

**POGG**  
**(Peace Order & Good Government)**

**Ottawa, Canada**

**GROWING A SUSTAINABLE CANADA - GETTING IMMIGRATION RIGHT**

**POGG IMMIGRATION REPORT 1**

**April 2008**

**APPENDICES**

A.	The Evolution of Canada's Immigration Policy	2
B.	The Immigration & Refugee Protection Act - The Objectives of the Act	4
C.	Charter of Rights and Freedoms	9
D.	A Central Role for Canadian Values	10
E.	Political Considerations	14
F.	Job-Driven Selection and Settlement of New Canadians	15
G.	Qualifications and Absorption	18
H.	Entry, Enforcement and Removals	20

## APPENDIX 'A' The Evolution of Canada's Immigration Policy

Immigration in Canada has gone through many stages of development during the life of our country. In a 2006 presentation entitled: The Canadian Immigration System: An Overview, Geneviève Bouchard, Research Director for Governance at the Institute for Research on Public Policy described eight immigration periods.

Period one, 1867-1919, focused on the opening of the west by attracting farmers and “hardy” settlers. But it was also the time of the head tax, a period when, once the numbers of “oriental” immigrants were in the country; further Orientals were charged large amounts of money to apply. This includes the World 1 period.

Period two: 1919 – 1929, saw more regulation put into place, some based on racial features. A literacy test was also in place. It was in this period that the government recognized a policy of “short-term absorptive capacity”; the ability of the country to absorb immigrants based on current employment, social and/or cultural conditions.

Period three: 1930s and 40s, with conditions of high unemployment, the immigration taps were turned off. Those who were allowed entry were part of the family reunification program.

Period four: 1946 – 1962, was a time of rapid re-growth following WWII. However, two features formed the basis of the policy. The first was that the devastation in Europe led the government to favour displaced persons. The second was a 1947 speech given by Prime Minister Mackenzie King that stated that the purpose of immigration was population growth and improved Canadian standard of living. He emphasized in his speech: “...immigration should not change the basic character of the Canadian population.”

In 1952, the New Immigrant Act allowed for “refusal of admission on the grounds of nationality, ethnic group, geographical area of origin, peculiar customs, habits and modes of life, unsuitability with regard to the climate, probable inability to become readily assimilated.”

For the first time, assimilation and the character of Canada were being discussed.

Period five: 1962-1973, saw a complete change in policy. Canada abandoned its racist policies to allow admission to be based on individuals characteristics; not nationality. A points system was established and immigration posts, staffed by Canadians, were established in third world countries.

Period six: 1974 – 1985, was a time of swinging business cycles in Canada. Immigration inflows fluctuated based on the economic situation at the time. In 1976, the Immigration Act defined three priorities for the policy: 1) family reunification; 2) humanitarian concerns; and 3) promotion of Canada's economic, social, demographic and cultural goals.

Period seven: 1986 -1993, in many ways this was a watershed period in immigration policy. By 1985 the fertility rate had dropped and the 1% inflow target was set. In 1993, the previous policy of absorptive capacity was abandoned.

Period eight: 1993 – today, we are in a period where youth, language and education give high marks to immigrants, however the classes of immigrants has been increased so that many more “augmented” immigrants (family class, etc) are admitted for every “working” immigrant. In this period, highly educated professionals are being admitted when no jobs exist for them, or they are not up to Canadian standards with their foreign qualifications.

In 2005, there were 262,157 immigrants to Canada. Only 56.1% were economic immigrants<sup>1</sup>, or potential

---

<sup>1</sup> The 56.1% includes the family members of the skilled immigrant.

workers. The rest were family members and/or refugees. Of this number, 53.6% settled in Ontario, 17.1% in BC, 16.5% in Quebec and 7.4% in Alberta. The remainder, just over 5%, settled in the rest of Canada.

Over the years, immigration to Canada has gone from a tool to boost the welfare of the country and its people to a policy of what might be better termed social engineering. Provincial governments, especially Quebec, have taken co-control of the policy with the federal government: but to what end?

**APPENDIX ‘B’ The Immigration & Refugee Protection Act - Reforming The Objectives**

An examination of Canada’s Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (2001) revealed that social, cultural and humanitarian objectives displaced economic and rational humanitarian objectives. The results are not beneficial to Canada’s best interests and also adversely affect those who have successfully emigrated to Canada.

The following table summarizes the conclusions reached by a POGG group.

