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Global Context

• Global mobility and identities
• Increased prominence of religion
• Influence of US and European debates and growing xenophobia
• Commonalities and differences with indigenous issues
Immigration-Based Society
Culture of Accommodation

• Canada built by successive waves of immigration

• Accommodation (imperfect) among Indigenous, French, and British

• Context for later later group arrivals and multiculturalism

• Immigrant to citizen expectation
Canadian Model of Integration

Selection
- Immigration (Permanent Residents)
- Foreign Workers (Temporary Residents)

Short-term Integration
- Language Orientation
- Employment

Citizenship
- Requirements
- Ceremonies and Awareness

Multiculturalism

Canadian History, Identity and Values
In keeping with the democratic belief in the dignity and freedom of the individual, it is felt that integration should be voluntary and should not be pressed. It is assumed that integration is more moderate in its demands on the immigrant and less painful for him than assimilation would be. Assimilation usually means the complete absorption of the newcomer by the dominant culture. In the process, cultural and social differences are worn off and a more-or-less homogeneous society emerges. Integration, on the other hand, recognizes and respects the cultural contributions that may be made by people of diverse ethnic backgrounds who, nevertheless, are devoted to the welfare of the same country.

The ultimate responsibility for integration rests with the Canadian people for, without their acceptance of the newcomers into community life, there can be no integration. One of the main objectives of the Citizenship Branch* therefore has been to encourage understanding and co-operation between old and new Canadians and between the various ethnic groups in the population.
Integration, in the broad sense, does not imply the loss of an individual's identity and original characteristics or of his original language and culture. Man is a thinking and sensitive being; severing him from his roots could destroy an aspect of his personality and deprive society of some of the values he can bring to it. *Integration is not synonymous with assimilation*. Assimilation implies almost total absorption into another linguistic and cultural group. An assimilated individual gives up his cultural identity, and may even go as far as to change his name. Both integration and assimilation occur in Canada, and the individual must be free to choose whichever process suits him, but it seems to us that those of other than French or British origin clearly prefer integration.
Integration-related Policies

• 1960s — Discrimination removed from immigrant selection (1962); points system introduced (1967)

• 1971 — Multiculturalism Policy

• 1977 — Citizenship Act

• 1982 — Charter of Rights and Freedoms

• 1986 — Employment Equity Act

• 1988 — Multiculturalism Act
Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982)

• Fundamental freedoms
  (a) freedom of conscience and religion;
  (b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication;
  (c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and
  (d) freedom of association.

• Equality
  15. (1) Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.

• Multiculturalism
  27. This Charter shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians.
Key policies
# Evolving Immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>1867-1914</th>
<th>1915-1945</th>
<th>1946-1985</th>
<th>1986-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Settling the land</td>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>Labour shortages</td>
<td>Skills shortage, address aging population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Highly skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origins</td>
<td>UK &amp; USA, 1896-on Northern, Central and Eastern Europe</td>
<td>Removal of racial limits, point system introduced (1960s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Chinese, Indian, Jewish, Black etc</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Extensive Fed &amp; Provincial</td>
<td>Railways, none after 1929</td>
<td>Ongoing and focused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Mainly Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater provincial role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Prohibited classes</td>
<td>Appeal Board</td>
<td>CBSA created 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Extensive, subsidized passage, free land, Immigration Halls and Aid Societies</td>
<td>Employment focus, orientation, language</td>
<td>Increased funding, overseas services, Credential Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>Largely closed, but Mennonites and some Jews</td>
<td>Post-war waves, SCC decision on right to hearing</td>
<td>Immigrant and Refugee Board, safe third country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Immigration - Selection

• Focus on labour force (economic class 60 percent), then families and refugees
  • Express Entry weighting: age, language, education, job offer, provincial nominee

• Managed and controlled

• Temporary — high-skilled focus with some low-skilled
Immigration Mix
By Category, Long-term 1980-2016

