had an impact on both immigration policies and trends from the 1950s to the 1990s.

#### **1.4 Importance of Thesis**

The thesis is important for several reasons. First, it seeks to ascertain the nature and determinants of changes of immigration flows to Canada during past two decades. Second, although substantial research has been done in this area, this thesis pays particular attention to the explanation of decisions regarding immigration flows as listed in CIC's annual reports to Parliament. Finally, the thesis provides important insights regarding the ways decisions are shaped and made with respect to immigration planning.

#### **1.5 Organization of Thesis**

The narrative of this thesis consists of three chapters. Chapter 2 [The Immigration Flows of the 1990s] examines the nature and determinants of immigration flows to Canada in the 1990s. This chapter describes the volume of immigration and shows that since the early 1990s the volume has rapidly started to increase. Furthermore, it also reveals that in addition to the increase

in the number of immigrants there have been some notable changes in the classes of immigrants and their source countries. The chapter also provides an analysis of both the federal and provincial roles and interests that have shaped immigration policy. Particular attention is paid to the interaction between the federal and Québec governments. During this decade Québec was the only province that performed a direct and significant role in setting policies regarding the volume of immigration flows and the categories of immigrants within those flows.

Chapter 3 [The Immigration Flows of the 2000s] examines immigration flows during the past decade from the year 2000. It analyses with respect to immigration categories' the volumes, classes, and source countries of immigrants in the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The chapter devotes special attention to the interests and roles of the federal government as well as provincial governments in establishing policies for immigration flows to Canada. More particularly the implementation of the *Immigrant Protection Refugee Act* and its effects on the roles and responsibilities of the federal and provincial governments in determining immigration flows are analyzed. The chapter also devotes attention to the changes in the alignment of roles and responsibilities in setting policies related to immigration flows. The reason for this is that the establishment of the Provincial Nominee Program (PNP) has increased the role of provincial/territorial governments.

Chapter 4 [Summary and Conclusions] summarizes the major findings and draws some conclusions with respect to several issues: (a) the relative importance of the federal government versus the provincial governments in setting policy on immigration flows; (b) the relative importance of various provinces in setting policy on immigration; and (c) the types of factors that were central in the federal and provincial governments efforts in establishing particular policies on immigration flows.



## CHAPTER 2:

### The Nature and Determinants of Immigration Flows of the 1990s

#### **2.1 Introduction**

The central objective in this chapter is twofold: (a) to determine the volumes, classes, and source countries of immigration flows in the 1990s; and (b) to examine the federal and provincial roles in setting immigration levels, and their political, demographic, and economic interests in setting those levels. For this purpose the chapter consists of three major sections. The first section presents Canadian immigration trends in the 1990s based on government reports that provide an overview of the immigration flows to Canada based on the volumes, classes, and sources of immigrants. The data used for this purpose are drawn from StatCan and CIC.

The second section demonstrates how changes in immigration flows were influenced by federal immigration policy, which, in turn, is shaped by the federal government's political, demographic and economic interests. This section also provides an analysis of how the annual immigration flows were influenced by key provisions in immigration legislation as well as national and international factors (e.g., the demographic changes and economic needs within the country, or the appearance of "push" economic and humanitarian factors abroad).

The third section examines the influence of provincial policies, which, in turn, have been shaped by the population, demographic and economic interests of the various provinces. Special attention is devoted to the key role performed by Québec in setting immigration levels, how it achieved the determinative roles it enjoys now, and how it influenced the other provinces' roles in setting immigration.

## **2.2 Trends in Immigration Flows in the 1990s**

### **2.2.1 The Volume of Flows**

The *CIC Facts and Figures: Immigration Overview 2010* presents data on the volumes of all categories of immigration. The data reveal a significant increase in permanent residents since the early 1990s. Data for the twentieth century shows that the highest number of immigrants arriving in one year occurred in 1913 when 400,870 people immigrated to Canada and the lowest was 1942 when only 7,576 immigrated to this country because of the Second World War. On average, approximately 128,000 immigrants came to Canada each year during the twentieth century. If the 1990s are omitted, the average for the previous nine decades was approximately 119,000 per year. During the 1990s, on average, 210,400 permanent immigrants came to Canada annually (CIC, 2010b: 3). Between 1942 and 1989, the total number of immigrants arriving as permanent residents exceeded 200,000 per year but a few times. For example, in 1957 there were 282,164 arrivals, in 1967 there were 222,876 arrivals, and in 1974 there were 218,565. Since 1990, immigration has been above 200,000 for most years. Only in 1998 and 1999 were permanent resident immigration flows less than 200,000 – 174,195 and 189,951 respectively (CIC, 1995b: 8; CIC, 1996: 3). During this decade the largest number of permanent residents arrived in 1993 when 256,641 individuals were granted visas.

For the subsequent five years of that decade the government set and achieved annual immigration flows in the 190,000 to 250,000 range. For the year 1994 the immigration plan stated that 230,000 to 250,000 immigrants would be granted visas; 224,000 were, in fact, granted. In 1995 the immigration plan identified that 190,000 to 215,000 immigrants would be admitted. A total of 212,865 were allowed to enter (CIC, 1995a: 6). For 1996 and 1997 CIC planned to receive 195,000 to 220,000 individuals. The actual number was slightly above that range for 1996 and within the range for 1997. Clearly, the federal government has been able to stay within the

projected annual range in most cases and only deviated from the range by a few thousand in some years (CIC, 1999a: 3). The deviation from the planned or projected annual levels was never more than 7,000.

The temporary resident flows' dynamics in the 1990s were similar to the permanent resident category. The general trend was upward and then stabilized at a higher level. CIC data reveal that in 1990 the total number of present residents (i.e., stock) and entries of new residents exceeded 500,000. That year the number of the two groups comprised 546,701 temporary residents. The following year that amount increased to 582,106 (CIC, 2010b: 52-53). Both categories demonstrated relatively proportional regularity. On average, during the 1990s the total number of entries and stock residents was approximately 465,000 annually. Only in 1999 did the volume of total entries and stock residents exceed 500,000.

### **2.2.2 The Classes of Flows**

This section outlines the key statistics for each of the permanent resident classes, their respective sub-categories and classes of temporary resident category. In the 1990s the permanent resident category has been divided into four major classes: family, independent, humanitarian, and "other" immigrants.

During the 1990s the independent class comprised the greatest number of total immigrants. The independent class included business immigrants (entrepreneurs, self-employed, investors), live-in caregivers, provincial nominees, and other independents as skilled workers and assisted relatives. This class became the main source of economic immigrants to the country. The live-in caregiver program was established in 1992. Participants arrive on a temporary residence basis and after two years of successful work can apply for permanent immigration status (CIC, 1995b: 11). Assisted relatives were abolished as a separate class in 1993 (Kelley and Trebilcock,

2010: 391). The provincial/territorial nominees have started immigrating to Canada since the first Provincial Nominee Program came into effect in 1999.

The number of economic immigrants increased during the 1990s. It started with 100,000 in 1990, peaked at 130,000 in 1997, and then plateaued at 110,000 by 1999. The number of economic immigrants who arrived in 1997 was almost 15,000 higher than the CIC expected (CIC, 1996b: 2). More than half of all economic immigrants arriving each year were skilled workers. In 1999, there were 92,504 skilled worker immigrants (principal applicants and their dependants) and 16,667 sustained other independent immigrants (CIC, 2003b: 11). Among the permanent resident category the CIC counts spouses and dependants as economic immigrants as well. If spouses and dependants of all economic immigrants were counted as family class it would reduce the economic class dramatically, given that on average each immigrant has two dependants.

Throughout Canada's immigration history the family class has always been the most stable numerically. In response to federal policy, however, the number of immigrants under the family class began to decline in the 1990s, in part a function of changes made to the sub-categories identified with this class of immigrant. The family class originally included the sub-categories of spouses and partners, fiancés, sons and daughters (dependent children), parents and grandparents, and other relatives. In April 1992, regulations cut the dependent children sub-category, redefining it from never-married children to children under the age of 19, full-time students supported by parents, and disabled children supported by parents (CIC, 1995a: 9). During the 1990s, the flow of family members reached its maximum of 112,641 in 1993. The federal government's target to reduce the family class immigration was reached next year. However, of the total 250,000 immigrants who were eligible for visas in 1994, 111,000 were family members. In 1995, the number of visas for the both family and economic classes declined

by approximately 20,000 (CIC, 1995a: 6). The smallest number of family class immigrants (50,897) arrived in 1998 (CIC, 2003b: 11). On average, during the 1990s approximately 68,160 family class immigrants were granted visas annually. During the first half of the decade, the majority of family class immigrants consisted of parents and grandparents. Since 1995 spouses and partners would become the majority. The sub-category of sons and daughters kept its third rank.

The refugee class continued to represent the smallest share of permanent residents. This class was comprised of government-assisted, privately sponsored, refugees landed in Canada, as well as refugee dependants. The number of refugees coming each year declined during the 1990s. The refugee immigration plan contained significant reductions in the number of refugees by the end of the decade. The immigration plan for 1999 projected 22,100 to 29,300 refugees (CIC, 1998a: 3). The 1999 target plan was achieved as was a general reduction in refugee flows. Whereas in 1990 a total of 40,216 refugees were granted visas in 1999 this number declined to 24,395. The highest number of refugees came in 1991 – 54,074 (CIC, 2003b: 11). The biggest refugee groups were refugee claimants who landed in Canada and government-assisted refugees. Privately sponsored refugees constituted the smallest refugee group. Importantly, since 1989 all refugee-claimants residents together with other special humanitarian cases were counted as non-permanent (Azaad, 1991: 2).

The “other” permanent resident immigrants comprised the smallest class. It included retirees, unsuccessful refugees on deferred removal orders and their spouses and dependants. The deferred removal order sub-category was introduced to regularize the status of unsuccessful refugee claimants. The highest number of “other” immigrants came in 1993 when 7,751 visas were issued. By 1999 the number of such immigrants had been reduced to 1,031.

The category of temporary residents consists of foreign workers, foreign students, humanitarian cases, and “other” cases. The “other” class consists of visitors and individuals who do not fit into any of the aforementioned categories. As opposed to permanent residents, the status of temporary residents is changeable. According to CIC statement: “Foreign workers are in Canada primarily to work, and foreign students are in Canada primarily to study, though they may have other permits or authorizations” (CIC, 2003b: 55).

Foreign temporary workers traditionally constituted the largest class of temporary residents. The general temporary foreign worker program originally brought professionals (e.g., academics, business executives, engineers) to work in Canada on a temporary basis. Foreign workers can come to Canada either on the general temporary foreign worker program or sector-specific programs such as the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program and the Live-in Caregiver Program (Becklumb, 2008a: 34). In 1990, the volume of foreign temporary workers was 177,509, which amounted to 32.5 per cent of total temporary residents in Canada. However, since the mid-1990s the inflow of this class started decreasing.

During the 1990s Canada welcomed significant number of newcomers under the humanitarian case class, which was expanded by refugee claimants in 1989. “The refugee claimants were included into humanitarian cases along with individuals who did not make refugee claims and others who remain in Canada on special humanitarian grounds” (Azaad, 1991: 2). Since its implementation humanitarian cases constituted the second largest class of temporary resident. A large decrease in humanitarian cases took place in the second half of the 1990s when thousands of Kosovo refugees to Canada arrived but were not counted as refugee claimants (CIC, 2002c: 1).

Foreign students comprise another temporary resident class, which grew substantially during the 1990s. Foreign students, who occupied the fourth rank at the beginning of the decade,

displaced “other” cases from third place in 1993, and humanitarian cases from second place four years later.

### **2.2.3 The Source Countries**

#### **Flows of Permanent Immigrants**

At the beginning of the 1990s substantial changes started occurring in the immigration flows from various source countries. The most significant change was the shift in importance of Asian and European source countries. The number of immigrants coming from Asia continued to increase and the number of immigrants arriving from Europe decreased. In 1990, of the 216,452 permanent residents who came to Canada, 52.2 per cent were from Asia, 24.3 per cent from Europe, 6.3 per cent from Africa, 5.5 per cent from the Caribbean, 4.2 per cent from South America, 3.6 per cent from Central America, 2.8 per cent from the USA, and 1.2 per cent were from other regions (EIC, 1990: 12).

During the 1990s there was a dramatic shift in the proportion of immigrants from the European region to the Asian and Pacific region. The growing importance of the Asian and Pacific region as a source for immigration was demonstrated by the rapid growth of immigration from China, India, Philippines, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan. In the mid-1990s Pakistan and Iran appeared among top source countries for the first time in history. By 1999, these two countries occupied the third and sixth positions among source countries (CIC, 2003b: 32). At the same time all European countries, except for the UK, disappeared from the top 10 source countries. China moved from eighth position in 1990 to first in 1999, India from fifth to second, and Pakistan from tenth to third. The position of Philippines fluctuated during that decade, but in both 1990 and again in 1999 it occupied the fourth rank. Only Hong Kong steadily dropped in its ranking, moving from first to thirteenth during this period (CIC, 2003b: 32). Prior to 1997 Hong

Kong had taken the lead as the major source of business immigrants (Makarenko, 2010). This increase was triggered by business persons who wanted to move some of their financial capital out of Hong Kong and to acquire a Canadian passport before Hong Kong was returned from Great Britain to China in 1997.

### **Flows of Temporary Immigrants**

The composition of temporary residents in the 1990s also revealed some interesting trends. To reiterate, the three major classes among temporary residents are foreign workers, foreign students, and humanitarian cases. For each of these classes CIC provides statistics both for annual entries and stock residents. The stock resident statistics are “calculated on December 1 of each calendar year and state whether the individual is still authorized to be in the country on that date, regardless of when he or she entered the country” (CIC, 2002c: 1).

Among source countries for temporary foreign workers the leading country was the USA. CIC reported a large number of annual entries of American temporary workers during that decade. The average annual flow was about 23,500 migrants, equal to some 33 per cent of all foreign workers. Furthermore, at the beginning of the 1990s approximately 25 per cent (from 16,000 to 20,000 migrants in different years) of the foreign worker stock was American. The stock grew almost until the end of the 1990s. During that decade, the next six positions of foreign workers varied among countries. By the end of the 1990s the sequence for the top 10 positions was as follows: United States, Mexico, the UK, Jamaica, Japan, France, Australia, Germany, the Philippines, and Trinidad and Tobago. Migrants from these countries constituted over 60 per cent of annual entries and approximately 75 per cent of stock residents (CIC, 2002c: 9).

The flows of foreign students also increased and the countries of origin expanded. The top 10 source countries of foreign students provided 65 per cent of annual entries and stock. During the 1990s these source countries were Japan, the USA, the Republic of Korea, Hong Kong,



France, Mexico, Taiwan, Germany, the UK, and China. During the decade the overall volume of foreign students increased rapidly as a result of a combination of more foreign students with resources to study in Canada and active recruitment by educational institutions (CIC, 2003b: 74, 77).