Objectives of the Act re Immigration	POGG Re-Statement of Objectives
(a) to permit Canada to pursue the maximum social, cultural and economic benefits of immigration.	(a) to permit Canada to pursue the maximum economic benefits of immigration.
Comment: There is no benefit to including social and cultural benefits as these will automatically flow from economically successful immigrants. Social and cultural benefits are best achieved by social and cultural policies and should not be a responsibility within the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (2001)	
(b) to enrich and strengthen the social character and cultural fabric of Canadian society, while respecting the federal, bilingual and multi-cultural character of Canada.	(b) Delete this objective.
Comment: These are social/cultural objectives which have no place in an immigration act. Furthermore, immigration as presently conducted does not contribute to this objective.	
(b.1) to support and assist the development of minority official languages communities.	(b.1) Delete this objective.
Comment: These are social/cultural objectives which have no place in an immigration act. Official language matters are best dealt with by provincial governments e.g. Quebec and New Brunswick. Furthermore, immigration as presently conducted does not contribute to this objective.	
© to support the development of a strong and prosperous Canadian economy, in which the benefits of immigration are shared across all regions of Canada.	(c) Delete this objective
Comment: Objective (a) addresses this.	
(d) to see that families are reunited in Canada	(d) to facilitate the reunification of one spouse of an immigrant and unmarried minor children and such other persons as may be defined by regulation from time to time.

Comment: relatives, other than those defined above, remain free to apply for immigration status based on their own merits and the needs of Canada. An open-ended definition of family is not in the best interest of Canada and may place undue strains on Canadian social services, municipal infrastructure, and societal norms to the disadvantage of all.

(e)  
to promote the successful integration of permanent residents into Canada, while recognizing that integration involves mutual obligations for new residents and Canadian society.

(e)  
to promote the successful integration of permanent residents into Canada through effective selection and admission standards and practices.

Comment: The obligation of Canada is to Canada and Canadian society.

(f)  
to support, by means of consistent standards and prompt processing, the attainment of immigration goals established by the Government of Canada in consultation with the provinces.

Delete this objective.

Comment: These are management objectives and have no place in legislation.

(g)  
to facilitate the entry of visitors, students and temporary workers for purposes such as trade, commerce, tourism, international understanding and cultural, educational and scientific activities.

(g)  
to facilitate the entry of visitors, students and temporary workers where to do so will be of benefit to Canada

Comment: There is no need to have such a detailed list' in an objective.

(h)  
to protect the health and safety of Canadians and to maintain the security of Canadian society.

(h.1) to protect the health and safety of Canadians and to maintain the security of Canadian society.  
(h.2)  
to protect the natural environment of Canada.

Comment: Since immigration results in sudden large increases in the population of a few large metropolitan centres, it is logical to add an objective to "protect the natural environment".

(l)  
to promote international justice and security by fostering respect for human rights and by denying access to Canadian territory to persons who are criminals or security risks.

(l)  
to deny access to Canadian territory to persons who are criminals or security or health risks.

Comment: The promotion of international justice and human rights is not properly within the purview of the immigration act. With the world shrinking due to international travel it is logical to add 'health risks' as a consideration.

(j) to work in cooperation with the provinces to secure better recognition of the foreign credentials of permanent residents and their more rapid integration into society.	Delete this objective.
Comment: These are policy considerations and need not be in the Act.	
(k) No such provision in existing Act	(k) to ensure the enforcement of immigration laws and regulations, including the speedy removal of unqualified persons.
Comment: Present enforcement practice does not meet Canada's needs	
<u>Objectives of the Act re Refugees:</u>	<u>POGG Re-Statement of Objectives</u>
(a) to recognize that the refugee program is in the first instance about saving lives and offering protection to the displaced and persecuted.	(a) Delete this objective.
Comment: This a societal "value" statement. It is not an objective.	
(b) to fulfill Canada's international legal obligations with respect to refugees and affirm Canada's commitment to international efforts to provide assistance to those in need of resettlement.	(b) No change.
Comment: The existing objective addresses the requirement adequately	
© to grant, as a fundamental expression of Canada's humanitarian ideals, fair consideration to those who come to Canada claiming persecution.	(c) Delete this objective.
Comment: Refugee claimants should be considered in accordance with the law	
(d) to offer safe haven to persons with a well-founded fear of persecution based on race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership in a particular social group, as well as those at risk of torture or cruel and unusual treatment or punishment.	(d) Delete this objective
Comment: Adequately covered in objective (b)	

<p>(e) to establish fair and efficient procedures that will maintain the integrity of the Canadian refugee protection system, while upholding Canada's respect for human rights and fundamental freedom of all human beings.</p>	<p>(e) Delete this objective.</p>
<p>Comment: Totally redundant</p>	
<p>(f) to support the self-sufficiency and social and economic well-being of refugees by facilitating reunification with their family members in Canada.</p>	<p>(f) to facilitate the reunification of the spouse of a refugee and unmarried minor children and such other persons as may be defined by regulation from time to time.</p>
<p>Comment: relatives, other than those defined above, remain free to apply for immigration status based on their own merits and the needs of Canada. An open-ended definition of family is not in the best interest of Canada and may place undue strains on Canadian social services, municipal infrastructure, and societal norms to the disadvantage of all.</p>	
<p>(g) to protect the health and safety of Canadians and to maintain security of Canadian society.</p>	<p>(g.1) to protect the health and safety of Canadians and to maintain the security of Canadian society. (g.2) to protect the natural environment of Canada.</p>
<p>Comment: Since immigration results in sudden large increases in the population of a few large metropolitan centres, it is logical to add an objective to "protect the natural environment".</p>	
<p>(h) to promote international justice and security by denying access to Canadian territory to persons, including refugee claimants, who are security risks or serious criminals.</p>	<p>(h) to deny access to Canadian territory to persons who are criminals or security or health risks.</p>
	<p>(I) to ensure the enforcement of immigration laws and regulations, including the speedy removal of unqualified persons.</p>

**Objectives of the Immigration and Refugees Protection Act - as revised by POGG**  
(For convenience of reference the original paragraph numbers are used below.)

