McGill Institute for the Study of Canada (MISC) / Institut d'études canadiennes de McGill (IECM)

Comparing Immigration Policies: Canada and the World

Comparer les politiques d'immigration: le Canada et le monde

Annual conference / Conférence annuelle

October 27 - 28, 2022
Montréal, Québec, Canada

Report prepared by:
Josh Medicoff
MA Candidate, Department of Political Science, McGill University

About the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada - l'Institut d'études canadiennes de McGill

Established in 1994 thanks to an innovative agreement between the Bronfman family and McGill University, the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada (MISC) runs an academic program at McGill University, supports an active research environment, and organizes a variety of large-scale, public events on matters of interest to Canadians, including MISC's Annual Conferences, which attract a great deal of attention from policy-makers, media, and the general public.

About the *Comparing Immigration Policies: Canada and the World*, MISC's 26th annual conference

Facing Canada's Future / Comparer les politiques d'immigration: le Canada et le monde, MISC's 26th annual conference, provided a comparative analysis of immigration policies between Quebec, Canada, the United States, and Europe. The conference assessed issues such as temporary migration, refugee and asylum systems, the rise of the far right, climate migration, and the future of global migration.

Key takeaways from *Comparing Immigration Policies: Canada and the World / Comparer les politiques d'immigration: le Canada et le monde*

- **We need to unpack our understanding as a liberal immigration country.** Immigration in Canada is a mixed bag and in need of re-examination, including issues like language requirements, temporary migration, class-based exclusion, and how immigrants can most feel a sense of belonging.

- **Canada must start living up to its name on the global stage.** Though Canada fashions itself as a country welcoming of refugees and displaced populations, its track record on refugee acceptance is uneven. Bilateral, regional, and global collaboration is essential.

- **The reshaping of Quebec's political landscape threatens to entrench immigration as a structuring issue.** Interparty consensus on immigration in Quebec has frayed, and consequently Quebec and Canada need to be careful about the way ahead.

- **Quebec is at a crossroads in debates on immigration and integration**. Reality is different from perception, even if real cleavages are being reinforced between Montreal and everywhere else.

- **Transatlantic linkages are key to understanding today's migration challenges.** Race and immigration are tightly linked, and policy and rhetorical diffusion occurs across the Atlantic. Scholars and practitioners need to make sense of these links to understand the way forward.

- **Migration and the rise of the far right has reshaped Europe**. Some countries are managing immigration and integration better than others, but for most countries anti-immigrant far right parties are growing. Policy learning and changing the existing system is needed.

- **Canada, Australia, and the US share many similarities and indicate changing global migration trends**. Temporary migration is up in all three countries; over complex visa schemes threaten to lose people in the cracks. Agility, activism, and flexibility are needed to address these challenges.

MISC's *Comparing Immigration Policies: Canada and the World / Comparer les politiques d'immigration: le Canada et le monde* began with a keynote talk by the Rt. Honorable Senator Ratna Omidvar. The Senator's talk focused on emerging trends in immigration in Canada and what Canada can learn from like-minded countries.

Noting that everything in immigration is linked, Senator Omidvar focused on three emerging trends in the global and local immigration system: displacement, the global labour market of essential workers, and climate migration. Beginning with displacement, she underscored that there are 100 million displaced people across the world. Neighbouring countries, who are usually already economically distressed, generally absorb most displaced people. For example, she discussed migration flows from Myanmar to Bangladesh, Afghanistan to Pakistan, and South Sudan to Uganda. Largely, poorer countries manage absorbing and integrating new migrants. This, she noted, is an issue of governance, and an ideal solution includes mandatory contributions to the UNHCR -- yet, political will remains absent.

The Senator spent time unpacking Canada's relationship with displaced peoples, stating that Canada has a reputation as a haven for displaced people; in reality, however, Canada has a spotty relationship with displacement. For every Syria or Ukraine, there exists an Afghanistan or Venezuela. The Ukraine example also shows the complexity of regionalism and the power of diasporas, as Canada has the largest Ukrainian diaspora outside of Russia. Unfortunately, regarding displaced peoples, Canada's reputation exceeds reality, and is easily outstripped by countries including Germany, Columbia, Ecuador, or Uganda. The solution? Regional collaboration and a coalition of the willing, who can act as a club with rules and norms to settle displaced populations.