The most unpredictable annual flows of immigrants involve humanitarian residents. Since refugee claimants are determined to be non-permanent residents, they are considered to be humanitarian residents under the temporary resident category. This class is quite unpredictable both in terms of size and source countries. As with other components of immigration flows, it is heavily influenced by “push” and “pull” factors, which bring both constant and instant humanitarian flows. Whereas constant flows originate in traditionally underdeveloped areas, instant flows are caused by temporary but extensive disasters. This explains the level of immigration flows from different countries at various points in time. Therefore, during the 1990s, the most constant source countries for humanitarian flows were as follows: Sri Lanka (2,500 residents annually), India (1,250), Algeria (600), Romania (450), Afghanistan (400), Peru (300), and the USA (250) (CIC, 2003b: 86).

Particular countries provided humanitarian case influxes in short time periods during the 1990s. For example, 7,450 migrants arrived from the former Yugoslavia in 1999, 2,480 were from the Czech Republic in 1997, 1,119 arrived from Israel in 1996, and 1,000 humanitarian immigrants were from Venezuela in 1995 (CIC, 2003b: 86).

The other notable feature of humanitarian flows is its variable nature. Gradually declining humanitarian flows were recorded for such previously important countries as Iran, Somalia, Bangladesh, and Israel. Meanwhile, increasing humanitarian flows were evident from several countries in 1999. These included China (2,493), Pakistan (2,445), Hungary (1,488), and Mexico (1,049) (CIC, 2003b: 89).

## **2.3 The Role and Interests of Federal Government in Setting Immigration Flows in the 1990s**

### **2.3.1 The Federal Government Role in Setting Immigration Flows**

The federal role in setting immigration flows is mainly determined by immigration laws. In the 1990s, the immigration legislation was mainly based on existing norms. The *Immigration Act 1976* set the basic framework for the next 26 years of Canada's immigration policy. Under the Act, the federal government was required to set targets for the volume of immigrants it would admit each year, and to consult with the provinces regarding planning and management of provincial immigration. A key element was the requirement for greater planning and provincial consultation in immigration policy (Kelley and Trebilcock, 2010: 382).

The classes of permanent residents (previously landed immigrants) introduced by the *Immigration Act* were as follows: (a) the independent class consisting of individuals applying for landed-immigrant status on their own initiative (skilled workers and professionals); (b) the family class consisting of foreign nationals sponsored by close relatives or family members in Canada, including spouses and partners, dependent children, parents and grandparents; (c) the assisted relatives class consisting of distant relatives sponsored by a family member in Canada who met some of the selection criteria of the independent class; and (d) the humanitarian class which included refugees and other persecuted and displaced persons under the UN *Convention on Refugees* 1951 (Abu-Laban, 1998: 76). The *Immigration Act 1976* initially defined the humanitarian class as government-assisted refugees, privately sponsored refugees, refugees landed in Canada, and dependants of refugees landed in Canada but living abroad. The growing number of refugees was a new trend influenced by this law.

Introduced prior to 1967, the Points System was an important mechanism for selecting immigrants. It was successfully applied to independent and partially assisted relative classes.

Immigration through the independent class was possible if applicants obtained a pass mark of 72 points out of a possible 100 on the basis of their education, work experience, age, arranged employment, language abilities, and adaptability (Becklumb, 2008a: 43).

In two years after the passage of the *Immigration Act* a business class was created, consisting of persons willing to bring significant financial capital to Canada in order to start a business or invest in the domestic economy. It included self-employed entrepreneurs, and investors. The last sub-category was introduced in 1986 (Kelley and Trebilcock, 2010: 395). The business class became subject to a modified selection grid, which granted extra points for business experience. This would become an important part of the independent class immigration.

A 1993 amendment to the *Immigration Act 1976* abolished the assisted relatives class as a separate class. Its applicants were assessed as independent immigrants and had to satisfy the same selection grid, receiving bonus points for being a relative of an eligible family member in Canada (Kelley and Trebilcock, 2010: 391)

In 1994, the Citizenship and Immigration Canada department was created. The department was established by the new Liberal government that came to power in 1993. CIC was tasked with linking immigration and citizenship programs, promoting the unique ideals all Canadians share in order to help build a stronger Canada. The CIC Minister initiated further amendments to the *Immigration Act 1976*, such as redefining immigration sub-categories and adjusting the Points System criteria. During the 1990s, the business class was integrated into the independent class. At the same time, the family class level was reduced and the independent class level increased. At this time the emphasis in awarding points shifted from education to professional training, work experience, and official language abilities of the applicants.

### **2.3.2 The Federal Government Interests in Setting Immigration Flows**

The federal government's decisions regarding immigration flows were driven by its political, demographic and economic interests.

#### **2.3.2.1 Political Interests**

Canada entered the 1990s with a Progressive Conservative government, which had come to power in 1984 under the leadership of Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. Within a year of coming to power, the Mulroney government increased immigration levels. In the 1980s, demographers predicted that the average age of the Canadian population would increase significantly by the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This projected increase, it was felt, would create problems adversely affecting the economy and the country's social programs (Freeman, 1992: 1152). In 1985, the government authorized a gradual increase in permanent residency permits as a means of addressing the problems associated with an aging society. In 1990 the Mulroney government introduced the first five year plan allowing an annual intake of 250,000 permanent residents into Canada by 1995. But by 1992, members of the Conservative Party were critical of the high immigration levels involving the family and humanitarian classes (Freeman, 1992: 1152), leading the Mulroney government to reduce overall immigration levels. This increased the proportion of visas granted the independent immigrant class and decreased the proportion granted to the family and humanitarian classes.

The new Liberal government of Jean Chrétien, elected in November 1993, did not share the previous government's concern and need for reductions in the level of immigration flows. The Chrétien government saw immigration as a valuable tool "to smooth the current age imbalance in the Canadian population" (Economic Council of Canada, 1991: 17). Hence, in 1994 the Liberal Immigration Minister Sergio Marchi announced that the annual immigration levels

would remain at 250,000 (Abu-Laban, 1998: 79). The 1995-2000 immigration plans increased the proportion of the independent class and decreased the proportion of refugees and family immigrants.

Successive federal governments, of course, had political interests that related to humanitarian immigration flows. These wanted to be viewed as making a valuable contribution in dealing with the global humanitarian problem, hoping to minimize and deflect criticism that the government and the country were not doing enough to help refugees and people in need around the world. Canada has built a reputation as a country committed to fostering justice for those most in need, a reputation that successive governments have sought to safeguard, especially important after having been awarded in 1986 the Nansen Refugee Award by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

### **2.3.2.2 Demographic Policy Interests**

Demographic interests were also influential in shaping the decisions of federal governments during the past two decades. The major considerations were potential challenges and problems in the economic and social service spheres if immigration flows were not managed carefully. Generally, the demographic situation in the 1990s worsened in comparison to the last five years of the previous decade. In 1991, StatCan reported a population of 28.031 million in Canada. By 1995 the population had grown by approximately 1,580,000 persons, a number that was 350,000 persons fewer than in the previous five years. By the year 2001, the population grew even more slowly. The population increased only by 1,410,000 individuals, reaching 31.021 million. During the 1990s, the number of deaths exceeded one million people every five years. However, the number of immigrants also exceeded one million every five years. During 1996-2001, some 1,217,000 immigrants settled in Canada, the largest number in a five year period to

that time (StatCan, 2005b). In short, immigration became a major source for population growth, contributing to a gradual increase in the size of the population during the 1990s.

Although Canada's population was growing, there was a widespread concern among governments that the population was not increasing at a sufficiently high rate and the proportion of the elderly was reaching a problematical level. The major concern was that the size of the population would decline and an imbalance would be created between the proportion of the working-age population and retired population. More specifically, the concern was that the proportion of the working population would not be sufficiently large enough to provide a sufficiently large tax base to support pensions and social services for the retired portion of the population while also meeting other essential government expenditures. For this reason the federal government established new criteria that gave priority to younger working age applicants and to the independent class over the family class. Under the new selection criteria, applicants between the age range of 21 to 49 years old are awarded a maximum 10 points (Becklumb, 2008a: 43). These points – constituting approximately one seventh of the total number of points needed to be eligible to immigrate to Canada as independent immigrants – increase the chances of younger working age applicants being granted visas.

Although the size of the family class decreased, it continued to be a significant part of the number of immigrants. From a demographic point of view the rejuvenation of population directly depends on fertility rates that can be greatly improved through immigrant family reunification. The growing trend of partner-sponsoring within the family class is an important factor influencing the demographic interest in setting the level of immigration.

### **2.3.2.3 Economic Policy Interests**

The federal government's economic interests were also instrumental in shaping the immigration flows during the past two decades. Immigration was important to prevent severe labour shortages. During the first half of the 1990s, immigration accounted for 70 per cent of the net growth in the labour force (Becklumb, 2008a: 4). To maintain such growth the federal government increased the number of applicants who would be granted visas as part of an independent class. As discussed above, this class consisted of economic immigrants (i.e., skilled workers, professionals, investors, entrepreneurs, and self-employed) who possess the knowledge, skills, and capital required to meet Canada's labour and financial market needs.

A key factor in economic immigrants acquiring a visa was their ability to get established in Canada by meeting the Points System's selection criteria, which assessed such factors as education, work experience, age, arranged employment, ability to speak at least one of the official languages, and adaptability. The modified selection grid was applied to investors and entrepreneurs of the business class, who were awarded extra points for their business experience along with the abovementioned criteria. The self-employed sub-category of the business class would be admitted if they could prove they would make a significant contribution to the cultural, artistic, and athletic life of Canada, or manage a farm in Canada (Becklumb, 2008a: 18).

## **2.4 Roles and Interests of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows in the 1990s**

### **2.4.1 Roles of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows**

Section 95 of *Canada's Constitution Act 1867* stipulates that immigration is a field of concurrent federal-provincial jurisdiction with federal paramountcy. This means that the laws provinces may adopt must not be "repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada". Constitutionally, every province has equal jurisdictional authority in this policy field (Garcea,

1993: 3). In recent decades, the federal government has collaborated with the provinces to establish immigration goals and policies, though the level of cooperation has varied at times. The *Immigration Act 1976* contained important provisions that in developing and implementing immigration policy sought to foster more concerted consultation and collaboration by the federal government with the provinces and the public.

Québec is the first province to become extensively involved in managing its own immigration program. This is the result of a series of negotiations and agreements that began in the late 1960s and culminated in a significant agreement in 1991 that is still in force today. A significant degree of provincial autonomy was achieved in immigration by the Québec provincial government because it took a greater interest and a more active role in immigration policy than its counterparts in any other province.

In 1968, Québec established its own immigration department (Canada, 1994a), after which immigration agreements between the federal government and the government of Québec were signed in 1971, 1975 and 1978. Each of these agreements gave Québec increasing responsibility in managing immigration policy. Generally, the agreements assigned roles to Québec, which evolved progressively from a consultative, to a co-determinative, to a determinative role. A consultative role extends to one party a right to offer commentary or to advise the other party, which alone is authorized to decide. A co-determinative role on the other hand means that the authority of decision-making is shared between two or more parties, even if one of them has ultimate say. A determinative role refers to the case where one party has exclusive authority (Garcea, 1993: 112).

Between 1971 and 1991 the federal and Québec governments signed several agreements. The first Canada-Québec immigration agreement, the *Lang-Cloutier Agreement* signed in 1971, allowed Québec to have representatives and counsellors in Canadian embassies abroad. This



provided Québec with a consultative role. The second agreement, the *Andras-Bienvenue Agreement* signed in 1975, widened Quebec's role in the selection process, allowing Québec officials to hold interviews and make recommendations to visa officers. The third agreement, the *Cullen-Couture Agreement* signed in 1978, gave Québec a say in the selection of immigrants abroad, allowing Québec to define its own selection criteria (CIC, 2010c). This agreement provided Québec with a co-determinative role in the selection of independent immigrants (Garcea, 1993: 123). The fourth agreement, the *Canada-Québec Accord Relating to Immigration and Temporary Admission of Aliens*, signed in 1991, replaced the previous agreements. The accord accomplished what would have taken place in the area of immigration if the *Meech Lake Accord 1987* had been ratified. The *Meech Lake Accord* was a package of amendments to the *Canada Constitution Act* that failed to be ratified in 1990 (Becklumb, 2008b: 2).

Under the *Canada-Québec Accord* and through subsequent renegotiations with the federal government, Québec received most of the determinative roles it enjoys today. It became responsible for setting its own annual immigration targets, selection of persons coming temporarily or permanently (with the exception for refugee and family classes), their admission, as well as providing settlement and integration services for new immigrants to the province with partial federal funding support (Becklumb, 2008b: 4). Québec has independent offices abroad for screening, selecting, and recruiting immigrants. The federal government, however, is solely responsible for processing refugee and family claims from inside Canada. With regard to those selected abroad, Canada determines who qualify in these categories and, in turn, Québec chooses from among them. Although the federal government is solely responsible for processing family members, refugees, and others in similar circumstances, it does not admit those who are destined for Québec and do not meet Québec's selection criteria. And Québec does not commit itself to receiving individuals that do not meet federal criteria (Canada, 1991). Hence, Québec's

immigration targets, selection criteria, and admission right play the overwhelming role in the application of the immigration provision in Québec.

Other provinces have signed immigration agreements as early as 1971. However, it has only been since the mid-1990s, when special provisions were included relating to provincial nominee programs, that the other provinces assumed some key roles in the selection of immigrants. The first provincial nominee program agreement was signed in 1996 between the federal and Manitoba governments. Others were signed in subsequent years. The first nominee programs came into effect in 1999 but it has been during the most recent decade that significant results have emerged in the number and type of immigrants selected pursuant to those agreements (CIC, 2011b: 1).

#### **2.4.2 Interests of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows**

Provincial involvement in immigration and the types of immigration policies the provinces have developed and implemented were influenced largely by the same types of interests as was demonstrated by the federal government. The interests of the provincial governments are explained below. It should be noted at the outset, however, that Québec has been involved for the longest time and has been most active in managing immigration. Because of Québec's more developed interest in immigration, this section devotes particular attention to the political, demographic and economic policy interests of this province as drivers of an immigration strategy.

##### **2.4.2.1 Political Interests**

To reiterate, Québec has established its own department of immigration and has negotiated several significant agreements with the federal government of Canada regarding

immigration policy, criteria, and targets. All these steps in individual provincial immigration policy were stimulated greatly by political interests. Given the centrality of the French language and distinct cultural heritage of the Québécois, the strong desire for extensive provincial autonomy and self-determination has been a significant political factor in influencing Québec to seek greater authority and autonomy in various aspects of immigration in recent decades, including setting immigration levels. The Québec government's political interest in signing the *Canada-Québec Accord* in 1991 was precipitated by the failure of the federal and provincial governments to ratify the *Meech Lake Accord*. The latter was designed to gather Québec's endorsement of the major constitutional amendment of 1982 by granting it more autonomy (Parkinson, 2007). Another major political interest for the Québec government has been the effect that levels and types of immigration flows will have on their electoral goals and objectives (Garcea, 1993: 179).

Political interests have also influenced the decisions of other provincial government srelating to various aspects of immigration, including setting immigration levels. The other provinces have had to find a fine balance between the levels and types of immigration flows and the effects that their policy decisions will have for their electoral support (Garcea, 1993: 49). Immigration is one of those electorally sensitive policy fields in which provincial governments have to be careful to ensure that their policy decisions do not have an adverse effect on their electoral goals and objectives.