**Revised Objectives - Immigration:**

- (a) to permit Canada to pursue the maximum economic benefits of immigration.
- (d) to facilitate the reunification of one spouse of an immigrant and unmarried minor children and such other persons as may be defined by regulation from time to time.
- (e) to promote the successful integration of permanent residents into Canada through effective selection and admission standards and practices.
- (g) to facilitate the entry of visitors, students and temporary workers where to do so will be of benefit to Canada.
- (h.1) to protect the health and safety of Canadians and to maintain the security of Canadian society.
- (h.2) to protect the natural environment of Canada.
- (l) to deny access to Canadian territory to persons who are criminals or security or health risks.
- (k) to ensure the enforcement of immigration laws and regulations, including the speedy removal of unqualified persons.

**Revised Objectives Refugees**

- (b) to fulfill Canada's international legal obligations with respect to refugees and affirm Canada's commitment to international efforts to provide assistance to those in need of resettlement.
- (f) to facilitate the reunification of the spouse of a refugee and unmarried minor children and such other persons as may be defined by regulation from time to time.
- (g.1) to protect the health and safety of Canadians and to maintain the security of Canadian society.
- (g.2) to protect the natural environment of Canada
- (h) to deny access to Canadian territory to persons who are criminals or security or health risks.
- (l) to ensure the enforcement of immigration laws and regulations, including the speedy removal of unqualified persons.

## **APPENDIX 'C' Charter of Rights and Freedoms**

For a variety of reasons primarily related to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the immigration system has become subject to excessive litigation. It is now almost impossible to refuse an application for a family member without a court case developing. The result has been that officers are reluctant to refuse anyone. It is easier to simply issue a visa and get on with the job. A refusal involves much paper work and written justification in the event of representations or appeals. A positive decision is easy and no questions are asked. This is an unsatisfactory situation. The solution is not easy and, short of invoking the 'notwithstanding' provisions of the Charter of Rights and Freedom, it may not be possible to overcome this situation.

Related to the above is the reality that immigration procedures have become so complicated that immigrants or Canadians wishing to deal with the Department find they are forced to hire the services of a consultant or a lawyer (the impact has seen the birth of the Immigration Industry) to help them wind their way through the myriad of procedures and systems involving even the simplest activity such as sponsoring a relative. The Department suffers from a serious lack of transparency and has become overly legalistic, bureaucratic and remote from its clients.

The problem: The Supreme Court of Canada has declared that section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms applies to all persons physically in Canada, not just Canadian citizens and landed immigrants. This has been interpreted by the authorities to create rights under the Charter for claimants of refugee status, once they set foot on Canadian soil. In turn, this gives rise to very heavy procedural requirements, multiple rounds of hearings (by a largely incompetent Immigrant & Refugee Review Board), and heavy constraints on appropriate administrative action such as deportation. In turn, this has led to a heavy workload for government officials and lengthy delays, harming legitimate refugee claimants and imposing a heavy financial burden on everyone. There is also evidence that some refugee claimants have taken advantage of these delays to simply "disappear" into Canadian society, to stay or to illegally enter into the USA.

The solution: The government should use the "notwithstanding" clause to state that the Charter does not apply to claimants for refugee status in Canada, whether they are physically located in Canada or not. The Charter would, of course, continue to apply to Canadian citizens, landed immigrants and legitimate documented tourists and other visitors to Canada.

The use of the notwithstanding clause for a five year period would give the government the opportunity to work out adequate and appropriate procedures to deal with refugee claimants.

The other solution is to amend the Charter, to insert words that would make clear that Section 7 is to apply to Canadian citizens and landed immigrants only. However, such a Constitutional amendment would require very significant resources and would encounter lengthy delays. It is not an immediate solution.

## **APPENDIX 'D' A Central Role for Canadian Values**

The historical review (Appendix A) identifies the periods before 1962 as characterized by 'racist policies'. Any critique of current policies is certain to be regarded by some as driven by a 'racist' agenda, and any political party that would even entertain a discussion of change is subject to that attack. But since the programs offered by governments are supposed to be in keeping with the generally accepted values of the population, it is appropriate to define those values and then determine if the programs and the values are consistent with each other. That is the process by which existing policies can be ratified where appropriate and changed where necessary. Here, then, is a Statement of Canadian Values, as compiled in May, 2007 by a Task Team of POGG (Peace, Order, and Good Government).

