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Executive Summary

Over the summer of 2011, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) held two distinct but complementary consultations related to immigration levels:

A) 2012 Immigration Levels: Stakeholder Consultation (June 21 to July 15, 2011)

B) Immigration Levels and Mix: Stakeholder and Public Consultations (Stakeholder round tables July 12 to August 16, 2011; online consultations with stakeholders and the public from August 29 to September 19, 2011)

Key Findings

N.B. The findings summarized in this report reflect only the views of those who participated in the consultations. These views are not representative of the overall Canadian population or CIC stakeholder community.

A) 2012 Immigration Levels: Stakeholder Consultation

Every year, consultations on annual immigration levels are required to gather stakeholder insight for consideration in the preparation of CIC’s *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration*, which is tabled by November 1 of each year.

The 2012 Immigration Levels Consultation consisted of an online consultation with stakeholders. From June 21 to July 15, 2011, CIC invited over 750 organizations, including employers, unions, sector councils, settlement service providers, non-governmental organizations and other key stakeholders, to participate in an online consultation to gather their views on immigration objectives and factors to consider when establishing immigration levels.

The online survey built on consultations from past years in order to track responses from stakeholders and determine if their views on immigration levels had changed over time. Stakeholders were provided with a background document to assist in responding to the survey questions. The online component was complemented by consultations with Canada’s provinces and territories, the City of Toronto and other federal government partners.

Refer to Annex A for the 2012 levels background document, entitled *Immigration Levels Planning: Balancing Priorities to Meet Canada’s Immigration Objectives* and Annex B for the online questionnaire.

What we heard

Over 170 stakeholders participated in the online consultation on 2012 Immigration Levels.
• Respondents reported a generally positive or neutral experience with Canada’s current level of immigration.
• Participants felt that the immigration system needed to first and foremost support the country’s economic needs while ensuring that immigrants can be properly integrated to give them a better opportunity to succeed and contribute in Canada.
• Some suggested that longer processing times needed to be addressed.

When asked to consider how immigration can be positioned to meet a variety of objectives, respondents ranked the objectives in the following order:

1. Supporting long-term economic growth
2. Meeting current labour market needs
3. Supporting population maintenance or growth
4. Assisting family reunification
5. Protecting refugees
6. Promoting regionalization

When establishing immigration levels, respondents indicated that the immigrant economic issues were most important, followed by the basic needs of the immigrants, integration issues, the impact on the host population, resource issues and the sustainability of immigration.

B) Immigration Levels and Mix: Stakeholder and Public Consultations

CIC is of the view that a longer term approach to levels planning is necessary to allow the Department and its partners to plan for and respond to shifts in priorities and circumstances. Engaging key stakeholders and the public on immigration levels and mix provided an opportunity to offer greater context for Canada’s immigration system and its categories, and to receive more informed feedback for consideration in setting CIC policy directions. The input gathered by way of engagement was intended to inform immediate and future policy direction with regard to multi-year levels planning, ministerial instructions, and federal/provincial/territorial negotiations.

In addition to speeches and editorial boards, Minister Jason Kenney, as well as parliamentary secretaries Rick Dykstra and Chungsen Leung, led a series of national round table discussions with stakeholders.

• July 12, 2011 – Calgary, Alberta (Minister Kenney)
• July 18, 2011 – Vancouver, British Columbia (Minister Kenney)
• July 20, 2011 – Toronto, Ontario (Minister Kenney)
• August 15, 2011– Mississauga, Ontario (parliamentary secretaries Dykstra and Leung)
• August 15, 2011 – Scarborough, Ontario (parliamentary secretaries Dykstra and Leung)
• August 16, 2011 – London, Ontario (Parliamentary Secretary Dykstra)
The meetings were attended by representatives from employers, labour, academia, learning institutions, professional organizations, business organizations, regulatory bodies, municipalities, settlement service providers and ethnocultural organizations. The consultations covered topics such as longer-term planning for immigration levels and mix, including specific categories such as parents and grandparents, live-in caregivers, provincial nominees, federal skilled workers, and permanent and temporary immigrants.

A complementary online component to the consultations was held from August 29 to September 19, 2011, to allow the general population, stakeholder organizations and representatives of provincial and territorial governments to provide their views on Canada’s immigration levels and mix.

What we heard: Round tables

The round table meetings were attended by one hundred stakeholders (Calgary: 13; Vancouver: 21; Toronto: 16; Mississauga: 19; Scarborough: 18; London: 13).

The dialogue from these sessions centred on three key themes: levels, mix, and the immigration system and process.

Levels
Participants were generally supportive of the government and its direction on immigration. For the most part, there was consensus that Canada should maintain levels and explore the feasibility of increasing them. Some representatives, however, indicated a desire for a decrease, commenting that decision makers need to consider the costs of integration and the “hidden costs,” such as the impact on the health budget and housing costs.

Mix
There was strong overall support for the Provincial Nominee Program. The program is seen as a Prairies success story where more immigrants could be accommodated without negatively impacting the federal skilled worker programs. From a municipal perspective, capacity is key. The scenario in Ontario is seen to be different than the rest of the country. Municipalities have responsibilities for housing, employment services and other social assistance, and they struggle with their own finite resources when facing complex needs.