#### **2.4.2.2 Demographic Policy Interests**

Since the implementation of the *Immigration Act 1976*, policy-makers in Québec were concerned by the province's projected slow population growth. Since then Québec has been engaged in a project of attracting more immigrants to the province (Seidle, 2010: 2). Immigration

to Québec was seen as a tool not only to maintain population levels in the face of declining birth rates but also to strengthen the francophone character of Québec society. These goals reflect the province's demographic policy interest.

The federal government establishes annually the total number of immigrants for the country as a whole, taking into consideration Québec's advice about the number of immigrants that it wishes to receive. The *Canada-Québec Accord* sets a particular proportion of immigrants selected for Québec. Under the accord, the province of Québec receives a percentage of the total number of immigrants to Canada equal to the percentage of Québec's population in Canada, with a right to "exceed by 5 per cent for demographic reasons" (Canada, 1991).

In entering the *Canada-Québec Accord*, the federal government rationalized the special arrangement by asserting that Québec is unique and has special demographic and socio-cultural needs and imperatives (Garcea, 1993: 455). This rationale was raised during the *Meech Lake Accord 1987* negotiations. Therefore, section 2 of the *Canada-Québec Accord* of 1991 includes a statement to the effect that the goal is to "preserve Québec's demographic importance within Canada and to integrate immigrants to the province in a manner that respects the distinct identity of Québec". According to Becklumb (2008b) this objective was to be achieved through Québec's role in advising the federal government about the number of immigrants it wished to receive and by attempting to ensure that the number of immigrants was proportional to the population of the province. According to the Points System criteria, immigrants must demonstrate fluency in one official language. In Québec the emphasis is on French. However, all immigrants to Québec receive the means to learn French provided by integration services.

Other provinces have demographic policy interests of their own. Generally, the other provinces are less interested than Québec in the linguistic composition of the immigration flow than other demographic factors – age, socio-economic status, and socio-cultural background.

Invariably their goals and objectives are to ensure that the demographic profile of immigration flows is consistent with provincial economic needs and social development and cohesion of the province (Garcea, 1993: 147).

#### **2.4.2.3 Economic Policy Interests**

For provincial governments, the economic policy interests of immigration are influenced by their long term economic development goals and objectives. Overall, provincial immigration policy in the 1990s was designed to increase the immigration flows of independent skilled workers, professionals, and business immigrants to Canada. Economic immigrants were to demonstrate different knowledge and skills profiles that were absent or lacking in the existing labor pool. Québec and the other provinces, however, felt that there was insufficient planning in linking immigration flows to economic policy interests. The provinces maintained that immigrants met general federal criteria rather than provincial economic goals and objectives. Hence, the provinces claimed they would need to take into account regional needs from a long term perspective. But during the 1990s only the province of Québec enjoyed the right of independent immigrant selection, allowing it to provide a list of preferable occupations with regard to its regional economic needs. Therefore, provincial autonomy in immigration policy would allow economic interests to be met through the shaping of selection criteria for independent immigrants according to the long-term economic development goals of the provinces.

## **2.5 Summary and Concluding Observations on the Size and Determinants of Immigration Flows in the 1990s**

With respect to primary objective of this chapter, the evidence reveals that changes in immigration flows during the 1990s were influenced by the political, demographic and economic interests of the federal and provincial governments. The evidence also reveals that the volume of immigration has risen, and that changes have occurred in immigration classes and source countries. During the 1990s, the stated annual immigration levels were generally achieved: the permanent resident volumes exceeded 200,000 annually, and the remainder were temporary residents. The size and composition of immigration levels were designed to address some of the demographic and economic challenges faced by Canada as well as its provinces and territories.

## CHAPTER 3:

### The Nature and Determinants of Immigration Flows of the 2000s

#### 3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to ascertain the volumes, classes, and source countries of immigration flows in the 2000s. Additionally, it will seek to explain the roles and responsibilities of the federal and provincial governments and the political, demographic, and economic interests that underlie the setting of immigration flows. This chapter consists of three major sections. The first section presents an overview of Canadian immigration trends in the 2000s. This section reveals that the immigration flows continued to comprise large volumes of permanent as well as temporary residents.

The second section provides an overview of the federal impact on immigration flows to Canada in the 2000s, highlighting the fact that the new millennium has brought new perspectives and challenges for both immigrants and the country. This section will also explain the effect that the new federal *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act 2002* – replacing the *Immigration Act 1976* – has had through its definition of basic classes of permanent residents: family class, economic class, refugee class. These classes correspond to major program objectives such as reuniting families, contributing to economic development, and protecting refugees.

The third section explains the impact of provincial governments on the immigration flows in the 2000s. During the 2000s many provincial and territorial governments started cooperating with the federal government to determine the levels and composition of immigration flows. This section will examine the determinants that have shaped the Provincial Nominee Programs (PNPs) and identify the general characteristics of the various PNPs, emphasizing their similarities and differences. The section will also explain the provincial political, demographic, and economic interests in setting immigration flows.

## **3.2 Trends in Immigration Flows in the 2000s**

### **3.2.1 The Volume of Flows**

The high levels of immigration to Canada during the 1990s continued throughout the first decade of the new millennium. Moreover, the average annual immigration level has risen. The immigration of permanent residents continued to be high and stable when the volumes of arriving temporary residents started to increase.

CIC's immigration plan set high targets for the 2000s. Between 2000 and 2005 the planned immigration targets were 200,000 to 250,000 visas annually (CIC, 1999a: 7; CIC, 2001: 15). During the next five year period CIC stipulated that the projected annual flows would range from approximately 240,000 to 265,000 immigrants annually (CIC, 2011a: 11). However, in 2010, Canada exceeded the expected levels, welcoming the highest number of legal immigrants in more than 50 years, at 280,636 permanent residents (CIC, 2011d). Despite the exceptionally high numbers of permanent residents coming in more recent years, on average, during the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, 240,000 immigrants arrived annually.

The annual flows of temporary residents during the 2000s reveal a continuation of trends of the 1990s. The temporary resident category has been made up primarily of individuals who have visitor records, including foreign workers and students. By the end of the 1990s the total number of temporary residents, including stock and entries, exceeded 500,000. During the 2000s it has not gone below this number, but rather witnessed an increase of about 50,000 temporary immigrants annually (CIC, 2010b: 52). By analyzing the data on the volumes of temporary residents as presented by CIC in its *Immigration Overview*, it is possible to state the following:

- The number temporary residents receiving visas annually has risen constantly during the 2000s. Whereas in 2000 a total of 306,000 applicants were granted temporary resident visas in Canada, by 2010 this number had increased to 384,000.



- At the beginning of the new decade, the size of the temporary resident stock continued previous trends and rose proportionally in relation to entries. Since 2002 the stock volume has started to exceed the number of entries. In 2002, a total of 310,000 temporary immigrants were granted visas while 360,000 temporary immigrants remained in Canada. By 2010 the stock of temporary immigrants reached 600,000 (CIC, 2010b: 53). This suggests that an increasing number of temporary residents come with the purpose of extending their stay after they arrive in Canada.

### **3.2.2 The Classes of Flows**

Since 2002, when the IRPA came into effect the basic classes of permanent residents have been as follows: family class, economic class, refugee class, and “other”. Generally, this immigration class division was inherited from the previous *Immigration Act 1976*.

The largest permanent resident class in the 2000s was the federal economic class. The economic class was comprised of Federal Skilled Worker (FSW) and business immigrants, individuals selected for their skills and ability to contribute to Canada’s economy. Live-in caregivers and provincial nominees complete the list of economic immigrants. During the 2000s, FSW demonstrated its dominant position within the economic class. In 2008, a new sub-category was added. As stated above, the Canadian Experience Class (CEC) was designed for foreign workers and foreign students with experience in Canada who wished to apply for permanent residency.

The federal economic class as well as its precursor (i.e., the independent class) sustains the majority of economic immigrants in the 2000s. The average number of economic immigrants during the 2000s was 162,169 per year – equivalent to about 62 per cent of the total (CIC, 2003b: 11). The number of economic immigrants at the beginning of the decade was not as high as it was

at the end of the last ten year period. The largest number of economic immigrants in any single year that CIC planned to receive was in 2000. It was projected that 179,900 to 191,700 immigrants would be received. As this immigration target was not achieved, the range was lowered by 50,000 the following year. In 2010 the number of economic immigrants increased to 187,000. This number satisfied the planned target for 2000 and exceeded the CIC immigration plan for 2010 by 20,000 immigrants.

Since the early 2000s the volume of provincial nominees has been increasing. The increase is attributable to the twelve bilateral agreements that the federal government has signed with provinces and territories. Whereas in 2000 there were only 1,250 provincial nominees, by 2010 the number had increased to 38,800 (CIC, 2010b: 6). Their proportion to other economic immigrants to Canada rose. Since 2006, provincial nominees have occupied second place in terms of total economic immigrants after FSW. Since 2008, third place has been occupied by live-in caregivers. Therefore, the business class represented the smallest share of economic immigrants (CIC, 2010b: 6).

During the 2000s the federal family class constituted the second largest group of immigrants (about 25 per cent). The family class is comprised of foreigners sponsored by close relatives or family members in Canada and includes spouses and partners, dependent children, parents and grandparents. The average annual number of family immigrants who came to Canada during the 2000s was approximately 65,000. This was consistent with what CIC planned for this class. The lowest level of family members, 51,500, was set for 2005 (CIC, 2004: 28). The highest level of family class, 71,000, was set for 2008 and 2009 (CIC, 2008b: 11). As we saw earlier, the number of spouses and partners started to exceed the number of parents and grandparents since the mid-1990s. During the 2000s, the partners and spouses sub-category, in fact, has doubled in number. The highest number of spouses, 45,458, arrived in 2005. The number of parents

continued to be lower. However, it would keep its second place within this class. By 2010 the number was reduced to 12,475. During the 2000s, the sons and daughters sub-category varied between 3,000 and 4,000 per year, remaining in third position. (CIC, 2010b: 6).

During the past decade the number of refugees has been relatively stable. The average number of refugees was 28,900 per year; approximately 10 per cent of the total annual immigration flows. The criteria for the entry of refugees in the 2000s became much stricter. CIC started to reduce the number of refugees in its annual plan. In 2010, its plan called for 19,600 to 26,000 refugees (CIC, 2009a: 10). However, the number was raised for the following two years.

The “other” immigrant class is comprised of claimants not recognized as refugees in Canada such as immigrants under stays of the deferred removal orders and post-determination refugee claimants. In 2002, this class included humanitarian and compassionate cases within and outside the family class. Since 2003, temporary resident permit holders started to receive permanent residence permits under the “other” class. In 2004 its target number plan was raised to 8,700. This resulted in a rapid increase from 460 immigrants in 2000 to 8,309 in 2011 (CIC, 2003a: 23). The highest number of “other” immigrants, 11,312, was in 2007. On average the percentage of “other” immigrants has been equal to about three per cent of all immigrants during this ten year period (CIC, 2010b: 6).

The temporary resident classes remained the same as in the 1990s, including foreign workers, foreign students, humanitarian cases, and “other” cases (i.e., visitors). As in the previous decade, the leading position among temporary residents was occupied by foreign workers, the second by foreign students. Even though the number of humanitarian cases increased, their percentage fell, occupying third place. The visitor class remained in last position. Although foreign workers were the most numerous in this decade, during 2002-2004 the numerical size of this group was surpassed by the growing number of foreign students. Since 2005, the temporary

worker class has increased relatively quickly, becoming twice as large as the foreign student class by the end of decade (CIC, 2010b: 53; Becklumb, 2008a: 34). Since the 2003 immigration provisions and CEC implementation in 2008, work and/or study permit holders directly influenced growth of the permanent resident category.

### **3.2.3 The Source Countries**

A combination of “push” and “pull” factors served as major determinants of immigration from source countries. When a new push or pull factor appears, immigration starts to intensify gradually. Conversely, if one of these factors is reduced, immigration from a particular region or country decreases. The top 10 source countries of all permanent and temporary residents represent about 50 per cent of the total immigrant population.

#### **Flows of Permanent Immigrants**

The change in source countries providing permanent residents has been rather gradual. The trends that started in the 1990s continued in the 2000s. Asia continued to supply the majority of immigrants to Canada. Therefore, the most outstanding immigrant source countries were China, India, Philippines, Pakistan, and the Republic of Korea. At the start of the new millennium, China provided the largest number of immigrants– 36,750. China was followed by India (26,100), Pakistan (14,196), Philippines (10,100), and the Republic of Korea (7,635). The number of immigrants from China was the highest in 2005 at 42,292. By the end of first decade, this situation changed substantially; Philippines provided 36,578, India 30,252, and China 30,197. Other countries that have provided a substantial number of immigrants during this time have been the USA, France, Iran, the UAE, and Morocco.

### **Flows of Temporary Immigrants**

During the first half of the 2000 the situation with respect to the source countries of foreign workers was quite similar as in the 1990s. The leading source country for foreign workers continued to be the USA, one of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) partners. The number of American workers entering Canada at the start of the decade was above 40,000 a year (CIC, 2010b: 70). By the mid-2000s, this number was reduced to some 30,000, and by the end of 2010 there were again approximately 35,000. As a result of these flows the USA occupies first place in terms of the number of foreign workers. Mexico, the other NAFTA partner country, occupied the second position of foreign worker entries. During the 2000s the number of Mexican workers arriving almost doubled, so that by 2010 there were approximately 18,000 migrants. The arrival of seasonal workers in the agricultural sector accounts for this increase. By the end of the decade, France occupied third place in this chart. French migrants to Canada had tripled during the decade to approximately 17,000. Australia and Philippines were the next highest source countries at approximately 10,000 migrants each, followed by UK with approximately 9,000 migrants. India followed with roughly 8,000, and Japan with approximately 6,000. Among the top ten source countries for temporary foreign workers Germany and the Republic of Korea occupied the two bottom positions.

By 2010 the largest stocks of temporary foreign workers were from Philippines (46,000), the USA (33,000), and Mexico (21,000) (CIC, 2010b: 72). Even though the number of entries of Chinese foreign workers did not appear among top source countries, that stock continued to increase rapidly. During the 2000s the Chinese worker stock increased eight fold, to approximately 12,000 in 2010. This put China in sixth position in the stock chart.

The principal source countries of foreign students entering Canada in the 2000s were China, the Republic of Korea, India, Saudi Arabia, France, the USA, Mexico, Japan, Germany,

and Brazil (CIC, 2010b: 80). By 2010 the top 10 countries of origin for student stock were, in order, China (56,910), the Republic of Korea (24,620), India (17,525), Saudi Arabia (12,945), the USA (11,330), France (10,045), Japan (5,840), Mexico (4,350), Hong Kong (4,000), and Taiwan (3,350) (CIC, 2010b: 83).