### **STATEMENT OF CANADIAN VALUES**

#### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of establishing a set of Canadian values is two-fold:

- A. To establish a set of criteria against which to judge government policies - whether actual or proposed;
- B. To identify areas where further government action may be needed

In an increasingly complex world, it is difficult to judge the merits of many government initiatives. This is aggravated by the opportunistic nature of some government actions, which may pursue short-term tactical political advantage, rather than advancing a principled agenda. Short-term solutions and tactics are necessary, of course, but they should be consistent with a core of principles and values that guide the country's development in the long term.

The values set out below are intended to provide such a benchmark. Not all government initiatives will advance these values, as some will be designed to solve much more specific problems. Programs and policies that run counter to these values, however, should receive special scrutiny and consideration.

#### **THE VALUES**

The development of a 'Statement of Canadian Values' was a response to claims by various political parties and political candidates in the 2007 federal election that they were the true supporter of 'Canadian Values'.

The 2007 POGG Canadian Values Committee stated:

They have evolved out of centuries of Judeo-Christian tradition as it developed, first in Britain and France, and then in this country. Over the last two centuries, these values took root in Canada and are the genesis and overarching guide in the formation and advancement of Canadian values. Since World War II, other traditions and cultures have contributed to attaining the values widely recognized as Canadian values in the twenty-first century.

These basic values are as follows:

#### **1. FREEDOM**

The following are fundamental freedoms, and the basis of our society:

- (a) freedom of conscience and religion; freedom of thought, belief, opinion and speech;
- (b) freedom of peaceful assembly;
- (c) freedom of association, including the right not to associate;

(d) the right to life, liberty and security of the person; and

(e) the right to own property.

Canadians place a very high importance on these freedoms and rights, and see them as underpinning all other values. While some limits on these freedoms and rights may be required to ensure the proper functioning of a complex society, these limits should be kept to the strict minimum necessary.

Respect for the dignity and autonomy of others, public order, personal integrity and truthfulness are deemed necessary companions to freedom.

In the long run, a free society is one that can adapt itself as necessary to correct any errors in government or other institutions, and to provide a framework which better allows Canadians' hopes and aspirations to be realized.

## **2. INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY**

Fundamental rights and freedoms cannot exist without the acceptance of responsibilities. Canadians value the individual taking on responsibility for oneself, one's family, and one's community. Dependence on government should be kept to a minimum.

Canadians value the operation of free markets as the best way to self-reliance.

Government intervention should be limited to circumstances where it is absolutely necessary for the functioning of an economically successful and compassionate society.

Canadians desire to be accountable for their decisions and their actions, as these affect themselves and others.

## **3. EQUALITY**

Canadians believe that society in general, and governments in particular, should treat all individual Canadians equally. Government rules, policies and actions, should be blind to race, religion, gender, ethnic origin, or deeply held personal beliefs.

Canadians believe in equality of opportunity, as regards society in general and government in particular. Equality of opportunity should take precedence over equality of outcome: Canadians should succeed chiefly by means of their own efforts. For example, affirmative action and quotas to benefit certain groups are measures of inequality of opportunity, and create multiple classes of citizen. Similarly, the justice system must treat everyone the same way, and should not have separate procedures for specific groups in Canadian society.

## **4. FRATERNITY**

Canadians feel solidarity with each other, and are proud of belonging to one country. Shared experiences, aspirations, institutions and historical experiences, and appreciation of the physical beauty of Canada, create strong bonds between Canadians.

Canadians believe that, while collective rights are important, they should not take precedence over individual rights and freedoms. It is the individual, acting of his or her own free will, who is the basis for the Canadian collectivity. However, this does not preclude collective action taken in the interests of the individuals who make up the collectivity.

Compassion for others less fortunate is a central Canadian value. Canadians help those who are less fortunate than themselves. However, assistance to others should not be transformed into a denial of individual autonomy.

## **5. DEMOCRACY, RULE OF LAW, AND PEACE**

Canadians strongly believe in democracy, and in elected governments who are responsible to the people. Accountability of governments and elected officials to their electors, both through periodic elections and through various reporting and other transparency mechanisms, are necessary to make democracy work. Non-elected public bodies lack the legitimacy of elected ones, and should be used only where justified by some other values, e.g. the independence of the court system.

Canadians believe in the rule of law. Government actions must not be arbitrary, but must conform to the democratic process and reflect the will of the people. The justice system must treat everyone fairly. It must not be used as a substitute for the elected legislature, and should limit itself to applying the law.

Finally, Canadians value non-violence at home and peace internationally. However, we recognize that force may sometimes be necessary to safeguard the values discussed above.

## **6. CIVILITY**

Canadians value civility in interpersonal and societal relationships and discourse.