Annual Average
1980s - 126,000
1990s - 220,000
2000s - 241,000
2010s - 268,000

Economic  Family  Refugees  Other
Immigration Numbers
By Category, 2006-16 (~75 percent 15-59 years old)
Temporary Foreign Workers
By Category, 2006-15 (Full and Part-Time)
Temporary to Permanent Transition

2006-15 Total

- International Agreements: 10.8%
- TFW High Skilled: 7.3%
- Canadian Interests: 7.2%
- TFW Low-Skilled: 2%
Refugee Numbers
By Sub-Category, 2006-16

In Canada  Privately Sponsored  Government-Assisted  Blended
Integration and Settlement

- $1.2 billion annually (69 percent IRCC budget 2016-17)
- Language learning, community and employment bridging services, settlement information
  - About 400,000 unique clients 2015-16
- Information, path-finding and referral services to internationally trained individuals obtain credentials to practice in Canada
- Most services designed and delivered by service provider organizations (SPOs)
# Evolving Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birthright</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (years)</td>
<td>5 after 1919 (shorter earlier)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Ages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-64 (18-54 2005)</td>
<td>14-64</td>
<td>18-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual nationality</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>“good character”</td>
<td>“good character”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to reside</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>Declaration before age 22</td>
<td>Declaration before age 25</td>
<td>Declaration before age 28</td>
<td>First generation limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation (fraud)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation (terrorism)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citizenship - Key Aspects

• Facilitation and meaningfulness balance
• Birthright citizenship
• Short residency (3/5 years) with physical presence
• Language and knowledge assessment (18-54 year olds)
• Fraud and misrepresentation investigations
Citizenship Applications & Citizens

2000-16 IRCC Operational Data

- Citizenship Applications
- 3-Year Moving Average
- New Citizens

PR Trendline
# Evolving Multiculturalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference Point</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Society building</td>
<td>Canadian identity</td>
<td>Canadian values</td>
<td>Inclusive Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Race relations</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Individual adjustment</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Rights and responsibilities</td>
<td>Responsibilities and rights</td>
<td>Diversity as strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Source</td>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>Systemic discrimination</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>Unequal access, “clash” of cultures</td>
<td>Faith and culture clashes</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Cultural sensitivity</td>
<td>Employment equity</td>
<td>Inclusiveness</td>
<td>Dialogue/mutual understanding</td>
<td>Shared values, anchored in history</td>
<td>Shared values, universalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Metaphor</td>
<td>“Mosaic”</td>
<td>“Level playing field”</td>
<td>“Belonging”</td>
<td>“Harmony/jazz”</td>
<td>“Conforming”</td>
<td>“Embracing”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from A. Fleras and Jean Kunz, *Media and Minorities: Representing Diversity in a Multicultural Canada.*
Multiculturalism Policy and Act
1971, 1988

• To assist cultural groups to retain and foster their identity

• To assist cultural groups to overcome barriers to their full participation in Canadian society

• To promote creative exchanges among all Canadian cultural groups

• To assist immigrants in acquiring at least one of the official languages
Employment Equity 1986

- Objective: Workplace equality by ensuring that ability and qualifications are the only criteria for opportunities, benefits, and advancements

- Women, visible minorities, Indigenous and persons with disabilities

- Applies to public service and federally regulated industries

- Premises
  - No one shall be denied employment opportunities and benefits for reasons unrelated to ability
  - Special measures are necessary to improve the employment
  - "Reasonable accommodation" to recognize legitimate differences and take reasonable steps to accommodate
What the data shows
Demographic

• More complex, varied diversity — ethnic and religious

• Toronto, Vancouver and Calgary, not MTV

• Dispersion to smaller centres

• 2036 projections — between 24 to 30 percent immigrants, one in five second generation, together close to 50 percent

Implications and Risks

• More debate and discussion regarding “reasonable” accommodation

• More communities and institutions affected
Economic

- Strong participation rates
- Persistence of economic differences
  - But university-educated 25-34 second generation largely comparable
- Quebec outcomes significantly poorer