The source countries of humanitarian temporary immigrants during the 2000s were just as unstable as was the case in the 1990s. Humanitarian temporary immigrants are driven largely by “push” factors that are often unpredictable and spontaneous. These flows are caused by unfavourable internal humanitarian situations in source countries. Unfavourable conditions in a source country include those in the USA. After the events of September 11, 2001, the American humanitarian population during the next three years increased dramatically. The “Global Financial Crisis” of 2008 also made people move to countries with relatively stronger and stable economies, including Canada, which explains in part the increase during 2007-2009 in the number of humanitarian cases from the USA (and other countries). In terms of the highest number of entries of humanitarian temporary residents in a single year, the top source countries during the decade were as follows: 9,492 from Mexico in 2008, 4,846 from the USA in 2008, 4,034 from Hungary in 2001, 3,200 from Pakistan in 2000, 2,900 from Sri Lanka in 2000, 2,732 from Zimbabwe in 2001, 2,542 from China in 2001, 2,289 from Colombia in 2004, 1,893 from Haiti in 2010, and 1,836 from Costa Rica in 2003 (CIC, 2010b: 92). The largest stock involved many of these same countries. The largest numbers of the humanitarian stock in a single year were from the following countries: Mexico, Pakistan, the USA, Haiti, Sri Lanka, China, Hungary, Colombia, India, and Somalia (CIC, 2010b: 94).

### **3.3 What Were the Roles and Interests of the Federal Government in Setting Immigration Flows in the 2000s?**

#### **3.3.1 Roles of Federal Government in Setting Immigration Flows**

Under the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* (IRPA), which came into force June 28, 2002, the federal government has retained ultimate jurisdictional authority in determining the size and type of immigration flows to Canada and establishing the overarching criteria (e.g., security and health considerations) upon which the final decision is made if the applicants meet federal and/or provincial needs (Makarenko, 2010). The IRPA has many of the same provisions as the *Immigration Act 1976*, regarding the federal and provincial roles in determining the size and composition of immigration. The IRPA sets out eligibility criteria for prospective immigrants in each class: family, economic, humanitarian, and “other”. These three basic classes of permanent residents correspond to major immigration program objectives such as reuniting families, contributing to economic development and protecting refugees.

The reasons for replacing the immigration law were diverse. Critics of the original immigration law accused the Canadian government of “harbouring terrorists and other criminal elements, granting them temporary refugee until the outcome of their case was determined by the Immigration and Refugee Board” (Mountz, 2010: 18). The slogans “Enough already: it is time to toughen the law” reflected a strain of public opinion at the time.

The IRPA tightened eligibility requirements for particular classes of immigrants. The stated objective of the new law was to eliminate pseudo-refugees or those providing false information. For security reasons the IRPA granted the government new sweeping powers to deal with criminals and terrorists, and whether to arrest, detain, and deport landed immigrants on the suspicion of a security threat (Becklumb, 2008a: 9).

At the same time, under the Canada-United States *Safe Third Country Agreement*, signed December 5, 2002, whose provisions for refugees and asylum seekers came into force in 2004, refugee claimants are only permitted to file an application for refugee status in the country in which they made their initial entry (Canadian Council for Refugees, 2009).

Under the IRPA family class changes also came into effect. The definition of dependent children was narrowed, and financial requirements for sponsorship were raised. With respect to modern values, the definition of partners was widened. The IRPA extended the partner definition, recognizing same-sex and common-law relationships.

The *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* also introduced the economic class of immigration in place of what was previously called the independent class. Since then the economic class has included the Federal Skill Worker (FSW) and the business (i.e., investors, entrepreneurs, and self-employed) sub-categories. The IRPA eliminated the assisted relative sub-category. Its applicants were to be processed under FSW. The FSW selection system was also re-established, reducing the threshold from 72 to 67 points (Kelley and Trebilcock, 2010: 429). It started to take into account the worker's overall capacity to adapt to Canada's labour market. With the disappearance of the assisted relative class, relative connections were granted extra points (CIC News, 2002). The IRPA tightened eligibility requirements for skilled workers and business immigrants. In particular, the admission range for federal economic immigrants has been reduced to permit further growth in provincial nominees. Meanwhile, the capital requirements for business immigrants have also been raised several times during this decade (CIC, 2010a: 8).

Starting in 2007, CIC introduced a new sub-category called the Canadian Experience Category (CEC) within the economic class. To be eligible under this sub-category, foreign workers had to demonstrate at least two years of work experience in Canada and possessed a



valid job offer. One year later the government announced a new CEC stream that included foreign students studying in Canada (Becklumb, 2008a: 36). These streams were opened up to help migrants with recent Canadian work experience, including students who graduated and worked in Canada. Within two years after graduation foreign students with a Canadian degree and one year of work experience were eligible to apply for permanent resident status.

A set of amendments to the IRPA adopted in 2008 made the determination of “humanitarian and compassionate” applications outside Canada discretionary, and gave the Minister power to issue instructions with regard to prioritizing the processing of certain categories of applications (CIC, 2008a). On June 18, 2008, Parliament approved these amendments thereby removing the obligation to process all applications that the CIC receives and authorizing the Minister to issue specific instructions to immigration officers regarding the processing of eligible or non-eligible applications based on the federal government’s immigration goals (CIC, 2008a). The amendments also gave CIC the authority to grant permanent resident status, in exceptional cases, to individuals and families who otherwise would not qualify in any category. Such exceptional cases can occur, for example, where there are either strong humanitarian and compassionate considerations or public policy considerations.

The amendments to the IRPA approved in 2008 were part of the Action Plan for Faster Immigration. The Plan was created to reduce the federal skilled worker application processing time. As CIC Minister, Jason Kenney reported: “The Action Plan for Faster Immigration is designed to make immigration more responsive to Canada’s economic conditions” (CIC, 2011e). Three sets of Ministerial Instructions have been introduced (in 2008, 2010 and 2011) that have reduced the pre-2008 FSW backlog. Under the Minister’s 2008 instructions, immigration visa officers have reviewed FWS applications of three types of candidates. Applicants must respond to Canada’s labour needs and be able to demonstrate such need by having employment offers

from Canadian employers or possessing experience in an occupation that is in demand. Each applicant category has its own application submission process (CIC News, 2008). In June 2010, the government released an updated list of 29 priority occupations and introduced a global cap of 20,000 for FSW. In the following year it reduced that number to 10,000 (CIC, 2011e). Through these measures the federal skilled worker application wait time has been reduced from years to months. The FSW backlog was reduced by 50 per cent in 2011 – two years ahead of schedule (CIC, 2011a: 7). This suggests that the federal minister responsible for immigration has a major role not only in determining the levels and composition of annual immigration flows, but also in categorizing immigrants as well as the pace by which applications by prospective immigrants are processed.

### **3.3.2 The Federal Government Interest in Setting Immigration Flows**

#### **3.3.2.1 Political Interests**

Federal political interest in immigration is determined by particular factors. The major political interest of the state lies in stability and development. The following section examines the political interests that were revealed in the government's economic, social, and humanitarian objectives for the immigration program.

Firstly, a political interest can be seen through the lens of economic merit that immigration brings. Public support for immigration is difficult at best. Although a majority of Canadians demonstrate tolerant attitudes towards immigration, there exists a significant share of the population that does not support immigration. Traditionally, public support for immigration follows from the added benefit that immigrants bring to the country's economy. Therefore, successful immigration policy has to be beneficial economically. It must also demonstrate efficiency, underlining the importance of maintain the strict procedure of nominating potential

immigrants. As mentioned previously, economic need is met by the immigration of the federal economic class (FSW and businessmen), live-in caregivers, and provincial nominees. These are immigrants who are expected to fulfill employer demand, bring significant financial capital to Canada in order to start a business and/or invest in the domestic economy.

A second political interest is to develop and project a positive international image. This is realized by granting visas to refugees and protected persons who fall within the humanitarian class. A progressive response in granting visas to those within the humanitarian class helps Canada sustain this positive image. The IRPA was mainly driven by the need for Canada to make adjustments in its acceptance of humanitarian nominations. The IRPA tightened regulations relating to refugees in ways that helped both differentiate between cases and expedite the decision-making processes. A major purpose of the IRPA was to meet security needs, denying admittance to those people who provided untruthful information or were suspected of being criminals or terrorists. During the 2000s, the political interest in maintaining the security of Canadian citizens has been preeminent. The IRPA eliminates the possibility of abuse of Canada's long-standing "generous" humanitarian approach. CIC Minister Elinor Caplan responded to the critics of the new legislation and regulations: "By saying 'No' more quickly to people who would abuse our rules, we are able to say 'Yes' more often to immigrants and refugees Canada will need to grow and prosper in the years ahead" (Mountz, 2010: 17). With the new provisions in place Canada continued to accept significant numbers of refugees, although lower than in the past. Canada's commitment to refugees was demonstrated in 2006-2008 when it resettled Karen refugees from Myanmar who had been living in camps in Thailand. In 2006, Canada accepted more than 800 Karen refugees, and welcomed about 2,000 more in 2007-2008. In 2007, Canada committed to resettle an additional 5,000 Bhutanese refugees by 2012 (CIC, 2007: 4).

### **3.3.2.2 Demographic Policy Interests**

Another factor that shaped immigration flows was demographic policy interests.

Immigration served as a tool to accomplish at least two goals. The first goal was to offset the flattening of the population age profile as a result of an aging population. The reason for this is that the major demographic challenge Canada faces is its low birthrate, which has a bearing on the overall size of the population. The second major goal is to provide an adjustment to the dependency ratio, which is caused by demographic imbalance in the age structure.

Although Canada's birthrate is increasing, this growth is very slight. In 2001, StatCan counted 1.49 children per couple. In 2011, this number increased to 1.58. Women usually bore their first child in the age of 30-40 years and rarely have more than two children. The problem of an aging population is acute in all the developed countries and Canada is no exception. The average age of a Canadian in 2001 was 37.2 years. In 2011, this number rose to 40.95, where 39.8 is the average age for men and 42.1 for women (StatCan, 2011).

The 2011 census determined that the population of Canada was 33.5 million. One third of the population belongs to the "baby boom" generation. Representatives of this generation were born between 1947 and 1967 (StatCan, 2010). Today these people have started reaching their retirement age. For Canada this means the development of an age imbalance, labour shortages, and, as a result, the lowering of incomes. It also leads to an increase in the number of people requiring social insurance that increases pressure on government expenditures. The combination of these two factors may lead to growing budget deficits in the coming years. Under the circumstances, the encouragement of immigration is justified.

Although during the 2000s, Canada had the highest population growth rate among G8 countries— 5.4 per cent of population in 2001-2006 and 5.9 per cent in 2006 -2011— Canada achieved this increase in population mainly through immigration (StatCan, 2011). Obviously,

there is criticism of utilizing immigration as a tool to meet demographic and labour needs.

Critics, such as James Bissett, claims that immigration does not help the aging problem because it does not rejuvenate the age structure of society. For Bissett only a higher birth rate can improve the situation: “Even with one million newcomers yearly the population will reach the average age of 44.1 in the middle of the twentieth century” (Bissett, 2009: 3). However, immigration improves the existing age imbalance and in doing so it addresses the dependency ratio between the working component of the population and those who draw pension and other social benefits. With the implementation of CEC immigration, foreign students with young spouses and dependent children contribute to increasing the size and proportion of young people in the population.

The public’s opinion towards immigration is of utmost importance. “Immigration has always been fundamental to the growth of Canada as a nation and to [Canadian] history of achievement” (CIC, 2004: 4). This causes public opinion to be more tolerant towards existing immigration policy and newcomers themselves. In this regard, Canada is in a more advantageous position than, for example, Western European countries or Japan, which are very homogenous and demonstrative in their suspicions and largely oppositional attitude towards immigration. This attitude make it difficult for both Europe and Japan to solve their demographic problem through immigration, a problem that is compounded by the fact that the average age in these countries is higher than in Canada. Canada as well as the USA share an advantage because they are “younger” than the other G8 members. Therefore, Canada cannot utilize only immigration to solve its demographic problem but also has some additional time to resolve this issue. Canada will reach the age structure that is current in Europe and Japan within a generation but will also be able to observe and learn lessons from their experiences (Becklumb, 2008a: 5).

### **3.3.2.3 Economic Policy Interests**

Immigration flows were greatly influenced by the economic policy interests of the federal and provincial governments. As was discussed above Canada faces a skilled labour shortage. This shortage must be met both in particular industries and across all regions. The economic fluctuations of the last decade make economic interests of preeminent importance.

In accordance with the demographic and labour market needs of the country and individual provinces, immigration has been used as a tool to meet short- and long-term goals. This includes addressing skills shortages in health, social and community services; transportation; construction; manufacturing; education; and mining among other fields. The implementation of CEC, for example, is expected to provide a new entry route for talented temporary foreign workers and foreign students. It allows skilled professionals to enter the Canadian labour market with the possibility that they will be able to stay and, by doing so, offset worker shortages (CIC, 2009b).

As was mentioned in the previous section, about one third of Canada's population is about to reach retirement age – a major reason for the coming labour shortages. Critics claim that the “baby boom” generation has only started retiring and the younger cohort has just reached its mid-40s. Furthermore, children of the baby-boomers, the so-called “echo boom” generation, have also started to enter into the labour market (Banerjee and Robson, 2009: 129). But when the entire “baby boom” generation has retired, the younger echo-boomers, although constituting a significant cohort of labour force, will lack work experience. This can only result in a shortage of professional and highly skilled labour. Therefore we can conclude that economic immigration remains a very important and effective tool to address these particular labour market challenges.

The economic class is comprised of those immigrants who might be able to sufficiently mitigate national labour shortfalls, enrich the economically active segment of the population

making the economy, and advance the state's prosperity. This explains the existing economic interest towards this class.

Despite the fact that the family class was created to respond to social needs, economic interests also apply in this instance. This class is based on the right to family reunification according to section 3(1) (d) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*. Host countries often consider problematic remittances sent overseas to support families. In 2010, about 300 million immigrants all over the world supported approximately the same number of relatives back home. The remittances from abroad are large and frequently constitute significant financial aid to the recipient countries. For some countries remittances are estimated to be higher than direct investment and represent a significant share of GDP. For example, in Moldova this share is equal to 27 per cent of GDP (Koser, 2012: 44). According to World Bank data, in the early 1990s, remittances amounted to about \$40 billion USD per year, and more recently this sum has increased greatly – up to \$300 billion. The sum of \$114 billion was sent to Asian countries, and \$68 billion to South American countries (Ritzer, 2011:192). Ritzer estimates about 70 per cent of all immigrants that come from the developing countries will settle in the North America. Hence, the outflow of financial capital is expected to be high, too. Often the policies of host countries are designed to slow down the outflow. For example, the USA has contemplated taxation on remittances, despite the potential for causing indignation among immigrants.

Unlike some countries, Canada is trying to construct its remittance policy and other facets of its immigration policy in an efficient and just way. Cognizant of global and regional trends, Canada has adjusted its immigration policy accordingly. Such adjustments serve as reminders that even family class immigration flows are mediated by various economic interests. Social immigrants enter because of family reunification provisions. Therefore, principal applicants are able to immigrate with their relatives. This policy reduces remittances and keeps immigrant

earnings in Canada. In addition, the more immigrants earn, the more they consume in the receiving country. The demographic situation in Canada makes the entry of family members eventually acceptable. In summary, the demographic downturn in Canada makes encouragement of family reunification rational.