### **CERTIFICATE of ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CANADIAN VALUES - see next page.**

We choose not to comment on the product of the 2007 POGG Committee on Canadian Values (see above). We are aware of the efforts of some nations to inform those entering their country that certain values are inherent in their national cultures; and, that some nations deny entry or deport those who will not conform to their cultural norms. Consideration should be given to informing immigrants and refugees entering Canada of some of our cultural norms to guide and assist them with their understanding of Canada.

We have drafted, as an example, a Certificate of Acknowledgement of Canadian Values that could be used by Canada (see next page). We emphasize that the acknowledgement is not a contractual commitment but, simply, a basis for assisting with integration into Canadian society.

**CERTIFICATE of ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CANADIAN VALUES**

I, ..... (name), born at ..... (place, country) on ..... (date of birth), and currently a citizen of ..... (country) hereby confirm that on ..... (date) I have applied to become ..... (a permanent resident or citizen) of Canada.

I confirm that on ..... (date), ..... (name of Canadian Immigration Officer) explained to me, and I understand, the fundamental rights and obligations of a Canadian resident and citizen.

In consideration of Canada’s approval of my application, I hereby confirm my intention to assume the rights and obligations of a Canadian resident and citizen, if my application should be approved.

I acknowledge that by this action I am agreeing to become a fully participating member of Canadian society which is characterized by the following values:

**1. FREEDOMS & RIGHTS:**

The individual has: freedom of conscience and religion; freedom of thought, belief, opinion and speech; freedom of peaceful assembly; freedom of association, including the right not to associate; the right to life, liberty and security of the person; and the right to own property. While some limits on these freedoms and rights may be required to ensure the proper functioning of a complex society, these limits should be kept to the strict minimum necessary.

**2. INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY**

Fundamental rights and freedoms cannot exist without the acceptance of responsibilities. The competent individual takes on responsibility for oneself, one's family, and one's community. Dependence on government should be kept to a minimum.

**3. EQUALITY**

Canadian society in general, and governments in particular, should treat all individuals equally. Laws, policies and actions, should be blind to race, religion, gender, ethnic origin, or deeply held personal beliefs. Equality of opportunity should take precedence over equality of outcome. The justice system must treat everyone the same way, and should not have separate procedures for specific groups in society.

**4. FRATERNITY**

Canadians feel solidarity with each other, and are proud to belong to one country. While collective rights are important, they should not take precedence over individual rights and freedoms. Canadians help those who need assistance. However, assistance to others should not be transformed into a denial of individual autonomy or responsibility.

**5. DEMOCRACY, RULE OF LAW, AND PEACE**

Laws should be made by elected governments that are responsible to the people. Non-elected entities lack the legitimacy of elected ones, and should be used only where justified by some other values, e.g. to maintain the independence of the court system. Government actions must not be arbitrary, but must conform to the democratic process and reflect the will of the people. The justice system must treat everyone fairly. Canadians value non-violence at home and peace internationally, but recognize that force may sometimes be necessary to safeguard the societal values.

**6. CIVILITY**

Canadians value civility in interpersonal and societal relationships and discourse.

..... at ..... Witness ..... on .....  
(Applicant’s signature or mark - Place - Name - Date)

## **APPENDIX 'E' Political Considerations**

All or most of the members of the House Standing Committee on Immigration are from constituencies with large ethnic populations. The Committee should consider a broader range of witnesses and data when conducting its affairs.

Political considerations make it difficult and political hazardous to develop and enforce immigration and refugee programs and policies that benefit Canada.

Promises made to qualified immigrants are not being kept. It is difficult for any political party to raise the immigration issue because to do so makes it vulnerable to criticism that it is anti – immigration or racist. The hard challenge is how to take the high ground and demonstrate that the current system is not serving Canada or the immigrants in a fair and satisfactory manner.

The unskilled or lesser-skilled immigrants that are coming are not doing well - and these are the bulk of the current intake and those in the backlog of approved applicants. Too many of them are living below the poverty line. Too many of them are finding it difficult to find jobs in line with their qualifications. Too many of them have been promised that a wide spectrum of relatives qualify to join them but these promises have not been quickly fulfilled.

The system places too much emphasis on education and not enough on getting those whose skills and occupations enable them to readily obtain appropriate employment and economic self-sufficiency.

Application fees paid by “backlogged applicants” offer false hopes and should be time-sensitive.

Procedures are not always transparent and seldom timely. The issue should be framed in terms of reforms that will emphasize benefits to Canada, fairness, transparency and service. We should not bring people to Canada with false expectations about whether their qualifications will be accepted. We should not promise they will get their relatives to Canada unless we are willing to keep the promise and able to do so within a reasonable time frame. We should not accept applications from people and make them pay a fee for doing so unless we can process their application in a reasonable time and not force them to wait in a backlog for months or years.

Our offices must be open and available to see people face to face and to help them resolve their problems and to provide them with a decent standard of service. Our procedures must be simplified and made transparent so they can be understood and easily followed.