There were several suggestions for changes regarding TFWs. The private sector (in particular representatives of oil, gas and trade-based industries) advocated the need for greater flexibility with work permits.

Views on the parents and grandparents stream were mixed. Some participants felt that the program helped Canada attract and retain immigrants, indicating that investors and workers do not want to come to Canada on a permanent basis without their families. Others disagreed, stating that when Australia tightened its family reunification program, it still received all the immigrants it needed. There
was general agreement with the importance of finding the right balance with this stream as Canada needs to think of future labour market needs in its current immigration policies.

Participants also believe that international students can be a great resource for eventual immigration, noting that Canada should increase the recruitment of international students and retain them through the Canadian Experience Class (CEC) because they have Canadian credentials.

Some participants, including service provider organizations and the private sector, supported the idea of increasing the focus on the humanitarian stream to fill labour market needs. There was consensus that an increase in privately sponsored refugees would be beneficial as they are often labour-market ready. Participants suggested that government-assisted refugees needed greater investment but applauded Canada’s commitment in this area.

**Immigration system and process**
For the most part, participants were not well versed in operational processes. Therefore, comments in this area were limited. Stakeholders generally said that a fair system that reduced fraud and distrust in the system would be beneficial to the immigration process and public opinion on immigration. Processing times and the complexity of the system were seen as obstacles. Greater communication with applicants and clearing the backlog (for example, parents and grandparents and FSW) were also suggested, as was setting long-term policy goals for ministerial instructions. Some participants suggested giving employers greater decision capacity on how many economic immigrants should come to Canada. Finally, participants maintained the importance of language, skills, age, adaptability and education as factors for success in immigrating to Canada. More stringent language and employment aptitude testing was suggested.

**Other comments**
Participants also made other general comments on Canada’s immigration system. Some felt that immigrants needed more information prior to arrival, specifically on opportunities and credential recognition, so that upon landing, they would have realistic expectations of the opportunities that exist and the training they might require. Participants also stressed the importance of language skills on the immigrant’s success. Many believe that immigrants have a responsibility to learn the language before coming to Canada.

**What we heard: Online consultation**
Over 4,900 respondents completed the online consultation questionnaire—the most of any online consultation hosted by CIC.

There was overall support among these respondents for a decrease in immigration levels over the next five years from the current annual average of 250,000.
was, however, a significant difference in the responses of stakeholders and individuals. The majority of stakeholders said that immigration levels should increase or be maintained. Meanwhile, almost half of the individuals were of the belief that levels should be decreased.

Among all immigration categories, respondents favoured the economic class over all other classes. When asked to rank objectives for economic immigration, respondents were most likely to say it was most important that “candidates have advanced post-secondary credentials (e.g., PhDs)” and that “candidates invest significant levels of capital or create jobs.”

In line with what was heard at the round tables, online consultation participants said that the most important factor in an immigrant’s success in Canada’s labour force would be strong skills in one of Canada’s official languages, followed by a job offer in Canada before they arrive.

There was less support for family class immigration among participants of the online consultations. Almost half of the respondents favoured a decrease in family class admissions. Likewise, almost half of the respondents did not believe it was important to maintain the parents and grandparents category. Participants maintained that the most important element of this category was that it allowed for family reunification and for newcomers to work since their parents or grandparents could care for their children. A clear majority of respondents did not believe that parents and grandparents should be given the same application processing priority as spouses, partners and children.

The protected persons category received the least amount of support from respondents. There was strong support for decreasing the annual number of entries accepted in this category. Overall, a strong majority believed the number should be decreased.
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2012 Levels: Online Stakeholder Consultation
**2012 Levels: Online Stakeholder Consultation**

**Overview and Context**

The *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* requires that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration table in Parliament by November 1 of each year an annual report to Parliament on immigration. The annual report contains the Annual Levels Plan, which establishes the total number of permanent residents Canada expects to welcome in the upcoming calendar year.

As part of the development of the Plan, CIC consults key stakeholders annually to ensure it is informed by and responsive to changing trends and dynamics while supporting Canada’s economic, social and humanitarian objectives. CIC also regularly consults with the provinces and territories on immigration levels and issues.

In order to gather stakeholder insight in the development of the 2012 Levels Plan, CIC invited over 750 stakeholders to an online consultation from June 21 to July 15, 2011. Stakeholders included employers, unions, sector councils, settlement service providers, non-governmental organizations and other key stakeholders in immigration. They were asked to participate in an online consultation to gather their views on immigration objectives and factors to consider when establishing immigration levels.

The online consultation invitation set out the purpose of the consultation, provided an overview of levels planning considerations and included a background document to assist stakeholders in responding to the consultation questions (see Annex A: Immigration Levels Planning: Balancing Priorities to Meet Canada’s Immigration Objectives). The consultation questions sought stakeholders’ experience with the current level of immigration, views on immigration objectives, factors that may influence levels planning and their feedback on the balance between economic immigrants and non-economic immigrants (see Annex B: Stakeholder Online Consultation Questionnaire).