### **3.4 Roles and Interests of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows in the 2000s**

#### **3.4.1 Roles of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows**

The IRPA codifies the right of the CIC minister to enter into agreements with the provinces. As a result of the *Canada-Québec Immigration Accord*, more provinces have assumed consultative, co-determinative and determinative roles in the settlement of immigrants (Garcea, 1993: 112). Although the other provinces did not participate in immigration and settlement to the same extent as Québec in the 1990s, they have started playing an active role since then. All provinces and two of the three territories have now entered into one or more agreements. The *Canada-Québec Accord* remains, nevertheless, the most comprehensive (CIC, 2010c).

A brief review of the historical background in the development of these agreements is useful in fully appreciating the system as it has evolved over time. The process started when other provinces expressed an interest in setting immigration levels comparable to those of the federal government agreement with Québec in the 1970s. In 1978 the federal government began to sign new and more substantial agreements with the provinces. To avoid the semblance that it was giving Québec special status, in 1978, the federal government signed the first two agreements with Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia, followed by a number of other provinces. These agreements did not accord the provinces a major determinative role in setting immigration levels (Seidle, 2010: 3). Canada signed an agreement with Alberta on November 5, 1985. Yet this granted only a consultative role in business immigrant selection to this province (Garcea, 1993: 432). During the



early 1990s, provinces began to express dissatisfaction about not receiving what they considered an appropriate share of immigrants. In an effort to appease the provinces, the federal government developed the Provincial Nominee Program (PNP). Under PNP, provinces and territories select and nominate immigrants for their provinces, and design and deliver programs and services for immigrants who settle within their borders. The federal government has committed to provide funding support to provinces delivering such services (CIC, 2004: 7).

During the 1996-2009 period, the federal government signed agreements with the other provinces. Many of these have included a Provincial Nominee Program (CIC, 2011a: 24). In 1999, the first three PNPs programs – Manitoba, New Brunswick, and Newfoundland and Labrador – came into effect. In the last decade, two territories and all other provinces (except for Québec) entered into agreements regarding provincial nominees. Although Saskatchewan and British Columbia signed agreements in the 1990s, these, together with Prince Edward Island's agreement, only came into force in 2001. These agreements were followed by similar agreements for Alberta and Yukon in 2002, Nova Scotia in 2003, Ontario in 2007, and the Northwest Territories in 2009 (CIC, 2012b).

The original PNPs were relatively limited in the number of immigrants that provincial governments could nominate for their respective provinces. The first federal target for provincial nominees was set at 1,000 immigrants (CIC, 1995b: 9). The first nominee programs started in 1999 but the number of provincial immigrants did not even reach 500 nationally that year (CIC, 1996: 3). By the end of the 1990s the number of provincial nominees had not reached 1,000. With the start of the new decade, however, provincial nominees started to exceed this number on an annual basis. The initial quota for provincial nominees was eventually raised to 45,000 in 2012 (CIC, 2012a: 10).

Each Provincial Nominee Program outlines the rights and responsibilities of the federal and provincial governments. Therefore, foreign nationals can come to a province/territory permanently under federal classes or through the PNP. Provincial governments have considerable flexibility to set criteria for choosing nominees and the programs have become highly diverse due to individual PNP streams defined by the application of unique criteria. There were over 50 PNP streams. CIC, however, has re-organized all the PNP streams across the 11 provinces and territories into seven major streams: skilled worker; semi-skilled worker; business; international student graduate; family connection; community-sponsored; and strategic recruitment (Fall Report of the Auditor General, 2009).

Provinces select and nominate prospective immigrants that would positively contribute to its society, and are likely to settle in the province successfully. For example, the community-sponsored stream operates only in those provinces— for example, Nova Scotia and Manitoba — that have identified population growth as the objective of their PNP. Although Manitoba has discontinued its community support stream after three years, key informants suggest that the stream will be reactivated if community groups identify this need in the future. Saskatchewan has also identified population growth as an objective of their PNP, but the province does not implement a community-sponsored stream (CIC, 2012b).

Ontario, Québec and British Columbia remain the top destination provinces for immigrants. However, since 2005 there has been a gradual decline in the immigrant flows to the first two. The immigration trend to Canada's three largest provinces was shaped by the allure of its major cities— Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver. Toronto and Vancouver have experienced declines in immigrant numbers since the mid-2000s. Meanwhile, provinces other than Ontario, Québec, and British Columbia, which have not been the traditionally popular destinations, have recently experienced growth in the number of immigrants. As a result of these trends new

immigrants to Canada have widened the geographic scope of immigration settlement. Provinces and territories take advantage of the benefits of immigration through PNPs and reinforce the notion that their province is a great place to live, work, and raise a family. During 2005-2009, the largest increases occurred in Prince Edward Island (137 per cent) and Saskatchewan (81.4 per cent). But immigration, by virtue of the federal classes to these seven provinces, has remained relatively static over the past years. Indeed, the percentage of federally selected immigrants relative to provincially selected immigrants has declined substantially in some provinces. Saskatchewan is a case in point as the majority of immigrants arrived through the PNP (Saskatchewan, 2007: 3; Saskatchewan, 2009: 3).

As was discussed above, *Canada-Québec Accord* expanded Québec's authority in immigration matters greatly. The federal government was unwilling to grant provisions of Canada-Québec Accord to other provinces. Under the accord Québec selects immigrants independently to its province. The PNP allows other provinces to select and nominate only prospective immigrants, with the CIC making the final decision. Moreover, the quota on provincially nominated immigrants is also significantly lower than Québec's quota. In 2013 the federal government's planned immigration targets will see Quebec receive approximately 36,000 people in the economic class categories to help it meet its economic development goals (Fakete, 2012).

Other provincial governments are not satisfied either with quotas they have been assigned for provincial nominees or the overall number of federally selected immigrants destined to their provinces. In November, 2012 these issues were addressed by the provincial premiers at a meeting of the Council of the Federation on the economy. They announced that they expected the federal government to be more responsive to their preferences for the levels and composition of immigration flows. However, CIC Minister Jason Kenney responded by emphasizing that the

provincial nominee immigration targets had risen dramatically in recent years and at the expense of FSW (Cohen, 2012: A10; and Cohen, 2012:A11). At the time of writing, indications are that federal-provincial negotiations on this matter will be on-going for some time.

### **3.4.2 Interests of Provincial Governments in Setting Immigration Flows**

#### **3.4.2.1 Political Interests**

Provincial political interests have shaped immigration flows during the first decade of this century. The provinces have had two major political interests. The first is to show that they know how to manage immigration in collaboration with the federal government to achieve their demographic and economic goals. This became increasingly more important for provincial governments as part of their efforts to win elections. At the same time provincial governments also had to be careful not to make mistakes in managing immigration flows in ways that would harm their political standing and their chances to win elections.

The major political challenge for provincial governments over time became the effective management of their respective provincial nominee programs. At the provincial/territorial level those programs are managed by each of the provincial/territorial department or ministry responsible for immigration. In addition to managing immigrant flows the other major function of provincial governments is managing immigration settlement and integration services such as housing, job training, and language education. The federal government provides varying amounts of funding either directly to the provinces or to community-based organizations to provide such services. For example, the ministry in Saskatchewan dealing with immigration is committed to ensuring that all settlement and integration services are readily accessible and are provided in a timely, supportive manner so as to ensure positive outcomes for immigrants, employers, and communities (CIC, 2012b). To encourage immigrants to settle and integrate in their provinces,

some provincial governments develop settlement and integration program models which provide funding to third party organizations to deliver settlement and language services that help facilitate better integration.

#### **3.4.2.2 Demographic Policy Interests**

The demographic policy interests of provinces were also influential in shaping immigration flows. As has been noted above, the widespread problem of slow population growth and an aging population is one that immigration addresses. Some provinces continue to be concerned with the expanding dependency ratio between those who rely on pensions and other benefits and those who are working at any given point in time. The resolution of this problem is a major determinant of demographic policy interest as it relates to immigration flows. Under PNPs, each province/territory has started developing its own immigration-related goals and strategies to deal with demographic conditions and concerns. One of the strategies to overcome the aging population problem is attracting young immigrants. Interesting and important trends are revealed in provincial statistics. The majority of immigrants that come through the PNPs tend to be younger than other federal immigrants. The *Saskatchewan Statistical Immigration Report 2009* shows that nominees were approximately a year younger than the average age of the total pool of immigrants.

To advance demographic goals and objectives, provincial governments are implementing policies designed to attract and retain international students in their provinces. Ontario was among the first provinces to grant permanent residency to graduate level students. This policy initiative has also influenced the implementation of the federal government's Canadian Experience Class. The various initiatives involving international students resulted in a system in which provincial governments as well as other actors such as employers and universities have

significant influence on the decision of the federal government about the composition of immigration to Canada (Seidle, 2010: 3). Temporary foreign workers and student graduates are allowed to apply for nomination from inside provinces. Nine of eleven provinces and territories require an applicant to work in the nominating province/territory for a minimum period of time on a temporary work permit as a temporary foreign worker or as a post-graduate worker—a provision that only applies to international student graduates who have earned their degrees in Canada— in order to be eligible for certain PNP streams (CIC, 2012b). In June 2010, federal-provincial/territorial ministers of immigration committed themselves to “work[ing] together to ensure that Canada continues to improve its standing as a destination of choice for international students seeking a quality education” (CIC, 2011a: 9).

Another demographic interest of the provinces has been to achieve better distribution of immigrants across their regions. This has been clearly evident in the criteria that have been used for approving some PNP’s applications. They attract immigrants to diverse locations, so that the geographic scope of immigration widens. The result has been that more immigrants have started settling in communities other than the large urban centres. This is important not only because it provides needed skills in smaller communities, but also because it reduces the problem of overpopulation in the big urban centres to which many immigrants locate.

#### **3.4.2.3 Economic Policy Interests**

Economic policy interests have also continued to influence the positions taken by provincial governments on immigration flows to their respective provinces. Since the end of the 1990s, federal and provincial governments have made an effort through the provincial nominee program to meet the specific labour market or investment needs of individual provinces. In the mid-1990s, Manitoba argued that as a result of selection criteria for economic immigrants based

on the federal Point System the provincial need for workers in skilled and semi-skilled trades had not been met. This intensified negotiations (Seidle, 2010: 3). As was mentioned above, in response to this type of criticism, the federal government then developed the PNP, which, without giving other provinces as much power as it had given Québec, would still “allow each province/territory to identify a limited number of economic immigrants to meet specific regional needs and/or receive priority attention for immigration processing” (CIC, 1996: 10).

As a result of the PNP, provinces and territories have been able to nominate immigrants in categories they need to meet their economic goals and objectives. All provinces and territories currently have an operating skilled worker stream. Seven provinces and territories require a job offer before an applicant can be nominated. Eight provinces and territories have a business stream, but some business streams have been discontinued or are being re-designed. Newfoundland and Labrador discontinued its entrepreneur stream in 2003 and its investor stream in 2007; Prince Edward Island terminated its partner stream in 2008 and entrepreneur stream in 2010; and Nova Scotia brought to an end its economic investor stream in 2006, but is currently considering a farm business owner/operator stream.

The other major economic PNP streams (the semi-skilled worker, international student graduate, and strategic recruitment streams) were created to meet the objectives and needs of each province and territory. Four provinces (Alberta, Manitoba, New Brunswick, and Saskatchewan) have developed a strategic recruitment stream in order to target specific occupations that are in demand. For example, Alberta recruits engineers and British Columbia health professionals. As the labour market of each province and territory changes over time, so do the available PNP streams. For example, Saskatchewan developed a strategic recruitment stream for health care professionals in 2002 and another stream for long-haul truck drivers in 2004 in order to meet labour market shortages in these occupations (CIC, 2012b).

The PNP programs have been deemed to be quite effective in achieving some economic goals and objectives. One of the challenges provinces and territories face is that the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* guarantees all permanent residents freedom of movement. Provinces aim to reduce the incidence of immigrants using a province as a “transit” station to go to other provinces immediately upon arrival. In light of the demand for labour and capital in specific economic sectors and the positive economic and social contributions of newcomers, most provinces continue to improve the PNPs to attract and retain new immigrants. The nucleus of provincial nomination is that an economic immigrant is settling in the province according to his or her arranged employment. For example, in Saskatchewan most categories (except for family members and entrepreneurs) require applicants to have a permanent, full-time job offer from an employer, in addition to education, work experience, and official language requirements (Saskatchewan, 2008: 1). Although arranged employment cannot guarantee that immigrants would remain in the destined province, this obligation often makes them stay.

In recent years the provinces raised the issue of additional control over the number of immigrants they can nominate and receive. Although each province has experienced more immigrants arriving under their respective PNP, several provincial governments are not satisfied with the numbers they receive. At the last Council of the Federation meeting on the economy, premiers insisted that provinces require more control because they are best able to assess local labour market needs related to their longstanding economic goals. Saskatchewan’s Provincial Premier, Brad Wall, supported this position by saying that various provinces, including Saskatchewan, need more immigrants that can fill their specific labour shortages in light of their special economic development goals and trends (Fekete and Couture, 2012: A2).



### **3.5 Summary and Concluding Observations on Size and Determinants of the Immigration Flows in the 2000s**

The primary objective of this chapter has been to ascertain the volumes, classes, and source countries of immigration flows during the 2000s; the federal and provincial governments' roles in shaping immigration flows; and their political, demographic, and economic interest in setting immigration levels. The evidence reveals that during this time the changes in immigration flows were significantly shaped by the political, demographic and economic interests of the federal and provincial governments. Major increases of migrant movement occurred among temporary residents. The volume of immigration remained high. The changes in immigration classes were influenced by the reconfiguration of some classes. The immigration law of 2002 and its further amendment in 2008 created an economic class (which replaced the independent class), introduced the new CEC immigrant category, and eliminated assisted relatives. The family and refugee (humanitarian) classes were redefined. New legislation was also designed to satisfy security needs of the federal and provincial governments, which were paramount in the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. This was expected to reduce claims by refugees considered to be illegitimate while also preventing entry to those deemed inadmissible.

The main change in the roles of the federal and provincial governments was in setting immigration levels. In the late-1990s, several bilateral agreements were signed between the federal government and the provincial/territorial governments. Although these agreements were influenced by the *Canada-Québec Accord*, the PNP agreements did not provide the other provinces with the same guarantees on the number of immigrants. Moreover, they did not guarantee any province individually, or all provinces collectively, the ability or power to determine how many immigrants and refugees would be allowed.

## CHAPTER 4:

### Summary and Conclusions

#### **4.1 Introduction**

The objective of this thesis has been to determine the volume, source, and classes of immigration flows as well as the factors that have influenced changes in those flows during the past two decades. In conducting the research the principal focus has been on the roles and interests of the Canadian federal and provincial governments. In keeping with those objectives, the thesis posed four main research questions: How did the volume of immigration change? How did the sources of immigrants change? How did the classes of immigrants change? and What were the federal-provincial roles and interests that influenced changes in immigration flows? These questions represent key elements of the nature and determinants of the trends in immigration flows to Canada. The objective of this final chapter is to provide a summary and analysis of the answers to each of these questions.