Canada should accept fewer immigrants and refugees and service them better.

Immigration is not about numbers it is about people and their hopes and aspirations. It is better to accept fewer immigrants and ensure these get quickly established in Canada and are successful than to concentrate on a theoretical target figure that may not conform to the reality of the Canadian labour force. The concentration on numbers creates heartbreak and hardship to the people who face disappointment after arrival in their new country. Canada has always been a welcoming country for immigrants but in recent years the policy of striving to reach the 1% of total population target has led to disappointing results and it is time to change.

## APPENDIX 'F' Job-Driven Selection and Settlement of New Canadians

There is widespread attention to the fact that the populations of the world's megacities are increasing rapidly. The ten largest megacities are: [Tokyo](#) (36,197,000), [New York City](#) (20,700,000), [Mexico City](#) (19,100,000), [Karachi](#) (18,600,000), [Mumbai](#) (Bombay) (18,100,000), [Delhi](#) (18,050,000), [Sao Paulo](#) (17,900,000), [Shanghai](#) (17,600,000), and [Los Angeles](#) (17,500,000).

"Immigrants living outside the largest urban centres can translate their credentials acquired abroad into a relative income advantage more easily. They are more likely to overcome their lack of ability in an official language, quickly learning English or French, enabling them to increase their ability to generate income faster, Statistics Canada said." - see page 9.

Canada's most populous metropolitan areas, Toronto (2,503,281), Montreal (1,620,693, and Vancouver (578,041) per the 2006 national census, are still small by comparison with the world's big ten, but their growth is driven by many of the same forces that are causing people to migrate to cities. Just as the rural populations of Mexico, Pakistan, India, and Brazil are moving into the megacities and struggling to live in slum settlements, the vast majority of the 250,000 plus immigrants arriving in Canada annually in recent years are settling in the biggest cities. Though too many are dependent on public housing and other social benefits, we do acknowledge that a certain percentage are quite affluent. The tendency for immigrants to settle in certain neighbourhoods (enclaves) is as strong as it has ever been.

There are benefits and costs to Canada as a result of this demographic trend. But it is almost certain that if two independent economic studies were to be conducted by qualified investigators each one would give widely differing values to the benefits and the costs. In the absence of any such definitive report, there is a segment of public opinion that the costs exceed the benefits, at least on a short-term horizon of perhaps two generations. Research<sup>2</sup> suggests that there may be a break-even result, financially, for Canada; that the gross national product may rise slightly but it is spread over a greater population total so there is little or no benefit to the average Canadian. But, some employers will gain from paying low wages brought about by increased competition between job-seekers for lower-ranked employment.

The Economic Council of Canada, 1991 concluded that immigration had only a tiny positive economic effect on average per capita incomes; while the Macdonald Royal Commission, 1985 concluded that immigration actually caused a decline in real per capita incomes and real wages. With the increase in family reunification immigrants, most often there is only one skilled worker in the family, this situation may be assumed to have worsened.

In any discussion of immigration, it is a requirement to reiterate the cliché that Canada is a country of immigrants. The aboriginals, who may have arrived here anytime from 1,000 – 20,000 years ago, are not considered to be immigrants, although they too came from away.

Since the time of Confederation in 1867 the purpose of immigration, from Canada's viewpoint, has evolved from economic utilitarianism to a mix of economic, cultural and humanitarian purposes. The desire by some persons and organizations to use immigration as a form of "social engineering" is reflected in the current objectives of the current Immigration and Refugees Protection Act.

Although the latter purpose is firmly embedded in Canada's current Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (2001), it is useful to consider a statement by former Prime Minister Chretien:

"We don't see immigrants as problems but as assets, .....so that gives us a totally different perspective. We want them to become citizens because we need them. In many cases, before an immigrant even steps off the

---

<sup>2</sup> Stoffman page 108 George Borjas, Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government

plane, he's been educated somewhere else, so that costs us nothing.

The first day he buys food.  
The second day he rents an apartment.  
The third day he buys furniture and clothes.  
Later he buys a car and a house.  
He becomes a consumer, a worker, a taxpayer.

So it's generosity, yes, but it's also self-interest. That's why multiculturalism works in Canada. Nobody gives a damn about a person's colour or religion.

No party scores any political points for promising to cut immigration quotas. On the contrary, we take pride in our tolerance and diversity. You have to look at it that way, and you have to sell it that way".  
(Jean Chrétien, My Years as Prime Minister (2007), p 335)

According to Mr. Chretien, the primary benefits that the immigrant brings to Canada are economic:

1. He's been educated somewhere else, so that costs us nothing;
2. The first day he buys food;
3. The second day he rents an apartment;
4. The third day he buys furniture and clothes;
5. Later he buys a car and a house;
6. He becomes a consumer, a worker, a taxpayer;
7. So it's generosity, yes, but it's also self-interest.