With regards to labour movement, Senator Omidvar discussed the 120 million "low-skill" workers who move annually from the Global South to OECD countries, a global flow rooted in national decisions and policies. Brain drain is an issue for Global South countries, who send their best and brightest; workers are often exploited, trafficked, and deprived of using their existing credentials. To remedy this, she suggests a new global institution made of sending *and* receiving countries, who can share responsibility in the global labour mobility scheme and act as an honest broker. Another essential step is to stop using the binary of high and low skill workers, and shifting to classifying all labour as essential and skilled.

Finally, Senator Omidvar briefly discussed the issue of climate migration, which she highlighted as a here and now issue. With 1.5 billion climate migrants in the next 30 years, she noted that the challenges are high but, since it is a new phenomenon, climate migration is a blank slate (and therefore full of innovative opportunities). To conclude, the Senator emphasized the importance of multilateralism and collaboration between friends. She

highlighted that, as a starting point, Canada could increase its collaboration with Germany, as the two share several similarities: both face labor shortages, both welcome refugees, both grapple with undocumented workers, and both are trying to solve issues related to credentials. On issues like integration, migration, and citizenship, the Senator noted, Canada has a natural partner in Germany.

Discussion: **Comparing Immigration Policies: Canada**
Speakers: **Ethel Tungohan**, **Jennifer Elrick**, **Daniel Hiebert**, and **Anna Triandafyllidou**, moderated by **Mireille Paquet**

Canada's immigration system is a study in contrasts: on one hand, the country prides itself as a bastion of liberal immigration policies. On the other, the realities of class-based migration, credentialization, job opportunities, and language requirements restrict the ability of immigrants to succeed. In this panel, several scholars of Canada's immigration system discuss the reality of the system and its future. These scholars include:

- **Ethel Tungohan**, Associate Professor at York University and Canada Research Chair in Canadian Migration Policy, Impacts and Activism
- **Jennifer Elrick**: Associate Professor of Sociology at McGill University
- **Daniel Hiebert**, Professor of Geography at the University of British Columbia and a member of the Deputy Minister Advisory Council at Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada
- **Anna Triandafyllidou**, Canada Excellence Research Chair in Migration and Integration

The panel began by moderator Mireille Paquet asking the scholars to unpack the idea of Canada as a country of liberal migration policy. Dr. Tungohan suggested that it was warranted in some ways, but that it is challenging for newcomers to attain citizenship due to the draconian points system and deportation policies. Concurring, Dr. Elrick said that Canada has an exceptional commitment to mass immigration, but the individual experience and acceptance of migrants in Canadian society varies based on our social construction of high and low skill. Dr. Triandafyllidou discussed how we don't consider about brain drain enough as well as that the two-step system is not clear enough for potential migrants. Finally, Dr. Hiebert highlighted that though Canada has high numbers of migrants, its openness to difference (in class and skill) is much more exclusionary than we may think.

In terms of how Canada's racist and exclusionary historical immigration policy affects us today, Dr. Elrick discussed that Canada's immigration policy has transformed from race-based selection to class-based selection. While "we are open to racial diversity," she noted, acceptance depends on if "diversity is from a relatively high economic status," suggesting that the question of who *enters* v. who *belongs* is important. Dr. Tungohan reinforced this perspective by noting that racial exclusion in Canada also operates in the politics of who gets to stay and who does not. She discussed how language tests for residence in Canada are a barrier for women, particularly care workers, who have proven they don't need to have high English or French proficiency for certain jobs. She noted this with a provocation, asking whether language tests are exams of *cultural competency* instead of linguistic competency.

Discussing how remote work and automation affect Canada's immigration policies, Dr. Triandafyllidou noted, interestingly, that migrants sometimes preferred gig work like UberEats or DoorDash because it provides flexibility in terms of scheduling and hours that they prefer, particularly compared to other service jobs. She also noted that the IRCC's use of AI to select workers is interesting but problematic. Adding to this, Dr. Hiebert discussed how Canada's immigration system is structurally biased towards high earners, and the often "placeless" nature of

high-earners' work is an issue with which Canada will have to reckon. Relatedly, Dr. Paquet questioned whether the recognition of essential workers through the pandemic has had/will have a lasting effect. Dr. Tungohan noted that it was frustrating to see how easy it was to lift gatekeeping restrictions put in place by the federal government, as well as the fact that the federal government has not taken cues to be innovative as a result of the pandemic. This stands in contrast to programs in the provinces. Dr. Elrick added that this general discussion is not exclusively one of policy, but also how we value work; we can change the system all we desire, she suggested, but we'd still have stark divisions between the primary and secondary sectors.