The online consultation questionnaire was built on consultations from past years in order to track responses from stakeholders and determine if their views on immigration levels had changed over time. The online component was complemented by consultations with Canada’s provinces and territories, the City of Toronto and other federal government partners.

**Summary of Responses**

*N.B. The findings summarized in this report reflect only the views of those who participated in the online consultation. These views are not necessarily representative of the overall CIC stakeholder community.*
From over 170 responses received to the online consultation, close to 45% were from immigration consultants or lawyers, followed by business and sectoral associations at around 12%. Almost 35% of responses were from the province of Ontario.

**Current level of immigration**
Stakeholders indicated a generally positive view or a neutral experience with the current immigration level. They also reported that the immigration system needed to first and foremost support the country’s economic needs while ensuring that immigrants can be properly integrated to give them a better opportunity to succeed and contribute to Canada.

As one stakeholder noted, “The current level of immigration has been a positive force to maintain the socio-economic sustainability in the rural and urban areas of our region. Labour market shortages have been benefiting from the current levels as well as the regional economy.” Others pointed to the strength of bringing diversity to Canada, where newcomers are “happy to be in our community, appreciate our schools and quality of life. They are generous in sharing about themselves and their cultures.”

Some stakeholders were of the view that current immigration levels are too low and that raising them could help Canada meet its immediate labour market needs and its longer-term challenges, such as our ageing population.

**Immigration objectives and factors**
The Levels Plan must balance several objectives and factors while adhering to operational constraints that limit the number of admissions that can be achieved within a given year.

For this year’s consultation, and like last year, stakeholders reported that supporting long-term economic growth was a very important immigration objective for Canada. This was followed by meeting current labour market needs and supporting population maintenance or growth. One stakeholder remarked:

> I feel that supporting long-term economic growth is always the mandate of any immigration program, and the only way that we can do so is to recruit talent from outside of the country, both looking to bring in skills needed in the future, and to meet gaps in the current Canadian labour market.

After the economic objectives of immigration, stakeholders continued to view supporting population maintenance or growth, reuniting families and protecting refugees as important objectives. As in last year’s consultations, respondents reported that promoting regionalization was the least important immigration objective.

As for the factors to consider in establishing immigration levels, respondents believed that immigrant economic issues were most important, followed by the...
basic needs of the immigrants, integration issues, the impact on the host population, resource issues and the sustainability of immigration. One stakeholder noted that “Immigrant economic issues reflect on the success or failure of proper selection and integration of newcomers. If we are not successful in these two areas, then immigration is less likely to have the desired economic effect and be less fulfilling for immigrants.”

However, some stakeholders said we needed to consider all the factors important in establishing immigration levels, recognizing that they all contribute to success in either meeting immigration objectives or ensuring that newcomers thrive in Canada.

**Other comments by stakeholders**

In addition to the responses outlined above, stakeholders suggested broadening the federal skilled worker eligible occupational list, using the Temporary Foreign Worker Program to address immediate labour market needs, better approaches to foreign credential recognition, and a more holistic look at immigrant participation (economic, social, cultural and political) as factors to consider in determining levels.

**Conclusion**

In line with the responses of the previous year, economic factors were considered by stakeholders as the primary considerations when establishing immigration levels and objectives. These include consideration of the economic needs of Canada, such as long-term economic growth, meeting current labour market needs and supporting population maintenance. Economic factors also included the economic integration of immigrants, such as ensuring their level of earnings and that their skills are well used in the Canadian labour market.

CIC will pursue discussions with the provincial and territorial officials responsible for immigration as well as key immigration stakeholders with a view to balancing immigration objectives and exploring long-term immigration planning for the future.
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Levels and Mix: Stakeholder and Public Consultations

Background

In planning for the total number of people to admit as permanent residents, CIC not only balances immigration objectives but also considers several other factors, including broader government commitments, input from provinces and territories, and current and future economic conditions. The Department must also consider its operational ability to process applications in a timely manner, as well as the capacity of communities to welcome newcomers.

In addition to presenting an opportunity to gather input from stakeholders and the public on key questions facing CIC, the consultations also allowed the Department to share with stakeholders and the public some of the considerations and difficult choices involved in managing a global immigration system.

The consultations presented an important opportunity to generate greater understanding of the trade-offs involved in setting immigration levels. There are competing visions and diverging goals for the future of the immigration program, and there is no single right answer on what the focus should be. Engaging stakeholders and the broader public in that conversation was seen as a key part of developing a plan that will work for Canada going forward.

Methodology

Over the summer period, CIC held in-person and online consultations with stakeholders and the public on immigration levels and mix. These included national round table meetings with stakeholders from July 12 through to August 16, 2011, and online consultations with stakeholders and the public from August 29 to September 19, 2011. The consultations were announced through a news release on July 12, 2011 (see Annex C).