Of course, Mr. Chretien goes on to acknowledge the political and social value of the immigrant:

"That's why multiculturalism works in Canada;  
Nobody gives a damn about a person's colour or religion;  
No party scores any political points for promising to cut immigration quotas. "

The last point is crucial. Immigration is politically sensitive in the extreme. It is natural that new immigrants and the Canadian families of prospective immigrants will punish severely any political party that may be inclined "to cut immigration quotas" or otherwise attempt to restrict who may enter Canada.

Therefore, at the same time that Canada's major cities are receiving the overwhelming majority of new immigrants and refugees and are struggling to provide the physical and social infrastructure to accommodate this population, it may be political suicide to challenge the premises on which the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (2001) is based.

It is not in Canada's interests to conduct an immigration program in such a way that its historic primary purposes, which are economic and humanitarian, are frustrated by a heavy overlay of social and humanitarian ideology which fail to recognize the needs and best interests of Canada. Current immigration objectives can only result in the growth of permanent ethnic urban areas not conducive to the creation of a healthy economic, social, or, a sustainable environmentally healthy Canada.

It is only in recent decades that the economic benefits of immigration have been diminished, in a public policy sense, by overriding social and humanitarian considerations. Ironically, both the 'progressive' ideologist, and the employer who wishes to keep wages and incomes down, make the same choice.

There is a major electoral risk inherent for any political party that chooses to lead a change that would counteract the natural tendency of immigrants to congregate in 'same-community' urban areas. Therefore, it is necessary for leaders of public opinion to engage in a debate, based on valid data and actual experience, to arrive at a new consensus on Canadian values and a corresponding improvement in the conduct of immigration policy for the health of our major cities and the long-term benefit of Canada.

As a starting point for such a debate, it is necessary, first, to review the evolution of immigration policy, and second, to be explicit about the values that would characterize a new era when immigration is managed in a way that allows Canada to benefit economically based on cities with healthy environments.

Change is necessary because the glowing picture painted so vividly by Mr. Chretien, and so widely entertained in conventional thinking, does not represent the whole story. In fact, it almost totally misrepresents the immigration story. The reality for many immigrants and refugees, and, indeed, for Canada as a whole, is most often quite different

A review of the history of immigration in Canada is in Appendix A.

## **APPENDIX 'G' Qualifications and Absorption**

Under current Government policy Canada has a target of admitting the equivalent of 1% of our population each year. No other country comes close to that percentage. The USA accepts 0.40 % and Australia 0.44%. As most immigrants settle in Vancouver, Toronto or Montreal there is an increased burden on infrastructure, social services, education and the challenges of integration. Municipal revenues are in crisis, in part because of this burden. As well, there is increased competition for low-paying jobs. The environmental footprint of each municipality is also adversely affected.

The relaxed Family Re-unification policies of the last two decades have resulted in only 25% of accepted immigrants being selected because of the value of their education, training and skills and early employment prospects in jobs that improve Canada's well-being in the post-modern world. The low percentage of high-value employment amongst immigrants has seen the average earnings of immigrants, adjusted for inflation, embark on a downward trend<sup>3</sup>. Of those who arrived before 1986 only about 20% lived below the poverty line, a little fewer than the Canadian-born poor. By 1991 the immigrant poverty figure had risen to more than 50% while the Canadian-born percentage did not change. By 2001 many people are poorer than they were 10 years earlier. Financial self-sufficiency is taking longer to achieve than in prior years<sup>4</sup>.

The vast majority of immigrants are no longer chosen because they have occupations that are in demand in Canada. The selection system now stresses family reunification and academic qualifications. The consequence is that many skilled workers needed for the labour force are refused or face lengthy delays. Many of the highly-educated who come find it difficult to obtain appropriate employment.

At one time, if an applicant did not have the occupation skills and knowledge that were needed in Canada it meant automatic refusal regardless of how many points might have been scored on other factors. This enabled the Department to control the numbers entering each year. If there was a strong demand for labour in specific occupations more immigrants were accepted. In times of high unemployment applicants, those with occupations in low demand, were refused. The tap was turned on or off depending on economic conditions. This system worked and served Canada well. Before the 1990's it was unusual for more than 200,000 immigrants to enter in any one year.

The backlog of qualified immigrants continues to grow daily because many immigration applicants do not have to meet the needs of Canada. This is choking our system and is unresponsive to national needs. Under the present system all applicants who meet the selection criteria are accepted. If they don't get a visa this year they are placed in a sequential backlog and wait for the visa to be issued at a later date. There is no means of cutting off the numbers to avoid the formation of backlogs. Today there is a backlog of some 900,000 immigrants who have qualified under the relaxed policies and are waiting to come forward at some future date. Nations such as China, India and Pakistan have huge populations and have many many thousands of people who meet our low selection criteria

The challenges are exacerbated by current and proposed immigration levels that are not substantiated by research. It is a myth that the aging of population can be solved by immigration. Studies show that a larger population does not increase the likelihood of prosperity, and costs may even outweigh benefits. Canada has six million children of resident Canadian Baby Boomers who are about to enter the labour market and will need jobs. Entrepreneur immigrants may create some of the needed jobs. Canada must implement realistic economic-based immigration inflow targets and selection processes. Demand in skilled occupations must again be a major criterion in immigration policies and processing. Canada must implement realistic economic-based immigration intake targets and selection policies.