Understanding what high immigration means, and recommendations for the future

Near the end of the panel, Dr. Paquet asked the scholars whether Canada's new immigration targets were realistic, and if they appropriately consider the needs of newcomers. Dr. Hiebert established that immigration increases the population, but does little for the median age. In reality, immigration benefits the private sector, and the people that newcomers compete with the most for jobs is other newcomers, particularly those from previous years. Consequently, he outlined a few truisms: 1) immigration will provide new workers, but it won't transform Canada's demography, 2) employers depend on new workers, and 3) there will be hyper-competition at the lower end of the market, but little on the high end. This means that, unless these issues are structurally addressed, immigrants will continue redistributing income in Canada to the Canadian-born.

Finally, Dr. Paquet asked what each scholar would choose as the most important reform to the immigration system. Dr. Hiebert suggested that the beneficiaries of immigration, namely the private sector and universities, should take more responsibility for those who arrive. Dr. Triandafyllidou wanted the government to focus on a fair migration scheme which integrates considerations like social capital into the equation. Dr. Elrick concurred with Dr. Hiebert on beneficiaries taking a larger share of the responsibility, while Dr. Tungohan concluded by suggesting we needed to listen to migrants first and foremost. This would mean potentially eliminating language tests and credentialing requirements, as well as rethinking the categories that the system is based on, including economic, refugee, and family resettlement categories.

Mireille Paquet, Concordia University Research Chair on the Politics of Immigration and Associate Professor of Political Science

The conference's second keynote speaker was Mireille Paquet, current Concordia University Research Chair on the Politics of Immigration at Concordia University. Her current research agenda analyzes the policy and political discourse(s) of immigration in Canada, with a focus on the role of administrative institutions and political parties. In her keynote, she argued that Quebec has entered a new phase of immigration politics and that the implications should be examined.

She contextualized her argument by highlighting that immigration is not new in Quebec, and it has long been used by the settler state to replace Indigenous peoples. She discussed three phases of Quebec's immigration history: Phase 1, 1960-1990, Phase 2, 1990-2006, and Phase 3, from 2006-today. Phase 1 was focused on intergovernmental conflict between Ottawa and Québec, efforts to decentralize immigration from Ottawa *to* Québec, and the process of state-building in Quebec. Phase 2 featured the signing of the Canada-Quebec Accord, which gave Quebec power to choose economic migrants and sponsor refugees; in effect, this accord neutralized intergovernmental conflict between the federal and provincial government on immigration, and helped depoliticize immigration in Quebec. Elite consensus was produced as well, especially after the 1995 referendum made anti-immigration discourse a taboo subject. This era, Dr. Paquet noted, is over.

Today, Dr. Paquet examined three core trends in immigration politics in Quebec: politicization, a two-step immigration system, and "unplanned" arrivals. Regarding unplanned immigration, she discussed figures like François Legault, Matthieu Bock-Coté, and Éric Duhaime who demonstrate the ending of the 1991-2006 partisan consensus on immigration. Media attention has both increased and fragmented, with misinformation on immigration increasing by the aforementioned figures. Politicization is important, she argued, because it causes a shift in the broader discourse, consequently limiting policy frames available to legislators. And as Quebec's party system transforms (evidenced by the 2018 and 2022 elections), immigration could become a more toxic and more structuring issue.

She then discussed Quebec's increasingly two-tier immigration system, which has seen a dramatic increase in temporary migration and a decrease in permanent migration. We structure the system, Dr. Paquet suggested, with the idea that people are coming permanently, but that is no longer the case; as a result, many live in limbo, creating anxiety and insecurity. This matters because it shows policy drift, reinforced by decisions like the Coalition Avenir Québec's moves to lower permanent migration. This has serious societal implications, including weakened state capacity, management backlogs, and, most importantly, migrants who can't make the most out of the system and, as a result, have potentially less attachment to Canada and Quebec. *What kind of citizens*, Dr. Paquet asked, *are we creating*?