N.B. The round table and online consultation participants volunteered to take part in the consultations. Therefore, the findings summarized in this report reflect only the views of those who participated in the consultations. These views are not necessarily representative of the overall Canadian population or CIC stakeholder community. The results are only one indicator among many that will be used in future policy decision-making processes related to the issues covered in the consultation.
Round Table Meetings with Stakeholders—Key Findings

Overview and Participants

In July and August 2011, CIC launched a series of cross-country consultations on immigration issues. Round table meetings were held with invited stakeholders in the following locations:

- July 12 – Calgary, Alberta
- July 18 – Vancouver, British Columbia
- July 20 – Toronto, Ontario
- August 15 – Mississauga, Ontario
- August 15 – Scarborough, Ontario
- August 16 – London, Ontario

The meetings were attended by one hundred representatives from various sectors, including employers, unions, educational institutions, professional and business organizations, regulatory bodies, municipalities, immigrant services organizations, sector councils and ethnocultural organizations. See Annex D for the list of participants.

Prior to the discussion, participants were provided with background materials that outlined the various challenges and realities involved in managing Canada’s immigration system (see Annex F). The purpose of the meetings was to collect stakeholder input on the right level of immigration to Canada—how many immigrants—and the right mix of the three immigrant classes to Canada – economic, family and protected persons. Stakeholder views were also sought on how best to manage the system in order to provide reasonable processing times and how to improve service.

Key Findings

Following are the key highlights of the discussions from the round table meetings.

Levels

- Participants were generally supportive of the government and its direction on immigration. For the most part, there was consensus that Canada should maintain levels and some suggestions that Canada could explore the feasibility of increasing levels.

- Some representatives indicated a desire for a decrease, commenting that Decision makers needed to consider the costs of integration and the “hidden costs,” such as the impact on the health budget and housing costs.

- With levels currently at 250,000, some participants questioned how best to determine what the correct number should be. Many factors should be considered, including Canada’s optimum population size and economic objectives; what will allow Canada to maintain a competitive edge on the
world stage; the anticipated skill shortages, and the population and labour force growth required; and the trade-offs with other social costs.

- Stakeholders commented on the competitiveness of immigration. Since global competitiveness is a reality, it will be important for Canada to attract and retain talent. Some stakeholders discussed benefits of raising levels to meet this challenge and maintain a balance with other streams.

- Some participants commented on the importance of evaluating the success of current and past immigrants (including second-generation immigrants) to understand outcomes and get a realistic perspective of appropriate levels.

**Mix**

- There was strong overall support for the Provincial Nominee Program. The program is seen as a Prairies success story where more immigrants could be accommodated without negatively impacting the federal skilled worker program. From a municipal perspective, capacity is key. The scenario in Ontario is seen to be different from the rest of the country. Municipalities have responsibilities for housing, employment services and other social assistance, and they struggle with their own finite resources when facing complex needs.

- Viewpoints on the TFW program were brought forward throughout the consultation meetings. Some private sector representatives (in particular from oil, gas and trade-based industries) advocated the need for greater flexibility and faster processing for work permits. To increase mobility, there was a suggestion to issue work permits by occupation or sector as opposed to linking them to a specific employer. Some suggested increasing access to the United States labour force in time to allow low or semi-skilled workers to move freely between the two countries for temporary work. Private sector and service provider organizations both noted that the program is being used to staff long-term permanent positions as opposed to its purpose of filling temporary positions. Some wondered if long-term TFWs could be “bridged” to permanent residents, while others commented that temporary workers should be limited in favour of permanent workers.

- Views on the parents and grandparents stream were mixed. Some participants felt that the program helped Canada attract and retain immigrants, indicating that investors and workers do not want to come to Canada on a permanent basis without their families. Others disagreed, stating that when Australia tightened its family reunification program, it still received all the immigrants it needed. Others suggested that some applicants in this category may not be interested in becoming permanent residents, but have been denied visitor visas. Overall, there was general agreement with the importance of finding the right balance with this stream as Canada needs to think of future labour market needs in its current immigration policies.
Many participants agreed that the Canadian Experience Class stream should be increased and expanded. Candidates in this stream have the language skills, are younger, and are more likely to adapt. Some participants suggested that the CEC should be expanded to offer a path to those who are already here—for example, long-term residents with no status and temporary workers who have been here for extended periods.

Participants also believe that international students can be a great resource for eventual immigration, noting that Canada should increase the recruitment of international students and retain them through the CEC because they have Canadian credentials.

Some participants, including service provider organizations and the private sector, supported the idea of increasing the focus on the humanitarian stream to fill labour market needs. There was consensus that an increase in privately sponsored refugees would be beneficial as they are more labour-market ready. Participants suggested that government-assisted refugees needed greater investment but applauded Canada’s commitment in this area. The importance of ensuring that settlement and integration services are available to refugees was also noted.

**Immigration system and process**

- For the most part, participants were not well versed in operational processes. Therefore, comments in this area were limited. Stakeholders generally said that a fair system that reduced fraud and distrust in the system would be beneficial to the immigration process and public opinion on immigration.

- Most recognized the need to clear backlogs (FSWs and parents and grandparents in particular) but no solutions were mentioned. It is equally important to communicate with applicants so that they know where they are in the process.

- Immigration programs are seen to be working well but processing times and complexity are getting in the way. It was suggested that long-term policy goals must be set for ministerial instructions.

- Some participants suggested giving employers greater decision capacity on the number of economic immigrants who come to Canada.