Set realistic inflow targets for categories of immigrants and refugees. The programme should aim at ensuring

---

<sup>3</sup> Canadian Council on Social Development (April 2000)

<sup>4</sup> The Greater Toronto Services Board 2001

that 60% of the annual flow be composed of "selected" immigrants and the remaining 40% is made up of family and refugee/humanitarian cases.

Redefine "family class" immigrant sponsorship eligibility to be to a spouse or fiancé, unmarried dependent children; sponsored parents over the age of sixty ought to be considered.. It is noted that Australia has very strict family class rules and allows the sponsorship of parents only if there are more members of the family in Australia than are residing in the country where the parents live. This practice has broken the chain effect of family migration.

Farewell the Peaceful Kingdom (the seduction and rape of Canada 1963 to 1994) by Joe C. W. Armstrong contains this quote by Bill Gairdner, author of *The Trouble With Canada* (1990):

"Quite understandably, India and China with, between them, massive populations totalling almost a quarter of the world's people, could present more qualified applicants (for immigration to Canada) than most of the other countries put together. So the immigration official asked to use a fair point system could end up allowing vastly more applicants into Canada from India and China than any other nation - just because more of them want in. This systemic bias, due not to any discriminatory motive, but to its opposite, will automatically discriminate against less populous nations . . . After all, surely any nation has the right to defend itself against demographic capture.

Diversity, is now an accepted feature of Canada, which we fully endorse. But diversity itself could be threatened by massive immigration into Canada from countries with massive populations. The question, usually unspoken is: "where or should this fit into any discussion of immigration in our ever-shrinking world?"

One response to that Canada should give consideration to capping the annual intake of immigrants from any one country (or group of countries) to allow for absorption and integration into the Canadian way of life and for greater diversity. A limit of five percent of the previous year's total of non-refugee landed immigrants would help ensure that no one or two countries would dominate the annual immigration programme as has occurred from time to time and is possible still today.

## **APPENDIX 'H' Entry, Enforcement and Removals**

Security of national borders requires the maintenance of an inventory of authorized non-citizens within Canada and the creation of a data base of those who exit Canada and are unable to provide documented proof that they had a legal right to be here.

Therefore:

- (a) visas must be used to regulate the entry and exit of all non-immigrants to/from Canada. For favoured' countries, a similar document, to be used for exit purposes, must be provided by the immigration officer at the point-of-entry.
- (b) refugees, who are designated as such by UNHCR shall be allowed entry into Canada.
- (c) non-UNHCR refugees, asylum seekers, and those who enter Canada with false or no documentation shall be detained and their refugee status verified using UNHCR procedures and criteria. If valid, entry will be allowed; if not immediate deportation shall occur.
- (d) because of the invaluable relationship and history between the USA and Canada, which has facilitated easy crossing of our borders by our nationals, Canadian and American citizens would not be entered into the data base referred to in (a) above. They would only have to show proof of Canadian or American citizenship to be admitted to the other country.

At present asylum claimants only have to land in Canada to be automatically "in the system"; they are costly to process and to provide for while under review; and, too many asylum claimants disappear into Canada never to be seen again. Our acceptance rate is higher than any other country. In large part this is because we are western country that allows any person who arrives to claim asylum. Many of such on-the-doorstep claimants have been smuggled into the country by international criminal gangs; but upon arrival with false documents or no documents they are seldom detained for any length of time and are often released within Canada, never to be seen again. All such claimants are permitted to work or obtain welfare assistance which acts as a strong incentive for them to choose Canada as a destination. With good cause, the United States see this lax system as a threat to their security and it impacts on the cross-border movements of people, goods, and services.

Recommendations:

- [1]: Persons claiming refugee status who have entered from a country recognized by Canada as a 'safe' country shall be detained and expeditiously deported to the country from which they departed.
- [2]: Immigration and Refugee Review Board of Canada lacks appropriate direction and professional capabilities. It should be disbanded and replaced by a cadre of professional career Immigration and Refugee Ombudsman Officers with specific training in refugee and asylum affairs.
- [3]. All non-citizens who are convicted of a felony in Canada or become a member of a terrorist organization shall be deported immediately to their country of origin.

## **APPENDIX 'I' Department of Immigration**

Most decisions re immigration laws, policies and administration appear to have little effective Department input. There appears to be little policy development or research being conducted within the Department.

There is a need to examine the use foreign staff to process in any part of the application process. We believe that there is a need for more staffing of immigration services in Canada and abroad.