Finally, she discussed Quebec as a destination for "unplanned" migration with increases in irregular migration at the Canada-US border since 2016. This is a function of the Safe Third Country Agreement between both countries, and comes as a shock to Quebecers who, Dr. Paquet noted, are used to having complete control in matters of immigration. This has transformed Quebec's immigration discourse because it is no longer about skill, French level, or economic migration, but now about border control, border enforcement, and social services for "diverse"

populations. Consequently, norms about immigration and asylum are shifting -- and creating new fights between Ottawa and Québec.

In closing, Dr. Paquet offered a word of caution. She noted that current immigration discourses aren't limited to Quebec, and that Canada is not immune to changing dynamics in the politics of immigration. Quebec's experience, she established, should be used to understand what is to come in Canada. Scholars and citizens would do well to understand that these issues are systemic, not episodic, and that Canada needs new societal bargain on immigration.

Discussion: **Comparing Immigration Policies: Québec**
Speakers: **Antoine Bilodeau, David Birnbaum, Adèle Garnier, Marjorie Villefranche, Catherine Xhardez,** moderated by **Yolande James**

Immigration discourse and debates have intensified in Quebec in recent years. To address and discuss some of these issues, MISC convened a panel of experts on immigration in Quebec. The panel was held in French, and the following description has been translated. The experts convened include:

- **Antoine Bilodeau**, Professor of Political Science at Concordia University
- **David Birnbaum**, Parti Libéral du Québec Member of the National Assembly from 2014-2022
- **Adèle Garnier**, Associate Professor and Director of Undergraduate Studies at the Université Laval Department of Geography, Honorary Senior Lecturer at the School of Social Sciences at Macquarie University in Australia
- **Marjorie Villefranche**, Director of Haiti House (*Maison Haïti)*
- **Catherine Xhardez,** Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at the Université de Montréal

The panel, which was held a few short weeks after the Coalition Avenir Québec increased their majority in Quebec's 2022 provincial election, began by discussing how immigration was a hot issue in the campaign. Mr. Birnbaum started off by saying that the CAQ government is a coalition of people formerly skeptical of immigration in the Union Nationale. He noted the election advanced the issue of immigration, but it wasn't a major departure from what they'd said before. However, he also felt that Quebec has the opportunity to have a more disciplined and reasoned conversation on immigration. Mrs. Villefranche added, following the election, politicians will have to reconcile with civil society; there were lots of issues that went unaddressed with the relentless focus on integration. That includes issues like two-step immigration, recognition of essential workers, and language needs.

 Dr. Garnier discussed the rift between public policy and discourse on public policy, noting that the CAQ has done multiple things that they didn't put front and center in the campaign. Dr. Xhardez furthered Dr. Garnier's comments by saying that the CAQ's immigration policies are complex and contrasting; they have expanded francization, but also increased processing delays. Finally, Dr. Bilodeau discussed the number of immigrants isn't actually importantly -- that the core issue is the relationship between immigration and cultural diversity. Other provinces don't struggle as much on this because they have embraced multiculturalism. In contrast, Quebec has adopted interculturalism, but that concept has never been formalized. That doesn't mean, however, that Quebecer's aren't open to immigration; statistics show that Quebecer's are some of the most open to immigration in Canada.

In terms of the Ottawa-Quebec relationship, Dr. Xhardez explained that some parties feel the 1991 Quebec-Canada accord on immigration is outdated. However, when compared to other federations, Quebec has the most power in terms of immigration; lots of money is sent back to Quebec from Ottawa as well. She noted that it is a serious question, whether the agreement should be reopened, especially as other provinces may also be keen. Regarding other provinces. Dr. Garnier discussed

that that may be a good idea, giving provinces more control over migration, as provincial competencies and labour-filling measures are increasingly done by provinces. Other provinces relationships to immigration, however, are not nearly as politicized as they are in Quebec, because there isn't as much of the dimension of identity.

Discussing labour shortages, Mr. Birnbaum established that immigration is an essential pillar to remedy these issues, and that the dichotomy presented between integration and immigration is false. Lost in debates about integration, he noted, are the essential roles the private sector and community life play in bringing in outsiders to their community. As someone who is on the ground (working at the *Maison Haïti*), Mrs. Villefranche noted that when immigrants are asked about integration, they're often at a loss of what to say. People are already here, working and contributing to Canadian and Quebec society -- that is what integration means.