With regard to high- and low-skilled workers, participants noted the importance of language (and the need for more stringent language testing), skills, age, adaptability and education as factors for success in immigrating to Canada. There was general acknowledgment of the importance of improving credential recognition, ensuring that occupation lists reflect labour market needs, and making the program more flexible to accommodate workers in low-skill or trades occupations.
Other comments

- Stakeholders throughout the consultation process noted the importance of meeting Canada’s objective of reaching a 4% Francophone quota in official language minority communities. Participants commented on the importance of attracting Francophone immigrants to regions with established Francophone communities throughout the country, and said that these objectives should be maintained regardless of mix.

- Some participants felt that immigrants needed more information prior to arrival, specifically on opportunities and credential recognition, so that at landing, they may have realistic expectations of the opportunities that exist and the training they might require.

- Regarding the retention of skilled immigrants, one participant noted that mobility should not be viewed as a failure. In a context of global competition, skilled workers are likely to move between countries for work.

- Participants stressed the importance of language skills for the immigrant’s success. Many believe that immigrants have a responsibility to learn the language before coming to Canada.
Levels and Mix: Online Consultations with the Public and Stakeholders

Methodology

From August 29 to September 19, 2011, CIC held online consultations on immigration levels and mix which were open to anyone who wished to express their views regarding Canada’s immigration system. When CIC announced the launch of its national consultations on levels and mix, the news release for the announcement (see Annex C) included a link to sign up to be informed of the launch of the online portion of the consultation. More than 1,600 people signed up to receive the questionnaire. The online consultations were launched on August 29, 2011, through a news release (see Annex E). The opportunity to participate was also communicated to those who had signed up for information about the consultations through a link posted on the Government of Canada’s Consulting Canadians website and prominently featured on the CIC website.

Online consultation participants began by reading a background paper (see Annex F) that provided information on Canada’s immigration system and programs. Participants then responded to a series of questions (see Annex G) to provide their views on immigration levels, including the appropriate level of immigration for Canada, and the most suitable mix between economic, family class and protected persons.

Over 4,900 responses were received during the month-long online consultation. Of these, 4,780 came from members of the general public, living either within (85%) or outside (13%) of Canada (over 2% did not indicate where they lived). Of these, 71% were Canadian citizens, 9% were permanent residents, 4% were temporary residents and 16% chose not to identify their status in Canada. In addition, 130 representatives of stakeholder organizations participated (see Appendix D for the organizations that participated and consented to having their names made public). Stakeholder participants included a range of organizations, including settlement or integration service providers, immigration lawyers and consultants, community organizations, employer/employee associations, business or sector associations, educational institutions, professional associations, private refugee sponsors, municipal associations or governments, think-tanks and labour organizations. Five representatives of provincial and territorial governments also participated.

Overall findings in this report include responses from stakeholders, the public and representatives of provincial or territorial governments. The differences between the responses provided by representatives of stakeholder organizations and individuals are highlighted in the report, where applicable. Since the number of responses provided by provincial and territorial governments is so low (n=5), these responses are not highlighted in the summary report, although they are included in the overall numbers.

It is important to consider the stakeholders’ responses separately from those provided by the general public as they represent two different perspectives. Stakeholders represented their organization’s experience and knowledge of the Canadian immigration system, and their responses reflected this perspective. The
members of the general public, on the other hand, provided their personal perspectives in response to the information in the background paper. As previously noted, however, the respondents were not selected but decided to participate on their own in this consultation and therefore, their views are not representative of the overall Canadian population or the CIC stakeholder community.

**Key Findings**

**Support for immigration levels**
There was mixed support among online consultation respondents for decreasing or increasing immigration levels over the next five years from the current average of 250,000. The majority of stakeholders said that immigration levels should increase (56%) or be maintained (29%). Among stakeholders, there was the strongest support (34%) for the 300,000 to 350,000 immigrants per year range. In contrast, almost half (46%) of the general public were of the belief that levels should be decreased. Only a quarter (27%) of the general public respondents said that levels should be increased and another quarter (25%) believed they should be maintained. General public respondents (25%) were most supportive of the 50,000 or less immigrants per year option, with 16% favouring 50,000 to 100,000 and 12% in favour of the 100,000 to 150,000 range. When asked to rank the objectives that should be used to establish immigration levels, “supporting long-term economic growth” was the one most often selected by all respondents (stakeholders and individuals) as the most important objective.

It should be noted that the views on immigration levels among the general public participants of the consultation are significantly different from the findings of CIC’s Annual Tracking Survey. The Tracking Survey is a telephone survey conducted on an annual basis with a representative sample of adults living in Canada to track changes in views on immigration levels, among other things. According to the findings of the tracking surveys from 2004 to 2010, support for immigration levels, whatever they were at the time, remained above 50%. In fact, the number of Canadians who said that there were “too many” immigrants dropped by almost half since 1996. This shows that the general population has a more favourable perception of immigration levels compared to members of the general population who chose to participate in the online consultation.