Implications and Risks

- Weaker inclusion of second-generation non-university educated
- Poorer outcomes for some groups (Black, Latin American)
  - Communities to focus both on external and internal barriers
- Ongoing discrimination in hiring
Social

- Strong education outcomes
- Some discrimination and hate crimes persist
- Healthcare and education reasonably representative
- More mixed ‘ethnic enclaves’ than majority ones

Implications and Risks

- Gap between education and economic outcomes
- Challenge in overcoming implicit bias
- Greater prevalence of some groups in support positions
Political

- Immigrant to citizen model at risk given declining naturalization (high fees)
- Under-representation in elected officials, judges, GiCs
  - Post-2015 election Cabinet and other appointments addressing gap
- Federal public service largely representative, provincial and municipal less
- Media diversity improving, both coverage and journalists

Implications and Risks

- Weakened social fabric
  - Increased number of marginalized long-term non-citizens
  - Judicial decisions may not reflect Canada’s diversity
  - DND and RCMP need to address weak representation
Public Attitudes on Immigration
Focus Canada 2016, Environics Institute

**Concerns**
- Not adapting Canadian values: 25% Strongly Agree, 29% Somewhat Agree, 25% Somewhat Disagree, 15% Strongly Disagree
- False refugee claims: 12% Strongly Agree, 27% Somewhat Agree, 26% Somewhat Disagree, 18% Strongly Disagree
- Too much immigration: 15% Strongly Agree, 22% Somewhat Agree, 31% Somewhat Disagree, 27% Strongly Disagree
- Increases level of crime: 9% Strongly Agree, 17% Somewhat Agree, 34% Somewhat Disagree, 34% Strongly Disagree

**Confidence**
- Immigration positive for economy: 40% Strongly Agree, 40% Somewhat Agree, 10% Somewhat Disagree, 6% Strongly Disagree
- Good job keeping criminals out: 23% Strongly Agree, 42% Somewhat Agree, 16% Somewhat Disagree, 10% Strongly Disagree
- Immigrants work harder: 19% Strongly Agree, 34% Somewhat Agree, 23% Somewhat Disagree, 16% Strongly Disagree

Legend:
- Blue: Strongly Agree
- Light Blue: Somewhat Agree
- Orange: Somewhat Disagree
- Red: Strongly Disagree
- Gray: Neither/DK
# International Comparisons

2015 OECD Integration Report (mainly 2012 data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>AUS</th>
<th>NZ</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Foreign-born</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social - Education compared to native-born**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>AUS</th>
<th>NZ</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PISA G2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary 15-64</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic compared to native-born**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>AUS</th>
<th>NZ</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household poverty rates</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate Household Ratio</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment 15-34 G2</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Employment 15-34 G2</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>-11.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
<td>-17.5%</td>
<td>-25.4%</td>
<td>-16.9%</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>-28.9%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>-23.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Political**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>AUS</th>
<th>NZ</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization 15 or older, 10 years</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PS data for Canada and Denmark from 2008 report
## International Comparisons

### MIPEX 2015 Policy Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>AUS</th>
<th>NZ</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour Market Mobility</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Reunion</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Participation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Residence</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access To Nationality</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-discrimination</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### International Comparisons
#### Multiculturalism Policy Index 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>AUS</th>
<th>NZ</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemptions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concluding observations
Models Reflect Realities

- Geography, history, culture, demographic mix
- Host society attitudes
- Canada’s model reflects these factors
Is Canada Unique? Resilient?
Keith Banting

- Economic insecurity
  - Growing inequality and precarious employment

- Cultural insecurity
  - Perceived ‘triple threat’ of immigration/multiculturalism
  - Economic threat, cultural threat, security threat

- Political opportunity
  - Political incentives to mobilize anti-immigrant backlash
  - Electoral system, ethnic voter concentration, number of new Canadian voters provide counterbalance
    - All parties court ethnic votes
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