Moving on to the future of the French language, Mrs. James discussed that immigration was long seen as a way to assure the future of its place in Quebec, but that that consensus seems to have frayed. Dr. Garnier noted that Quebec is a relative success story when it comes to French: 57% of Quebecers only speak French, and more than 15% are bilingual; Bill 101 works well, in other words. She established that Quebec needs more innovative solutions to get more people speaking French. Dr. Bilodeau mentioned the importance of the Other versus the Imagined Other, discussing how this has very little to do with immigrants and more to do with Francophones. Francophones, he noted, are leaving Montreal for the suburbs (the periphery of Montreal), and that means fewer meetings with immigrants, who largely settle on the island. Linguistic and cultural insecurity is thus more intense in the suburbs.

In terms of encouraging interaction in Quebec's regions (i.e. outside of Montréal and Québec City) Dr. Xhardez noted that choosing immigrants that speak French also endangers its own problems, and that linguistic integration is a global issue, not a Quebec-specific issue. Additionally, she noted we usually believe immigrants can settle in regions because they're location-flexible, but we need to consider why, if some Quebecers want to leave the regions, immigrants would opt to stay? Mr. Birnbaum noted that there is far too much of a dichotomy between Montreal and the rest of Quebec.

About integration, Dr. Garnier made clear that nobody is going to change the language spoken at home and that Quebec needs to recognize that multilingualism is an asset. Mrs. Villefranche added that, working in Saint-Michel, she observers that the common language *is* French; many immigrants will speak different languages, and French is their common language. There is, therefore, a difference between perception and reality. On demography, Dr. Xhardez talked history, mentioning that immigration was, for a long time, seen as a way to maintain Quebec's weight in Canada. Dr. Bilodeau countered, saying that pursuing that as a strategy to portray immigration positively is risky and dehumanizing. The panelists continued discussing integration and Bill 101. Mr. Birnbaum noted that 90% of the 2nd generation of kids affected by Bill 101 have mastered French. However, Dr. Bilodeau noted that those kids also do not generally have strong identification with the idea of being *québécois/québécoise*, which many Quebecers feel strongly about.

Mrs. James wondered if this rift was about values. Mrs. Villefranche questioned what Quebec values actually are, as they have shifted between generations and remain fluid. Dr. Xhardez

explained that Quebec's experience with integrating newcomers is hardly unique, and places like Flanders, Catalonia, and Scotland are also reflecting on these issues. Mr. Birnbaum noted that soon, older generations will be exiting this debate, and that Quebec youth are open and less obsessed with linguistic issues. However, Dr. Bilodeau countered this by saying that that uncaring attitude is mostly based in Montreal. Montreal's youth embrace diversity, but youth in the suburbs are often *more* closed than older generations because they rarely interact with newcomers.

Before ending the panel, Mrs. James asked if there can be a robust and responsible debate on immigration in Quebec. Dr. Garnier said that even despite challenges, Quebec is still having healthy(ish) debates on immigration; she expressed worry towards emerging far-right columnists in the province. She also added that the neoliberal context disinvests in the public sector, which is an essential pillar of immigrant integration. Mrs. Villefranche reinforced the need to talk about whether we want temporary or permanent migration, and that will set the tone for the coming years. Dr. Bilodeau established that the debate isn't a choice: it's extremely pertinent, and we need the tools to examine the difference between the Other and the Imagined Other. Mr. Birnbaum added that we need to ask important and complicated questions -- and live with the answers. Finally, Dr. Garnier made clear the debate is already happening, and we can look to the statistics for more lessons.

Professor Terri Givens, Professor of Political Science, McGill University

Dr. Terry Givens is a Professor of Political Science, in addition to being McGill's Provost Academic Lead and Advisor on McGill's Action Plan to Address Anti-Black Racism, and co-organizer of MISC's 2022 conference. Her research focuses on comparative politics, anti-discrimination policies, and the comparative politics of race. Dr. Given's keynote speech discussed the politics of immigration in Europe and its transatlantic linkages.