**Mix between economic, family class and protected persons**
Respondents were asked to select a percentage for each immigration class so that all three would add up to 100 percent. Support was highest for the economic class, with a strong majority of respondents selecting between 60% and 70%. Respondents most frequently said that family class should represent 20% to 30% of total immigration in Canada and that protected persons (refugees) should be 5% to 10%.
Economic Class
Among all immigration categories, respondents favoured the economic class over other classes. There was somewhat positive support (40%) among all respondents for increasing economic class immigration, although three in 10 (30%) respondents favoured decreasing the number of immigrants brought in through this category. While both stakeholders and individuals supported an increase in economic immigrants, stakeholders were much more likely to support an increase in this category (58%). Among all respondents who thought the economic class levels should increase (n=1,994), over four in 10 (42%) said that family class and protected persons levels should be decreased to accommodate it.

Among respondents who thought economic class levels should decrease (n=1,490), overall, 35% believed that family class should benefit from increased levels as a result. On the other hand, 35% said they did not know which class should have their levels increased as the trade-off to decreased economic class levels. Stakeholders were most likely (25%) to say that both family and protected persons classes should benefit from an increase. However, it should be noted that 43% of stakeholders “did not know.”

When asked to select the distribution between federal and provincial economic programs (factoring in 20% for Quebec’s skilled workers and business immigrants), respondents most often said it should be 40% federal and 40% provincial. Stakeholders most often said it should be 50% federal and 30% provincial. Individuals’ responses were in line with the overall figures: 40% federal and 40% provincial.

When asked who should have the greater say on which economic immigrants Canada should accept, almost half the respondents said that the federal government, provincial or territorial governments (for their own jurisdiction) and employers should work together. A quarter (24%) of all respondents believed that the federal government should have the greatest say.

When asked to rank objectives for economic immigration, respondents were most likely to say that it was most important that “candidates have advanced post-secondary credentials (e.g., PhDs)” (1,137 “most important” rankings) and “candidates who will invest significant levels of capital or create jobs” (1,095 “most important” rankings).

In line with what was heard at the round tables, online consultation participants said that the most important factor in an immigrant’s success in Canada’s labour force would be strong skills in one of Canada’s official languages, followed by a job offer in Canada before they arrive.

Temporary Foreign Workers
The majority (56%) of all respondents did not believe that additional pathways to permanent residence should be established for low-skilled temporary foreign workers. Differences existed between stakeholders’ and individuals’ responses. A majority of stakeholders (56%) believed that additional pathways to permanent
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residence should be established. In contrast, 57% of general population participants did not believe low-skilled TFWs should have pathways to permanent residence.

Of the respondents who thought that additional pathways should be established (n=1,465), 43% believed that TFWs had proven themselves with their Canadian employers. When looking at the differences between individuals’ and stakeholders’ rationale for creating pathways to permanent residence for TFWs, stakeholders were most likely to say that Canada needs more low-skilled workers (32%), that TFWs already have Canadian work experience (28%), and that they have proven themselves with their Canadian employer (25%). On the other hand, general public respondents said that TFWs have proven themselves with their Canadian employer (43%), that Canada needs more low-skilled workers (24%), and that they already have Canadian work experience (24%).

Of the respondents who did not think that additional pathways should be established (n=2,772), the majority (54%) believed that Canada needs to invest in and hire Canadians. This view was shared by both stakeholders (51%) and the general public (54%).

Stakeholders thought that temporary foreign workers bridged a labour gap that existed in many industries where workers within Canada were difficult to find. Some felt that the process for bringing in TFWs was too long and onerous, especially given the nature of the jobs to be filled. There were also concerns raised that “low-skilled temporary workers [were] vulnerable to abuse” and needed to be better protected by labour laws.

Family Class
There was less support for family class immigration among participants of the online consultations. Almost half of the respondents (48%) favoured a decrease in family class admissions. Stakeholder organizations, however, were almost equally in favour of increasing (36%) and decreasing (32%) family class admissions. Among the general population, support for decreasing this immigration category was more apparent, with 48% in favour of a decrease and 32% in favour of an increase.

Many of those who supported family class immigration mentioned that it goes beyond economic contributions:

Meeting current labour needs important for the economic growth of the country, however, to retain the skilled workers, family reunification must also be considered of great importance. Workers will be more likely to stay if family [is] nearby.

General public respondent

Among respondents who favoured an increase in family immigration (n=1,591), 48% said it should be done by taking from the protected persons class annual allotment. Meanwhile, among respondents who favoured a decrease in family
immigration (n=2,343), 70% said that additional immigrants should be brought in from the economic class.

Parents and Grandparents
Almost half the respondents (45%) did not believe it was important to maintain the parents and grandparents category. Participants maintained that the most important element of this category is that it allowed for family reunification (35%) and for newcomers to work since their parents or grandparents could care for their children (22%). A clear majority (60%) of respondents did not believe that parents and grandparents should be given the same application processing priority as spouses, partners and children.

When asked, unprompted, how Canada should handle the current backlog of applications in this category, respondents favoured increasing the number of parents and grandparents allowed into Canada each year (1,482 mentions), followed by limiting the number of people allowed to sponsor their parents and grandparents (1,275 mentions). On the other hand, 1,272 respondents stated that this was not applicable as the parents and grandparents category should be eliminated.