#### **4.2 Summary of Findings on Immigration Flows**

##### **4.2.1 Summary of the Volume of Flows**

Academics who have examined volumes of immigration flows since the 1990s showed that during the last two decades the flows were relatively high and stable; on average 225,000 permanent residents came each year during the past 20 years. During the 1990s the number fell below 200,000 only twice. On the other hand, during the 2000s the flows were significantly above 200,000 annually. Generally, the annual flows corresponded or were close to those articulated in federal immigration plans. During the 1990s and the 2000s the permanent immigration flows remained at this level, but the number of temporary residents started to increase significantly in the 2000s.

#### **4.2.2 Summary of the Classes of Flows**

The federal government has placed emphasis on economic immigration. The primary policy objective has been to meet Canada's labour and capital needs through the permanent resident category. The main immigration classes within the category are the family, economic (previously independent), and refugee classes. By the mid-1990s the volume of the economic class for the first time exceeded that of the family class. On average, the economic class of immigration represented 62 per cent of total immigration in the 2000s. Since 2008, the economic class has included not only federal skilled worker and business immigration (i.e., investors, entrepreneurs and self-employed), but also the Canadian Experience Class sub-category.

Since the beginning of the 1990s, the family class has started to shrink slightly and in the 2000s it declined to an average of 65,000 persons per year. This represented 25 per cent of the total annual immigration. With an increasing number of young immigrant arrivals, structural changes took place within this class. Since 1995, the spouses and partners category within the class has exceeded the parental category in terms of numbers.

The refugee class to Canada is composed of government assisted, privately sponsored, and landed in Canada refugees. During the first decade, the federal plan for refugees projected a gradual decline for each year. By the end of the 1990s the number of refugees had shrunk by half. This was influenced somewhat by the recognition of refugee claimants as non-permanent residents. The aim of this change was to reduce the large existing refugee backlog. The *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act 2002* has narrowed the criteria for the class to reflect security needs. During the first decade of the new century, the refugee class represented a rather stable 10 per cent of all permanent residents.

The temporary resident category consisted of foreign workers, foreign students, humanitarian cases, and "other" cases, including visitors. During the last two decades temporary

workers made up the majority of migrants. However, the foreign student category has started expanding greatly and has become comparable in size to the temporary workers class in the 2000s. With the re-categorization of refugee claimants in 1989 as temporary residents, the humanitarian population immediately exceeded “other” cases.

At the beginning only Québec took advantage of provincial immigration, but since the end of the 1990s provincial nominee programs were created to sustain economic immigration to individual provinces. Between the early 1990s, when the federal and provincial governments signed the agreements, and the end of the 2000s the flows of provincial nominees have increased steadily. By the end of the 2000s approximately 40,000 provincial nominees arrived annually.

#### **4.2.3 Summary of the Source Countries**

The source countries of the permanent and temporary residents vary greatly. This is largely explained by their different reasons for coming to Canada. In the case of permanent residents, the major change in source countries happened prior to the 1990s. That trend continued to develop during the past 20 years and changes were rather gradual and smooth. Since the early 1990s, the flow from Asia increased steadily to the point where it constituted more than 50 per cent of permanent residents. By contrast, the proportion of European immigration has decreased to approximately 25 per cent and it continues to decline. The Asian region now supplies the majority of immigrants. The top 10 source countries provide Canada with over 50 per cent of immigrants. The top source countries are China, India, Philippines, Pakistan, and the Republic of Korea. Among non-Asian source countries that have provided significant numbers of immigrants are the USA and the UK. Recently these were joined by France and Morocco.

Foreign workers have been the most significant class of temporary residents. NAFTA determined the major source countries of foreign workers to Canada. During the last two decades

the USA and Mexico have supplied the largest number of foreign workers. However, the number of workers from the USA stayed relatively stable and the share from Mexico doubled during the same period. The main reason for this trend is the arrival of seasonal workers in the agricultural sector. The top 10 source countries of foreign workers represent 75 per cent of all workers. The USA and Mexico are followed by France, Japan, Australia, the UK, Philippines, India, the Republic of Korea, and Jamaica.

The top 10 source countries account for approximately 65 per cent of foreign students. In the 1990s the USA and Japan were the most important source countries for this class. During the 2000s they were displaced by China and India. The Republic of Korea, France, Saudi Arabia, Mexico, and Germany represent the other top sources countries for foreign students to Canada.

The flow of the humanitarian population from various source countries has been unpredictable. The source countries changed rapidly with regard to “push” and “pull” factors. These factors determine two types of humanitarian flows: constant and instant. Both types are usually affected by natural disasters, wars, rebellions, oppression or as a result of the more rigorous enforcement of laws regarding persons in Canada who were without officially approved permanent or temporary status. Significant increases in instant humanitarian flows during the past two decades originated in the former Yugoslavia in 1999, the USA in 2002 and 2008, and Haiti in 2010. The constant or traditional humanitarian flows to Canada in the past two decades came mainly from Sri Lanka, India, Afghanistan, Peru, and the USA. At the same time there have been increasing flows from China, Pakistan, and Mexico, and decreasing flows from Iran, Somalia, and Israel.

### **4.3 Summary of Findings on Determinants of Immigration Flows**

This thesis has revealed that during the 1990s and 2000s the volume and composition of immigration flows were determined by the political, demographic, and economic interests of the federal and provincial governments. The thesis also revealed that determinants for these three sets of interests of the federal and provincial governments were relatively common. For this reason it is possible to summarize these determinants as follows.

#### **4.3.1. Political Interests of the Federal and Provincial Governments**

The major political interests of the federal and provincial governments were threefold. First, to maintain a positive image abroad with respect to the number and types of immigrants and refugees that would be accepted annually and the way that they would be treated when they settled in Canada. During the past two decades Canada has been portrayed as a country with relatively non-discriminatory, just immigration and settlement policies. Since the late 1980s, Canada has been particularly proud of developing a positive image with respect to receiving refugees. It was awarded the Nansen Refugee Award in 1989. However, during the 2000s, Canada's concern with its humanitarian image was reviewed and modified in light of the terrorist acts of the 9/11. The security needs of Canada led to a substantial change to its immigration law. The IRPA modified the criteria for refugees in an effort to eliminate dishonesty, abuse, and pseudo-claims that represented a threat to national security.

The volume and composition of immigration flows were also influenced by other political interests. One of these was a desire by various provinces to ensure that the size of their population would grow rather than shrink, realizing that in the Canadian political system population size has important ramifications for political power. Another key political factor was the desire to accommodate Québec's demands for a high proportion of immigrants, especially

francophone immigrants. There was a major concern that Québec would separate unless it received greater autonomy and authority within the federation, including determining levels of immigration flows to that province. The volume and composition of immigration flows were also influenced by the interests of all governments to manage immigration in ways that would not adversely affect their electoral standing. Another consideration was to manage immigration flows to prevent a backlash against immigrants and thereby create political and social conflict in the country.

#### **4.3.2 Demographic Interests of the Federal and Provincial Governments**

The volume and composition of immigration flows were also influenced by the demographic interests of the federal and provincial governments. All governments were confronted by some problematical demographic trends. The major trends included the slow increase in the size of the population due to low birth rates and high death rates, an increasingly aging population, and thus a worsening dependency ratio. All governments viewed increased immigration and particularly young immigrants as an important means to mitigate the demographic problems that were confronting the country and provinces.

#### **4.3.3 Economic Interests of the Federal and Provincial Governments**

Economic interests represented the third major set of interests influencing the volume and composition of immigration flows. When the Canadian economy performed poorly in the 1980s, the volumes of immigration flows were reduced temporarily. More focus was directed at attracting financial capital through the business immigrant sub-category to help stimulate the economy and create jobs. As the economy started to improve, however, during the latter part of the 1990s and for most of the 2000s, Canada faced labour shortages in particular within the

industrial sector and even across whole regions. The result was a return to higher levels of immigration and the search for both highly skilled and skilled immigrants who could fill labour market shortages in the new economy. At the same time greater attention was devoted to directing immigration flows to various regions, provinces and other jurisdictions.

Although each province has experienced more immigrants arriving under their respective PNP in recent years, the views expressed at the Council of the Federation conference in November 2012 clearly indicate that the provinces are not pleased with the current situation. The provinces desire more say in setting immigration levels and the ability to nominate even more immigrants under their respective provincial nominee programs (Fekete, 2012; Fekete and Couture, 2012). The response from the federal Minister of Immigration continues to be that while the federal government will increase the number of provincial nominees by approximately 2,000 in 2013, the federal government is not prepared to relinquish authority to the provinces to a point where it reduces Ottawa's ability to have the necessary tools to manage immigration in keeping with the nation's long-term interests (Cohen, 2012: A10; and Cohen, 2012:A11). Clearly, this recent exchange of views between the provincial and federal governments marks the beginning of a new chapter in federal-provincial negotiations regarding the annual setting of levels, composition and distribution of immigration flows.



## APPENDIX 1

### Permanent Residents by Category, 1990-2000

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Spouses and partners	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	36,545	30,913	32,099	30,136	28,323	32,829	35,296
Fiancé(e)s	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5,278	4,629	3,906	3,077	1,918	1,734	1,521
Sons and daughters	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	8,573	6,402	5,455	4,556	4,013	3,986	3,950
Parents and grandparents	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	41,477	33,138	24,625	20,221	14,201	14,487	19,376
Others	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,322	2,304	2,274	1,990	2,442	2,239	2,078
<b>Family class</b>	<b>74,677</b>	<b>87,970</b>	<b>101,124</b>	<b>112,668</b>	<b>94,197</b>	<b>77,384</b>	<b>68,358</b>	<b>59,979</b>	<b>50,895</b>	<b>55,277</b>	<b>60,613</b>
Skilled workers principal applicants (p.a.)	53,712	47,497	47,50	46,819	29,061	34,548	42,151	44,969	35,957	41,547	52,125
Skilled workers dependants (dep.)	included above	included above	included above	included above	40,845	47,183	55,763	60,679	45,308	50,957	66,469
Entrepreneurs p. a.	3,043	2,455	3,866	4,197	3,581	2,991	3,209	2,805	1,770	1,668	1,657
Entrepreneurs dep.	9,220	7,446	11,831	12,469	10,620	8,438	8,702	7,599	4,848	4,487	4,526
Self-employed p. a.	607	609	858	1,081	893	952	1,392	1,258	823	833	795
Self-employed dep.	1,367	1,344	1,960	2,303	1,851	1,902	2,984	2,669	1,802	1,766	1,735
Investors p. a.	1,000	1,238	2,267	3,020	2,565	1,338	1,607	1,522	1,225	1,138	1,390
Investors dep.	3,208	3,951	7,361	9,556	7,915	3,822	4,569	4,073	3,309	3,127	3,561
PT nominees	--	--	--	--	--	--	233	47	0	477	1,252
Live-in caregivers p. a.	--	--	--	3,001	4,584	3,905	2,924	1,831	1,976	1,959	1,760
Live-in caregivers dep.	--	--	--	0	396	1,552	1,835	899	892	1,302	1,023
Assisted relatives	25,393	22,447	19,880	22,819	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Economic immigrants</b>	<b>97,550</b>	<b>86,987</b>	<b>95,528</b>	<b>105,265</b>	<b>102,312</b>	<b>106,633</b>	<b>125,369</b>	<b>128,351</b>	<b>97,910</b>	<b>109,251</b>	<b>136,292</b>
Government Asist. refugees	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7,639	8,202	7,869	7,711	7,432	7,445	10,671
Privately Sponsor. refugees	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3,514	3,546	3,189	2,742	2,267	2,347	2,932
Refugees landed in Canada	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7,810	12,811	13,462	10,634	10,181	11,794	12,993
Refugee dependants	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,474	3,529	3,958	3,221	2,962	2,809	3,496
<b>Refugees</b>	<b>40,236</b>	<b>54,076</b>	<b>52,348</b>	<b>30,623</b>	<b>20,436</b>	<b>28,093</b>	<b>28,478</b>	<b>24,308</b>	<b>22,843</b>	<b>24,398</b>	<b>30,094</b>
Retirees p. a.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,196	90	44	12	0	0	0
Retirees dep.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5,241	214	103	34	5	7	0
DROC and PDRCC p. a.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	9	383	2,608	2,038	1,467	559	260
DROC and PDRCC dep.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	9	74	1,110	1,316	1,072	463	200
<b>Other immigrants</b>	<b>3,601</b>	<b>4,248</b>	<b>5,544</b>	<b>7,751</b>	<b>7,454</b>	<b>761</b>	<b>3,865</b>	<b>3,400</b>	<b>2,547</b>	<b>1,031</b>	<b>460</b>
Category not stated	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>216,439</b>	<b>232,800</b>	<b>254,818</b>	<b>256,704</b>	<b>224,400</b>	<b>212,871</b>	<b>226,071</b>	<b>216,038</b>	<b>174,195</b>	<b>189,957</b>	<b>227,459</b>

Source: EIC, 1993: 61; CIC, 2003b: 8-9, 11.