Dr. Givens began her keynote by discussing how things have changed: in political science, studying the politics of immigration wasn't a priority until the past 15 to 20 years. This highlights the general lack of comparative knowledge between immigration systems. For example, she noted that in discussions with policymakers, countries want to emulate Canada's immigration points system; the politics of this system, thus, are essential to understand. For her, this indicates the importance of understanding transatlantic flows, particularly how policymakers across the Atlantic understand and learn from each other.

Contextualizing her research, Dr. Givens discussed how the general shift to the right in Europe in the 1990s led to the idea that immigration should be focused on *control*, not on individuals. On one hand, the European Union (EU) Racial Equity Directive focused on multiculturalism and diversity, but on the other hand right-leaning politicians focused on securitization, control, and civic integration. For Dr. Givens, immigration is fundamentally about sovereignty; who is part of our polity, and who has a say in what our society is about? While right-leaning parties focused on control, the neoliberal wave of the late 90s also meant left-leaning politicians focused on control, work, and integration as well.

Dr. Givens further explained that racism and immigration control are tightly linked. These historical linkages, she established, are essential to understanding backlash towards immigration. Much of our understanding of immigration, Dr. Givens discussed, goes back to our ideas of people from Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. For example, France has a higher opinion of people from Sub Saharan Africa than Algeria, because of France's colonial history in Algeria and the wars of independence. History through colonialism shapes immigration flows everywhere, including in the UK, Belgium, and France; a lack of expansive colonial history (e.g., Germany) also shapes where labour migrates from, in Germany's case from Southern Europe and Turkey northward.

History and racism also shape contemporary responses to refugees and immigration. For example, responses in Europe and North America to refugees from Ukraine and Syria have been starkly different. Ukrainian's, who are phenotypically white, have been treated differently. Dr. Given's established that this is not a response in state capacity to settle immigrants and refugees; OECD countries have high numbers of immigrants as a matter of need, including the US (13% of population was born abroad), Sweden (19%), and Belgium (17%). While the radical right has grievances that need to be understand, Dr. Givens noted that these countries can handle high numbers of immigrants, and the systems work well.

Ultimately, Dr. Givens sought to encourage policy sharing between transatlantic actors in order to stem the rise of anti-immigration sentiment. That requires business interests, civil society, and other corners of society to accept and understand immigration as a normal, humane process.

As the political and sociological impacts of migratory 'crises' in Europe continue, MISC assembled a panel of scholars to discuss the comparative politics of immigration on the continent. Over the course of the panel, panelists discussed trends in immigration policy, the rise of the far right, Ukraine, and a variety of other subjects. The panelists included:

- **Antje Ellerman**, Professor of Political Science and Founding Director of the Centre for Migration Studies at the University of British Columbia
- **Justin Gest,** Associate Professor of Policy and Government at George Mason University's Schar School of Policy and Government
- **Anna C. Koretweg,** Professor of Sociology at the University of Toronto
- **Phil Triadafilopoulos**, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto

Dr. Givens began the panel by asking how immigration policy has shifted in Europe in the past 20 years. Dr. Triadafilopoulos noted that Western European countries have become more about managing immigration than restricting it, which is useful but managed migration is also about exclusion. Countries in Europe are happy to accept those they select, but keen to coercively control those who select them. It's important, he established, to understand the role of democracy here, in that it is citizens who are choosing more restrictive policies through elections in a sort of "immigration theatre." Dr. Gest also believes that incompetent management and a lack of good governance has eroded support for immigration. Adding to this, Dr. Ellerman discussed how race and class are important in Europe, where, class capital can offset a lack of race capital, but that these processes are varied between Western, Central, and Eastern Europe.

The panel then examined how the far-right has impacted Europe's political party landscape. Dr. Gest established that, due to proportional representation, most elections in Europe are now seeing 10% of seats being won by the far right. Though diverse, they're united by anti-immigrant sentiment, constraining the ability of strategic management of immigration (for example, to fill labour shortages). Dr. Koretweg noted that immigration politics are actually integration politics, and that discussions of gender, Islam, and immigration tend to the negative in discourses in Europe. Rebuking the generally negative tone of the panel, however, Dr. Triadafilopoulos suggested that migration in Europe *isn't* an unmitigated failure, saying that Europe's premier immigration country, Germany, has a progressive coalition; though issues exist, successes do, too. Towing the line between Dr. Gest and Dr. Triadafilopoulos, Dr. Ellerman discussed the fragmentation of the party system towards extremes. She also discussed how parties in Europe can ignore the votes of immigrants, because their vote is smaller, compared to a country like Canada.