Many participants, particularly the general population respondents, expressed concern over the financial burden parents and grandparents placed on Canada’s social systems and economy. If one change were made to the parents and grandparents program, 24% of all the respondents (26% of stakeholders and 24% of individuals) said that Canada should require sponsors to be better financially established before they are eligible to sponsor. There were also several unprompted suggestions by participants to devise other solutions to allow parents and grandparents to visit but not become permanent residents or citizens of Canada:

Most parents and grandparents are not interested [in] immigrat[ing], they just want to see their family. Why not make a different process for this kind of category[?] Just give them long term temporary pass and not immigration program. Or limit the age that will be accepted for parents and grandparents sponsorship.

General public respondent

Protected Persons (Refugees)
The protected persons category received the least amount of support from respondents. There was strong support for decreasing the annual number of entries accepted in this category. Overall, 68% believed the number should be decreased. While stakeholders supported (45%) decreasing the number of refugees being accepted in Canada, they were not as strongly in favour of a decrease as were the general population respondents (69%).

There was a perception among some participants that refugees contributed less to the country. Others were concerned that prospective immigrants to Canada would take advantage of the country’s strong humanitarian tradition: “Protecting refugees is very important. But Canada needs to be sure that they are REAL refugees.”
Participants who favoured an increase in this category (n=517) suggested doing so by taking from the economic class (37%) and family class (34%) categories. Stakeholders (n=36) who favoured increasing annual refugee admissions were much more supportive (44%) of taking from the economic class levels. Of the participants who favoured a decrease in refugees (n=3,339), a majority (52%) believed that levels should be increased in the economic class category as a result.

**Conclusion**
Protecting the integrity and intent of Canada’s immigration system was seen as paramount for participants in the online consultation on levels and mix. From ensuring that refugee claimants are genuine, to accepting skilled workers to fill labour shortages, to reuniting families in Canada, immigration contributes greatly to Canada’s culture and economy.

While Canada’s economic prosperity is largely believed to be achieved through maintained or increased economic immigration, many participants also said that family class immigration can also contribute to Canada’s success by helping immigrants establish themselves and stay in Canada. When determining the appropriate level and mix of immigrants, it will be important to continually assess the Canadian labour market needs, the rate of population growth (particularly in certain regions), and the country’s ability to support and integrate different classes of immigrants.

While there was no targeted outreach to First Nations on these issues, this is a gap that the department will rectify going forward.
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Immigration Levels Planning:
Balancing Priorities to Meet Canada’s Immigration Objectives

Introduction: Immigration to Canada
Immigration has been a sustaining feature of Canada’s history and continues to play a role in building our country. From Confederation to the global transformations of recent years, hard-working people have come to Canada from all over the world with their skills and entrepreneurial talents, to reunite with family members, or to seek security and stability. Collectively, they have contributed to the development of Canada’s economy, society and culture. In fact, Canada has long been a destination of choice for immigrants. It has one of the highest per capita rates of permanent immigration in the world—roughly 0.8 percent in recent years—and has welcomed 3.5 million immigrants in the last 15 years. Canada is also a leader in granting newcomers the full range of rights and responsibilities that come with citizenship. Indeed, on average, 80% of permanent residents become citizens within four years of arriving.

The Levels Plan: Meeting and Balancing Objectives
The current immigration system must manage multiple objectives. Immigration has a role both in helping to meet the labour market needs of today and helping to build the skilled workforce of the future. It helps reunite families, build strong communities, and support population maintenance and/or growth. In keeping with a proud Canadian tradition, the immigration system supports global humanitarian efforts through the resettlement of refugees and providing assistance to asylum seekers. The immigration system also protects the health, safety and security of Canadians, a responsibility that Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) shares with security partners such as the Canada Border Security Agency and the RCMP.

The annual levels plan must balance the objectives of the immigration program within operational constraints that limit the number of admissions that can be achieved each year. The plan sets out the number of persons Canada expects to welcome in the coming year and must be tabled in Parliament by November 1st, as per the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA). The plan sets ranges for each of the three classes of permanent residents (economic, family, and protected persons), as well as the

1 While Canada’s system of managed migration is based on two distinct streams—permanent immigrants (those who settle in Canada and may eventually become citizens) and temporary residents (those here for a limited time to visit, work or study)—the levels plan projects admissions for permanent immigration only.
subcategories for each. There is also a smaller “other” category. See Appendix A for the 2011 levels plan and Appendix B for recent admissions.

Since jurisdiction over immigration is a shared responsibility, effective collaboration between the Government of Canada and the provinces and territories is essential to the successful management of the immigration program. Provincial and territorial governments are CIC’s primary partners, and the shared goal is to make immigration programs responsive to the unique economic, social and labour market needs of each province and territory. In practice, the federal government has led on immigration policy and delivery, except in the case of Quebec. The *Canada-Quebec Accord* (1991) granted full responsibility to Quebec for setting admissions and selecting foreign nationals destined to that province. Under the Provincial Nominee Program, provincial governments nominate foreign nationals for permanent migration. The federal government continues to be responsible for processing all applications arising from Quebec selection activities and provincial nominations and for setting the national levels plan.