## APPENDIX 2

### Permanent Residents by Category, 2001-2011

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Spouses and partners	39,403	34,197	39,680	44,227	45,458	45,305	44,912	44,209	43,901	40,764	38,534
Sons and daughters	3,932	3,645	3,618	3,037	3,232	3,191	3,338	3,254	3,025	2,955	2,740
Parents and grandparents	21,341	22,245	19,385	12,733	12,475	20,005	15,813	16,600	17,178	15,324	14,078
Others	2,119	2,205	2,438	2,278	2,209	2,016	2,179	1,519	1,100	1,177	1,094
<b>Family class</b>	<b>66,795</b>	<b>62,292</b>	<b>65,121</b>	<b>62,275</b>	<b>63,374</b>	<b>70,517</b>	<b>66,242</b>	<b>65,582</b>	<b>65,204</b>	<b>60,220</b>	<b>56,446</b>
FSW p. a.	58,910	52,974	45,377	47,894	52,269	44,161	41,251	43,361	40,733	48,821	36,777
FSW dep.	78,321	69,756	59,847	65,557	77,969	61,782	56,601	60,373	55,220	70,536	52,009
CEC p. a.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1,775	2,532	3,973
CEC dep.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	770	1,385	2,054
Entrepreneurs p. a.	1,608	1,176	781	668	750	820	580	446	370	291	184
Entrepreneurs dep.	4,479	3,302	2,197	1,799	2,098	2,273	1,577	1,255	945	796	522
Self-employed p. a.	705	636	446	366	302	320	204	164	181	174	113
Self-employed dep.	1,451	1,271	981	824	714	632	375	341	358	326	236
Investors p. a.	1,768	1,234	972	1,671	2,591	2,201	2,025	2,832	2,872	3,223	2,980
Investors dep.	4,574	3,402	2,723	4,428	7,020	5,830	5,420	7,370	7,434	8,492	7,606
PT nominees p. a.	410	680	1,417	2,086	2,643	4,672	6,329	8,343	11,801	13,856	15,296
PT nominees dep.	864	1,447	3,001	4,162	5,404	8,664	10,765	14,075	18,578	22,572	23,124
Live-in caregivers p.a.	1,874	1,521	2,230	2,496	3,063	3,547	3,433	6,157	6,273	7,664	5,033
Live-in caregivers dep.	753	464	1,075	1,796	1,489	3,348	2,685	4,354	6,181	6,245	6,214
<b>Economic immigrants</b>	<b>155,717</b>	<b>137,863</b>	<b>121,047</b>	<b>133,747</b>	<b>156,312</b>	<b>138,250</b>	<b>131,245</b>	<b>149,071</b>	<b>153,491</b>	<b>186,913</b>	<b>156,121</b>
Government Asist. refugees	8,697	7,505	7,508	7,411	7,424	7,326	7,572	7,295	7,425	7,264	7,364
Privately Sponsor. refugees	3,576	3,041	3,252	3,116	2,976	3,338	3,588	3,512	5,036	4,833	5,582
Refugees landed in Canada	11,897	10,546	11,264	15,901	19,935	15,884	11,696	6,994	7,206	9,041	10,743
Refugee dep.	3,749	4,021	3,959	6,259	5,441	5,952	5,098	4,057	3,183	3,558	4,183
<b>Refugees</b>	<b>27,919</b>	<b>25,113</b>	<b>25,983</b>	<b>32,687</b>	<b>35,776</b>	<b>32,500</b>	<b>27,954</b>	<b>21,858</b>	<b>22,850</b>	<b>24,696</b>	<b>27,872</b>
Retirees, DROC and PDRC	206	0	79	53	20	23	15	2	4	0	6
TR permit holders	--	--	97	148	123	136	107	113	106	109	88
Hum-n and Com-te cases	0	618	2,376	2,984	3,110	4,312	4,346	3,452	3,142	2,900	2,687
Other Hum-n. and Com-te outside the family class	0	3,027	6,645	3,930	3,524	5,902	6,844	7,168	7,374	5,836	5,525
<b>Other immigrants</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>3,780</b>	<b>9,197</b>	<b>7,115</b>	<b>6,777</b>	<b>10,373</b>	<b>11,312</b>	<b>10,735</b>	<b>10,626</b>	<b>8,845</b>	<b>8,306</b>
Category not stated	1	0	1	0	2	2	1	2	1	7	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>250,638</b>	<b>229,048</b>	<b>221,349</b>	<b>235,824</b>	<b>262,241</b>	<b>251,642</b>	<b>236,754</b>	<b>247,248</b>	<b>252,172</b>	<b>280,681</b>	<b>248,748</b>

Source: EIC, 1993: 61; CIC, 2003b: 8-9, 11.

APPENDIX 3

Temporary residents by yearly status, 1990 to 2000

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Total entries	99,575	92,553	87,297	82,580	85,043	86,496	89,276	94,765	100,047	106,755	116,257
Still present	77,575	91,728	84,444	74,119	58,787	55,300	54,099	52,927	54,980	58,234	61,462
<b>Foreign workers</b>	<b>177,150</b>	<b>184,281</b>	<b>171,741</b>	<b>156,699</b>	<b>143,830</b>	<b>141,796</b>	<b>143,375</b>	<b>147,692</b>	<b>155,027</b>	<b>164,989</b>	<b>177,719</b>
Total entries	38,659	38,201	36,387	34,152	35,816	38,275	46,140	48,761	47,743	58,137	68,845
Still present	50,456	57,073	61,952	64,794	61,814	62,021	65,350	72,740	77,067	78,867	89,684
<b>Foreign students</b>	<b>89,115</b>	<b>95,274</b>	<b>98,339</b>	<b>98,946</b>	<b>97,630</b>	<b>100,296</b>	<b>111,490</b>	<b>121,501</b>	<b>124,810</b>	<b>137,004</b>	<b>158,529</b>
Total entries	38,964	33,245	38,113	21,504	22,243	25,771	25,489	24,140	24,891	37,986	37,842
Still present	121,646	148,945	77,817	83,012	78,702	82,074	84,355	83,049	81,019	80,965	92,315
<b>Humanitarian cases</b>	<b>160,610</b>	<b>182,190</b>	<b>115,930</b>	<b>104,516</b>	<b>100,945</b>	<b>107,845</b>	<b>109,844</b>	<b>107,189</b>	<b>105,910</b>	<b>118,951</b>	<b>130,157</b>
Total entries	83,824	77,640	69,361	63,097	61,134	63,766	62,185	64,249	65,319	71,748	81,956
Still present	35,983	42,691	40,259	34,785	30,699	31,193	33,576	35,635	36,403	35,892	39,811
<b>Other</b>	<b>119,807</b>	<b>120,331</b>	<b>109,620</b>	<b>97,882</b>	<b>91,833</b>	<b>94,959</b>	<b>95,761</b>	<b>99,884</b>	<b>101,722</b>	<b>107,640</b>	<b>121,767</b>
Total entries	261,022	241,639	231,158	201,333	204,236	214,308	223,090	231,915	238,000	274,626	304,900
Still present	285,660	340,437	264,472	256,710	230,002	230,588	237,380	244,351	249,469	253,958	283,272
<b>Total</b>	<b>546,682</b>	<b>582,076</b>	<b>495,630</b>	<b>458,043</b>	<b>434,238</b>	<b>444,896</b>	<b>460,470</b>	<b>476,266</b>	<b>487,469</b>	<b>528,584</b>	<b>588,172</b>

Source: CIC, 2011c: 52 - 53.

APPENDIX 4

Temporary residents by yearly status, 2001 to 2011

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Total entries	119,380	110,616	102,932	112,234	122,368	138,461	163,542	190,766	176,800	179,179	190,842
Still present	67,373	71,194	76,868	86,427	101,683	116,916	136,362	170,970	226,688	252,759	256,005
<b>Foreign workers</b>	<b>186,753</b>	<b>181,810</b>	<b>179,800</b>	<b>198,661</b>	<b>224,051</b>	<b>255,377</b>	<b>299,904</b>	<b>361,736</b>	<b>403,488</b>	<b>431,938</b>	<b>446,847</b>
Total entries	80,482	76,290	69,216	65,516	67,411	71,382	73,776	79,270	84,865	95,248	98,383
Still present	105,431	127,612	139,993	150,300	153,902	156,144	159,578	162,846	168,067	182,610	203,459
<b>Foreign students</b>	<b>185,913</b>	<b>203,902</b>	<b>209,209</b>	<b>215,816</b>	<b>221,313</b>	<b>227,526</b>	<b>233,354</b>	<b>242,116</b>	<b>252,932</b>	<b>277,858</b>	<b>301,842</b>
Total entries	45,205	34,698	32,613	26,134	20,422	23,793	29,586	37,943	34,157	24,859	26,196
Still present	96,621	114,581	123,728	126,212	119,549	102,844	92,112	91,647	105,146	111,980	105,326
<b>Humanitarian cases</b>	<b>141,826</b>	<b>149,279</b>	<b>156,341</b>	<b>152,346</b>	<b>139,971</b>	<b>126,637</b>	<b>121,698</b>	<b>129,590</b>	<b>139,303</b>	<b>136,839</b>	<b>131,522</b>
Total entries	84,530	87,723	85,157	89,007	86,716	87,108	88,940	89,425	84,329	80,509	82,784
Still present	44,320	46,945	52,345	52,561	55,298	57,128	57,289	58,401	57,855	54,695	56,299
<b>Other</b>	<b>128,850</b>	<b>134,668</b>	<b>137,502</b>	<b>141,568</b>	<b>142,014</b>	<b>144,236</b>	<b>146,229</b>	<b>147,826</b>	<b>142,184</b>	<b>135,204</b>	<b>139,083</b>
Total entries	329,597	309,327	289,918	292,891	296,917	320,744	355,844	397,404	380,151	379,795	398,205
Still present	313,745	360,332	392,934	415,500	430,432	433,032	445,341	483,864	557,756	602,044	621,089
<b>Total</b>	<b>643,342</b>	<b>669,659</b>	<b>682,852</b>	<b>708,391</b>	<b>727,349</b>	<b>753,776</b>	<b>801,185</b>	<b>881,268</b>	<b>937,907</b>	<b>981,839</b>	<b>1,019,294</b>

Source: CIC, 2011c: 52 - 53.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu-Laban, Yasmeeen. 1998. "Keeping 'em Out: Gender, Race, and Class Biases in Canadian immigration policy", in *Painting the Maple*, edited by Veronica Strong-Boag, Sherill Grace, Avigail Eisenberg, Joan Anderson. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press. pp. 70-82.

Adelman, Howard, ed. 1994. *Immigration and Refugee Policy: Australia and Canada compared*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

August, Martine, and Leo, Christopher. 2007. "The Multi-level Governance of Immigration and Settlement, Making Deep Federalism Work," *University of Winnipeg Blog*, December 12. <http://blog.uwinnipeg.ca/ChristopherLeo/ISW08-12-01.pdf> (November 1, 2011).

Azaad, Sheikh N. July 1991. *Resolving the Backlog: An Analysis of Canada's Refugee Backlog Clearance Program*. Toronto: Department of Political Science, York University.

Banerjee, Robin and Robson, William. 2009. "Immigration's Impact on the Growth and Age Structure of the Canadian Workforce", in *The Effects of Mass Immigration on Canadian Living Standards and Society*, edited by Herbert Grubel. Vancouver, BC: Fraser Institute, pp. 121-145.

Beach, Chares M., and Green, Alan G., and Reitz, Jeffery G, eds. 2003. *Canadian Immigration Policy for the 21st century*. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Beaujot, George. 2003. "Effect of Immigration on Demographic Structure", in *Canadian Immigration Policy for the 21st century*, edited by Chares M. Beach, Alan G. Green, Jeffery G. Reitz. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press., pp. 52-84.

Becklumb, Penny. October, 2008a. *Immigration: the Canada-Québec Accord*. Ottawa, ON: Parliamentary Information and Research Services. Law and Government Division. Library of Parliament.

Becklumb, Penny. September, 2008b. *Canada's Immigration Program*. Ottawa, ON: Parliamentary Information and Research Services. Law and Government Division. Library of Parliament.

Béland, Daniel. 2009. "Ideas, Institutions, and Policy Change." *Journal of European Public Policy* 16(5): 701-718.

Berman, Sheri. 2001. "Ideas, Norms, and Culture in Political Analysis." *Comparative Politics* 33(2): 231-250.

Biles, John, Burstein, Meyer, and Frideres, James, eds. 2008. *Immigration and Integration in Canada in the twenty-first century*. Kingston, ON: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University.

Bissett, James. 2009. "The Current State of Canadian Immigration Policy", in *The Effects of Mass Immigration on Canadian Living Standards and Society*, edited by Herbert Grubel. Vancouver, BC: Fraser Institute, pp. 3-27.

Bothwell, Robert, and Daud, Jean, eds. 2009. *100 Years of Canadian Foreign Policy*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Cairns, Allan C. 1977. "The Governments and Societies of Canadian Federalism," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 10(4): 695-725.

Canada. 1946. *Canadian Citizenship Act*, 27 June 1946. Available: DJ. <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-29/index.html> (October 13, 2011).

Canada. 1982. *Constitution Acts, 1867 to 1982*. Available: DJ. [http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/Const/Const\\_index.html](http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/Const/Const_index.html) (November 25, 2011).

Canada. 1988. *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*, 21 July 1988. Available: DJ. <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-18.7/page-1.html> (October 13, 2011).

Canada. 1991. *Canada-Québec Accord Relating to Immigration and Temporary Admission of Aliens*, February 5, 1991. Available: CIC. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/EnGLIsh/department/laws-policy/agreements/Québec/can-que.asp#levels> (February 2, 2012).

Canada. 1994a. *Canada-Québec Accord Made Easy*, November 5, 1994 Available: CIC. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/EnGLIsh/department/laws-policy/agreements/Québec/can-que-guide.asp> (February 2, 2012).

Canada. 1994b. *Department of Citizenship and Immigration Act*, 23 June 1994. Available: DJ. <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-29.4/FullText.html> (September 22, 2011).

Canada. 2002. *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, 28 June 2002. Available: DJ. <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/I-2.5/> (September 20, 2011).

Canada. 2011. *Balanced Refugee Reform Act*, 19 August 2011. Available: DJ. [http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/AnnualStatutes/2010\\_8/page-1.html](http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/AnnualStatutes/2010_8/page-1.html) (October 13, 2011).

Canadian Council for Refugees. 2009. "Safe Third Country". December 12, 2009 Available: CCR. <http://www.ccrweb.ca/S3C.htm> (August 13, 2012).

Canadian Council for Refugees. 2004. "Immigration and Settlement Resolution". November 2009. Available: CCR. <http://ccrweb.ca/resno04.html> (August 13, 2012).

Chandrasekhar, S. 1986. *From India to Canada. A Brief History of Immigration; Problems of Discrimination; Admission and Assimilation*. A Population Review Book. CA: La Jolla.

- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC). 1995a. *A Broader Vision. Immigration and Citizenship. Plan 1995-2000 Annual Report to Parliament*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 1995b. *A Broader Vision. Immigration Plan 1996. Annual Report to Parliament*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 1996. *Staying in the Course. 1997 Immigration Plan*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 1997a. *A Stronger Canada. 1998 Immigration Plan*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 1997b. *Immigration Statistics, 1994*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 1998a. *Canada – a Welcoming Land. 1999 Immigration Plan*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 1998b. *Immigration Statistics, 1995*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 1999a. *Canada... The Place to be. Annual Immigration Plan for the Year 2000*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 1999b. *Immigration Statistics, 1996*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 2000. *Facts and Figures Statistical Overview of The Temporary Residents and Refugee Claimants, 1999*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 2001. Communications Branch. *Pursuing Canada's Commitment to Immigration. The Immigration Plan for 2002*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 2002a. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2002*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 2002b. Canada Immigration Newsletter. January, 2002. "Proposed Regulations". Available: CIC News. <http://www.cicnews.com/2002/01/proposed-regulations-01328.html> (August, 26, 2012).
- CIC. 2002c. *Facts and Figures Statistical Overview of The Temporary Residents and Refugee Claimants, 2001*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- CIC. 2003a. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2003*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2003b. *Facts and Figures Statistical Overview of The Temporary Residents and Refugee Claimants, 2002*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2004. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2004*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2005. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2005*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2006. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2006*. Ottawa, ON: Communications Branch.

CIC. 2007. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2007*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2008a. *Action Plan for Faster Immigration: Ministerial Instructions*. November 28, 2008. Available: CIC. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/backgrounders/2008/2008-11-28.asp> (August 14, 2012).

CIC. 2008b. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2008*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2008c. Canada Immigration Newsletter. March, 2008. "Federal Skilled Worker Immigration – Four Months after the Implementation of Ministerial Changes". Available: CIC News. <http://www.cicnews.com/2009/03/federal-skilled-worker-immigration-months-implementation-ministerial-03714.html> (August, 26, 2012).

CIC. 2008d. *Legislative Amendments to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*. Available: CIC. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/backgrounders/2008/2008-07-03.asp> (August 15, 2012).

CIC. 2009a. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2009*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2009b. *Becoming Canadian: Canadian Experience Class Students*. March 13, 2009. Available: CIC. [http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/multimedia/video/becoming\\_canadian/students/students.asp](http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/multimedia/video/becoming_canadian/students/students.asp) (August 15, 2012).