Moving on to Ukraine, Dr. Ellerman noted that Ukrainian's have high employment rates due to the EU's Temporary Protective Directive, which is in stark contrast to Syrian and Afghan refugees. Dr. Gest explained that nationalism can explain some of the hostility to Ukrainian and Syrian refugees in Europe, suggesting that Vladimir Putin is framed as an existential threat while Bashar al-Assad is seen as a more remote threat. Thus, the *framing* around humanitarian immigrants is an

essential aspect of the conversation. Dr. Triadafilopoulos underscored how tipping points are important, and that it isn't about how many people are admitted to a country but instead about the speed with which they are admitted.

The panelists then discussed how border countries like Italy, Spain, and Poland affect the EU's positions. Dr. Ellerman underscored how free movement within Europe has led to a hardening of immigration policy to Europe. Dr. Triadafilopoulos expanded this by discussing the liberal-illiberal dialectic occurring in Europe, discussing research that demonstrated how the free movement of EU citizens is intrinsically linked to external border management intensification.

Learning from others

In the last part of the panel, the conversation moved to transatlantic linkages and learnings between policymakers. For a long time, Dr. Gest discussed, EU-North America policymakers didn't discuss issues of immigration; now, that would represent a severe loss. Dr. Gest suggested that the EU can learn a lot from North America on issues like workplace integration and civic nationalism, while North America could learn a lot from the EU's free mobility scheme. The continents have also reinforced each other on their utter inability to stem white nationalism; Donald Trump, he examines, took the baton from Europe. He suggested that if policymakers can make immigration not an issue of charity and humanitarianism but of something in the national interest, Europeans may have an easier time accepting it.

Discussing Canada and its relationship to Europe, Dr. Koretweg suggested that it's useful not to think of Canada as one unitary space. In Quebec, for example, Bill C-21 is illiberal in a very European way and demonstrates the diffusion of far-right nationalism into the Canadian sphere. Dr. Gest pondered consequently that, if we consider the far-right relying on perceptions of things being out of control, where does this come from in Canada, which has three oceans and the richest country in the world as borders? Dr. Triadafilopoulos discussed that *any* evidence of unmanaged migration will provoke fear, referring to the Chemin Roxham in Quebec.

Closing off the panel, Dr. Triadafilopoulos suggested that EU countries should limit their use of the language of integration and focus on the language of settlement. Newcomers need, in particular, settlement assistance, something Canada has long excelled at; additionally, he suggested not giving interior ministries control over immigration, and instead creating immigration ministries. Dr. Ellerman pushed back slightly, because as a settler colony, the language of "settlement" is highly charged in Canada. Dr. Ellerman, however, praised the elite consensus on the benefits of immigration, as it leaves space for the possibility of good work on the subject. Finally, she discussed the importance of credential recognition, noting that Germany has done robust work on the issue recently, which Canada should emulate.

While the topic of this panel was centered around the United States of America (USA), it largely focused on comparing the immigration policies of the United States, Canada, and Australia. To do so, MISC assembled a panel of subject matter experts on all three countries, which included:

- **Rupa Banerjee**, Associate Professor of Human Resource Management and Organizational Behavior at Toronto Metropolitan University and Canada Research Chair of Economic Inclusion, Employment, and Entrepreneurship of Canada's Immigrants
- **Jeanne Batalova,** Senior Policy Analyst at the Migration Policy Institute and Manager of the Migration Data Hub
- **Anna Boucher**, Associate Professor in Public Policy and Comparative Politics at the University of Sydney
- **Shannon Gleeson**, Professor of Labor Relations, Law, and History at the Cornell ILR School

To get started, Dr. Bloemraad asked the panelists to unpack how the US, Canada, and Australia differ on economic migration. Dr. Batalova discussed how some philosophical differences separate the two: the US sets caps on restrictions, Canada sets targets; employers are the drivers of economic immigrants in the US; in Canada, the points system does that. She also noted that the US is due for a revision, last done in 1990. Dr. Banerjee contrasted the US-Canada approach and noted Canada has moved to a two-step immigration system. The points system, she noted, has also changed, creating a hybrid system focused on both vocation and points. While she noted that agility is good, it can also create confusing and difficulty for migrants. Adding Australia into the equation, Dr. Boucher highlighted that Australia has one of the highest immigration rates in the world. It contrasts the US (and is similar to Canada) in having a system largely based off procedural, administrative changes. Australia also has a complex visa system, which is difficult to navigate, like Canada. And finally, she noted that Australia, like the US and Canada, has increased temporary economic visas.

Discussing other-than-economic migration streams, Dr. Gleeson introduced the concept of a spectrum of citizenship which migrants float across. Categories include undocumented immigrants, immigrants with limited legality (temporary workers, e.g. seasonal workers), family reunification, and those who have been fully naturalized. People who move around these categories, Dr. Gleeson noted, make up nearly 1/5 of the US workforce. She added that the worksite plays an essential role in the status of these migrants. Dr. Batalova then noted a few interesting statistics to non-family entry into the US; approximately 75% of H1B recipients (highly skilled) come from India, and 70% of H1B workers work in IT. Yet, these workers still have difficulty obtaining green cards.

Dr. Boucher then discussed that undocumented immigration is increasing in Australia, largely because people fall through the cracks of Australia's labyrinthine temporary visa system. Stressors like climate change and inequality mean that repatriating these citizens will become more challenging as time goes on. Finally, Dr. Banerjee underscored how Canada also has a complicated

temporary migration system, and that it is also in the international student sphere as well. While many believe being a student is a way to permanent residency in Canada, she specified that only about 3/10 are able to become PR. This may put people at risk of becoming undocumented as well.

Moving on, Dr. Bloemraad asked the panelists to discuss the costs of systems that don't provide pathways to permanent residency. Dr. Gleeson asked participants to focus on the precarity workers experience when they're undocumented. Furthermore, the complexities of undocumented people are felt at the family level, as many families have mixed-status, meaning the kids of undocumented people have citizenship even though their parents do not. This complicates their ability to engage with the government and feel like they are part of the recipient country.

Discussing the sordid state of affairs in the creation of immigration policy in the US, Dr. Batalova established that the consensus is the immigration system is broken, but that there is zero consensus on how to fix it. She chalked this up to political polarization, the fact that one administration can make sweeping changes that destroy institutional memory. Further, immigration overlaps with many polarizing issues: national security, national identity, economics, and the broader perception that the pie is limited. Dr. Gleeson also noted that immigrants often get scapegoated for other issues and events, and that the impacts of immigration debates at the federal level are absorbed at lower levels of government, for example counties and school boards.

US influence in the world and Canada's responsibility in the Americas

Near the end of the panel, Dr. Bloemraad asked panelists to reflect on the ways in which US immigration policies and politics impact other countries. Dr. Banerjee noted that Canada has moved to a demand-driven system, which could be partially due to US influence. Relatedly, though Canadians pride themselves on *not* being American, when you look outside the bigger cities in Canada, immigrants and refugees are not as welcome; additionally, employers often do not hire immigrants in high wage, high skill jobs. While there is a push and pull to the influence of the US on Canada's immigration policy, it certainly permeates. Dr. Boucher added that she believes the US has lots to learn from Australia's bureaucratic, policy instrument-oriented approach to changing immigration policy. In exchange, Australia could learn from American civil society's activism on wage theft and workplace issues. Historically, Australia has taken cues from the US (in matter such as the abolition of race-based selection and the embrace of multiculturalism), but this may be more historical than contemporary.

Finally, on discussing Canada's reasonability to the humanitarian and migrant flows managed by the US, Dr. Batalova explained her belief that each country in the equation must see itself as a regional player to solve the issue. For example, Canada should help the US figure out why people see the need to move and uproot their lives. Additionally, expanding the asylum stream in Canada would be useful; in sum, she hoped for Canada to see itself as a regional player with regional solutions. Dr. Banerjee and Dr. Boucher concluded more pessimistically. Dr. Banerjee said that Canada is not doing enough to help because it would shatter its understanding of immigration as orderly and planned. Dr. Boucher noted that Australia will not be able to manage migration in such a controlled way forever, particularly with climate change impacts on the horizon.