CIC. 2009c. *Facts and Figures. Immigration Overview: Permanent and Temporary Residents, 2009*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2010a. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2010*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.



CIC. 2010b. *Facts and Figures. Immigration Overview: Permanent and Temporary Residents*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2010c *Federal-Provincial/Territorial Agreements*. December 20, 2010. Available: CIC. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/EnGLIsh/department/laws-policy/agreements/index.asp> (April 16, 2012).

CIC. 2010d. News Release – *Expanding Canada’s Refugee Resettlement Programs*. Available: CIC. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/releases2010/2010-03-29.asp> (September 25, 2011).

CIC. 2011a. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2011*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2011b. *Evaluation and Provincial Nominee Program*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2011c. *Facts and Figures. Immigration Overview: Permanent and Temporary Residents*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2011d. News Release – *Canada Welcomes Highest Number of Legal Immigrants in 50 Years while Taking Action to Maintain the Integrity of Canada’s Immigration System*. February 13, 2011. Available: CIC. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/releases/2011/2011-02-13.asp> (March 25, 2012).

CIC. 2011e. News Release – *Changes to Economic Immigration Programs Will Help Further Reduce Backlogs and Improve Wait Times*. Available: CIC. June 24, 2011. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/releases/2011/2011-06-24a.asp> (August 25, 2012).

CIC. 2011f. News Release – *Minister Kenney Hits the Reset Button: Sets the Foundation for New, Faster, More Flexible Immigration System*. Available: CIC. July 9, 2011. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/releases/2012/2012-06-28.asp> (August 25, 2012).

CIC. 2012a. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2012*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

CIC. 2012b. Audits and Evaluation. *Evaluation of the Provincial Nominee Program*. January 24, 2012. Available: CIC. <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/evaluation/pnp/section3.asp> (August 14, 2012).

Clifton, Jonathan. 2010. “Fragmented Citizenship: Canadian Immigration Policy and Low-Skilled Portuguese Workers in Toronto.” *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 8: 409-430.

Cohen, Tobi. November 29, 2012. “Reports Says Immigration Needs Boost”. *The Starphoenix*, A10 – A11.

D'Costa, Ronald. 1986. "The Occupational Composition of Asian Indians in Canada" in *From India to Canada. A Brief History of Immigration; Problems of Discrimination; Admission and Assimilation*. A Population Review Book, edited by Chandrasekhar, S. CA: La Jolla, pp. 113-124.

De Eyre, Steve. 2010. "The Prospects for a North American Security Perimeter: Coordination and Harmonization of United States and Canadian Immigration and Refugee Laws," *Canada-United States LA W Journal* 35(1 & 2): 181-207.

Department of Justice (DJ) website. 2011. Last Modified: January 9, 2011.  
<http://laws.justice.gc.ca>

DeVoretz, Don J. 2006. *The Education, Immigration and Emigration of Canada's Highly Skilled Workers in the 21st century*. Burnaby, BC : Vancouver Centre of Excellence.

Dirks, Gerald E. 1977. *Canada's Refugee Policy. Indifference or Opportunities?* Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Economic Council of Canada. 1991. *Economic and Social Impacts of Immigration*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Supplies and Services Canada.

EIDakiky, Magdy, and Shields, John. 2009. *Immigration and the Demographic Challenge: a Statistical Survey of the Ontario Region*. Toronto, ON: CERIS – The Ontario Metropolis Centre.

Employment and Immigration Canada (EIC). 1991. *Immigration Statistics, 1990*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Supplies and Services Canada.

EIC. 1992. *Immigration Statistics, 1991*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Supplies and Services Canada.

EIC. 1994. *Immigration Statistics, 1992*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Supplies and Services Canada.

EIC. 1996. *Immigration Statistics, 1993*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Supplies and Services Canada.

Fekete, Jason and Couture, Joe. 2012. "Flexibility on immigration: labour shortage control". *The Starphoenix*, A1-A2. November 24, 2012.

Fekete, Jason. 2012. "Premiers Calling for More Control over Immigration". *O Canada Postmedia Network*. Available: <http://o.canada.com/2012/11/23/premiers-calling-for-more-control-over-immigration/> (November 29, 2012)

Freeman, Gary P. 1992. "Migration Policy and Politics in the Receiving States". *International Migration Review* 26(4): 1144-1167.

Garcea, Joseph. 1993. "Federal-provincial Relations in Immigration, 1971-1991: A Case Study of Asymmetrical Federalism". Doctoral dissertation. Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

Gardiner-Barber, Pauline. 2008. "The Ideal Immigrant? Gendered Class Subjects in Philippines-Canada Migration." *Third World Quarterly* 29(7): 1265-1285.

Green, Allan. 2003. "What is the Role of Immigration in Canada's Future?" in *Canadian Immigration Policy for the 21st century*, edited by Chares M. Beach, Alan G. Green, Jeffery G. Reitz. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press., pp. 33-46.

Grubel, Herbert, ed. 2009. *The Effects of Mass Immigration on Canadian Living Standards and Society*. Vancouver, BC: Fraser Institute.

Grubel, Herbert. 2011. *Immigration and the Canadian welfare state*, edited by Herbert Grubel and Patrick Grady. Vancouver, BC: Fraser Institute.

Hawkins, Freda. 1988. *Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern*. 2nd Edition. McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hawkins, Freda. 1991. *Critical Years in Immigration: Canada and Australia Compared*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hoeder, Dirk, and Faires, Nora. 2011. *Migrants and Migration in Modern North America. Cross-boarder, Labor, Markets, and Politics*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.  
<http://esa.un.org/migration/p2k0data.asp> (November 26, 2011).

International Organization for Migration (IOM). "Migration Typologies." Available: IOM.  
<http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/pid/522> (December 1, 2011).

Kelley, Ninette and Trebilcock, Michael. 2010. *The Making of Mosaic: a History of Canadian Immigration Policy*, second edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division.

Koser, Khalid. 2012. "Why Migration Matters?" in *Global Issues: Annual Editions 11-2*, ed. by Robert Jackson. New York: McGraw Hill, pp. 41-46.

Labman, Shauna. 2011. "Queue the Rhetoric: Refugees, Resettlement and Reform." *University of New Brunswick Law Journal* 62: 55-63.

Ley, David. 2003. "Seeking Homo Economicus: The Canadian State and the Strange Story of the Business Immigration Program." *Annals of Association of American Geographers* 93(2), Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing 93(2): 426-441.

Lopes, Eva. 2007. "New Colonization." Paper presented at 12th International Metropolis Conference: Rural Communities, Migration, Economic Growth and Social Cohesion, Australia, Melbourne, October 8-12.

Luedtke, Adam. December, 2004. "Citizenship, Economics, and Immigration in a Federal Polity: Evidence from Canada and the EU," Centre d'etudes canadiennes at University of Washington, Cycle de Conférences 2004-2005.

Makarenko, Jay. August 12, 2010. "Immigration Policy in Canada: History, Administration and Debates". *Mapleleafweb*. Available: Mapleleafweb.

<http://www.mapleleafweb.com/features/immigration-policy-canada-history-administration-and-debates> (August 8, 2012).

Marchildon, Gregory P, eds. 2009. *Immigration and Settlement, 1870-1939*. Regina: University of Regina: CPRC Press.

Massey, Douglas S. 1999. "International Migration at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century: The Role of the State." *Population and Development Review*, pp. 303-322.

McHale, John. 2003. "Canadian Immigration Policy in Comparative Perspective", in *Canadian immigration policy for the 21st century*, edited by Chares M. Beach, Alan G. Green, Jeffery G. Reitz. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press., pp. 217-252.

Miller, David. 1995. *On nationality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mountz, Alison. 2010. *Seeking Asylum: Human Smuggling and Bureaucracy at the Border*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2008. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism," in *The global justice reader*, ed. by Thom Brooks. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., pp. 306-314.

Office of the Auditor General of Canada. November 3, 2009. *Fall Report of the Auditor General of Canada*. Available: OAG. [http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl\\_oag\\_200911\\_02\\_e\\_33203.html](http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_oag_200911_02_e_33203.html) (16 February, 2012).

Parkinson, Rhonda. September 17, 2007. "Meech Lake Accord: History and Overview". *Mapleleafweb*. Available: Mapleleafweb. <http://www.mapleleafweb.com/features/meech-lake-accord-history-overview> (August 8, 2012).

Phillips, Nicola, ed. 2011. *Migration in the Global Political Economy*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Ritzer, George. 2011. "Global Flow of Migrants," in *Globalization: The Essentials*, Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 178-203.

Roberts, David J., and Mahtani, Minelle. 2010. "Neoliberalism: Placing "Race" in Neoliberal Discourses." *Editorial Board of Antipode* 42(2): 248-257.

Rodrik, Dani. 2011. "Has Globalization Gone Too Far?" in *The Globalization Reader*, ed. by Frank J. Lechner & John Boli. Malden Mass.: Blackwell, pp 231-236.

Saskatchewan. 2007. Ministry of Advanced Education, Employment and Labour (AEEL). Immigration Services Division. 2007. *Saskatchewan Statistical Immigration Report 2007*. Available: Government of Saskatchewan. <http://www.aeei.gov.sk.ca/sk-immigration-statistical-report-2007> (16 June, 2012).

Saskatchewan. 2008. *Saskatchewan Statistical Immigration Report 2008*. Available: Government of Saskatchewan. <http://www.aeei.gov.sk.ca/sk-immigration-statistical-report-2008> (16 June, 2012).

Saskatchewan. 2009. *Saskatchewan Statistical Immigration Report 2009*. Available: Government of Saskatchewan. <http://www.aeei.gov.sk.ca/sk-immigration-statistical-report-2009> (16 June, 2012).

Seidle, F. Leslie. 2010. *The Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement: Assessment and Options for Renewal*. Toronto, ON: Mowat Centre for Policy Innovation, School of Public Policy & Governance, University of Toronto.

Smick, Elisabeth. 2006. "Canada's Immigration Policy." *Background*. July 6. Available: Council on Foreign Relations. <http://www.cfr.org/canada/canadas-immigration-policy/p11047> (September 12, 2011).

Statistics Canada (StatCan). 2003a. *Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada: Process, Progress and Prospects*. Ottawa.

StatCan. 2003b. *Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada: Progress and Challenges of New Immigrants in the Workforce*. Ottawa.

StatCan. 2005a. *Knowledge of Official Languages Among New Immigrants: How Important Is It in the Labour Market?* Ottawa.

StatCan., 2005b. *Population and growth components*. (1851-2001 Censuses of Canada). January, 28, 2005. Available: StatCan. <http://www40.statcan.gc.ca/l01/cst01/demo03-eng.htm?sdi=immigration> (October 12, 2011).

StatCan. 2008. *Upper Canada & Loyalists (1785 to 1797)*. Available: StatCan. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/98-187-x/4151286-eng.htm> (January 3, 2012).

StatCan. 2010. *Projections of the Diversity of the Canadian Population, 2010*. Available: StatCan. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/cgi-bin/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=5126&lang=en&db=imdb&adm=8&dis=2> (September 20, 2011).

StatCan. 2011. *Report on the Demographic Situation in Canada*. Available: StatCan. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/91-209-x/91-209-x2011001-eng.htm> (August 15, 2012).

StatCan. 2012a. *Population Growth Rate (in percentage) of the G8 Countries, 2001 to 2006 and 2006 to 2011*. Available: StatCan. <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/98-310-x/2011001/fig/fig1-eng.cfm> (August 15, 2012).

StatCan. 2012b. *Population of Canada, 1951-2011*. Available: StatCan <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/98-310-x/2011001/fig/fig2-eng.cfm> (August 15, 2012).

Steinweg, Isabel. 2006. "United Nations High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development." *Dialogue on Globalization. Fact Sheet FES New York*. October, 2006. Available: FES. <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/iez/global/50410.pdf> (October 2, 2011).

Strutz, Andrea. 2011. "Post 1945 Transatlantic Austrian Migration to Canada," in *Cultural Constructions of Migration in Canada*, ed. by Ertler, Klaus-Pieter, Löschnigg, Martin, and Völkl Yvonne. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Wissenschaften, pp. 239-254.

Sturhahn, William J. H. 1976. *They Came from East and West: a History of Immigration to Canada*. Winnipeg: North American Baptist Immigration and Colonization Society.

*The Economist*. 2011. "Weaving the World Together", November 19-25, 2011400 (8760): pp. 72-74 UN Database website. 2012. <http://www.data.un.org>

United Nations (UN). 1948. "Universal Declaration of Human Rights", Paris, 10 December 1948.

UN.1951. "Convention relating to the Status of Refugees," Geneva, 28 July 1951.

UN.1967. "Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees," New York, 31 January 31, 1967.

UN. 1984. "Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment," New York, 10 December 1984.

UN. 2002. *Population Census Questionnaire. Demographic Yearbook*, NY: UN.

UN. 2005. *Questionnaire on International Travel and Migration Statistics. Demographic Yearbook*, NY: UN.

UN. 2006. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Population Division. 2006. *Compendium of Recommendations on International Migration and Development: The United Nations Development Agenda and the Global Commission on International Migration Compared*. New York: UN.

UN. 2008. General Assembly, 63rd Session. 2008. *International Migration and Development. Report of Secretary-General*. Geneva: UN, August 11.

UN. 2009. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Population Division. 2009. *Trends in International Migrant Stock: The 2008 Revision*. Available: UN.

UN. 2012. General Assembly, 67th Session. 2012. *International Migration and Development. Report of Secretary-General*. Geneva: UN, August 3.

Veugelers, John W.P. February, 2000. "State-Society Relations in the Making of Canadian Immigration Policy During the Mulroney Era", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 37(1): 95-110.

Walker, Barrington. 2008. *The History of Immigration and Racism in Canada*. Essential Readings. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press Inc.

Walsh, James. 2005. "From Genetic to Economic Nationalization; Immigration and Citizenship Policies as Historical Forms of Boundary Construction and Maintenance. The Cases of Australia and Canada." Paper presented at the Conference of American Sociological Association.

Walsh, James. 2008. "Navigating Globalization: Immigration Policy in Canada and Australia, 1945–2007." *Sociological Forum* 23(4): 786-813.

Wanner, Richard. 2011. *Immigration policy and the economic integration of immigrants: a cross-national comparison*. Edmonton, Alta.: Prairie Metropolis Centre.

Wilson, Stuart J. 2003. "Immigration and Capital Accumulation in Canada: A Long-Run Perspective", in *Canadian Immigration Policy for the 21st century*, edited by Chares M. Beach, Alan G. Green, Jeffery G. Reitz. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press., pp.125-152.

Winterdyk, John A., and Sundberg, Kelly W. 2010. "Assessing Public Confidence in Canada's New Approach to Border Security." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 25(3&4): 1-18.

Wolf, Martin. 2004. *Why Globalization Works?* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Wolper, Amy. 2010. "Unconstitutional and Unnecessary: a Cost/Benefit Analysis of "Crimes Involving Moral Turpitude" in the Immigration and Nationality Act." *Cardozo Law Review* 31(5): 1907-1942.