**The Purpose of Consultations on the Levels Plan**
The purpose of these consultations is to:
- Provide an overview of the immigration levels planning;
- Seek views on immigration levels from multiple perspectives, including those of employers, unions, settlement service providers, and other key stakeholders; and
- Increase CIC knowledge of local socio-economic and labour market conditions, in a manner that will assist the levels-planning process.

**Current Context: The Composition of Immigration to Canada**

*Economic Class*
This class includes persons selected in the following categories, as well as members of the applicant’s immediate family:
- Skilled workers, including federal skilled workers (FSWs) and those selected by Quebec;
- Provincial and territorial nominees (through the Provincial Nominee Program, or PNP);
- The Canadian Experience Class (CEC);
- Live-in caregivers; and
- Business immigrants, including both federal and Quebec-selected applicants.

In the selection of skilled workers, IRPA places emphasis on their level of education, previous work experience, knowledge of English and/or French, age, arranged employment and adaptability, attributes which would indicate their flexibility as the economy shifts. Changes to IRPA announced in June...
2008 allowed the Government the authority to process only those FSW applications that responded directly to national labour market pressures. Since the first set of instructions was implemented in November 2008, significant progress has been made in reducing the backlog of applications and in improving the labour market responsiveness of the immigration program. For example, the backlog of FSW applications has been reduced by over 50%.

Business immigrants are selected for their ability to create jobs for themselves and other Canadian residents and to stimulate economic activity. With the PNP, provincial and territorial governments designate immigrants who will meet their local economic needs. The CEC allows certain skilled temporary foreign workers and international students with Canadian degrees and work experience to apply for permanent resident status without leaving Canada. The Live-In Caregiver Program allows Canadians to employ a qualified foreign worker in their private residence to provide care for children, sick or elderly people, or persons with a disability. After two years, these caregivers are eligible to apply for permanent resident status.

**Family Class**
This class comprises two main groups: (1) spouses, partners and dependent children, and (2) parents and grandparents. Canadian citizens and permanent residents who are 18 years of age or older can sponsor close family members for immigration to Canada. Sponsors are responsible for addressing the essential needs of their family members and ensuring that they do not become dependent on the Canadian social assistance system.

**Protected Persons Class**
Each year, Canada protects thousands of asylum-seekers through the In-Canada refugee determination system and the resettlement of refugees selected abroad. Refugees selected abroad fall into two categories: government-assisted and privately-sponsored. Protection may also be granted to individuals who are already in Canada and whose removal to their country of nationality or habitual residence would subject them to risk of torture, risk to life, or cruel and unusual treatment or punishment.

**Other (Humanitarian and Compassionate and Public Policy)**
On an exceptional basis, IRPA gives CIC the authority to grant permanent resident status to individuals and families who would not otherwise qualify in any category, in cases where there are strong humanitarian and compassionate considerations, or for public policy reasons. These discretionary provisions provide the flexibility to approve deserving cases not anticipated in the legislation. This “other” group also includes a small number of ministerial permit holders.
Levels Planning: Considerations
In planning for the total number of persons to admit as permanent residents, CIC not only balances immigration objectives but also considers several other factors, including:

- Government of Canada priorities and commitments;
- Input solicited from consultations with provinces and territories and stakeholders;
- Current and future economic conditions, as well as labour market needs; and
- The capacity of the economy and of communities to welcome newcomers.

Government of Canada Priorities and Commitments
At the highest level, the levels plan must support the Government of Canada’s commitment to an immigration system that continues to balance the three pillars of immigration, namely, to contribute to Canada’s economic prosperity, to reunite families, and to uphold Canada’s humanitarian traditions and obligations. Beyond this, the levels plan must also address a range of other priorities and commitments, including:

- Doing more to meet immediate and regional skills shortages through the use of the ministerial instructions and, PNP, and CEC.
- Reducing the large backlog of applications, especially in the FSW category, that has led to long wait times for applicants wishing to start a new life in Canada;
- Expedited processing for immediate family members; and
- Complying with legislative amendments which commit Canada to resettle an additional 2,500 refugees from overseas, increasing the number of refugees resettled annually to as high as 14,500.

Consultations with Provincial and Territorial Partners and Stakeholders
Levels plans reflect input received from provincial and territorial governments, as well as that solicited from key stakeholders across Canada. This input includes provincial and territorial projections for provincial nominees and, in Quebec’s case, for Quebec-selected skilled worker and business immigrants.

Economic Conditions and Labour Market Needs
CIC takes into account current and projected economic and labour-market conditions when planning admissions. Both long- and short-term labour market needs must be considered. Similar to other countries with aging populations, Canada is facing significant demographic challenges such as slowing labour force growth. Although immigration alone cannot address this problem, it will continue to help build the labour force of tomorrow. With the introduction of ministerial instructions and the occupations-under-
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Capacity to Welcome Newcomers
With a range of programming and significant funding allocated for settlement and integration, the Government of Canada works closely with the provinces and territories to ensure that newcomers have access to the supports they need to find their place in Canadian communities. Accordingly, increases in levels have downstream costs related to settlement programming, and the capacity to welcome immigrants cannot be separated from levels planning.

Capacity to Process Applications
CIC strives to process applications in a timely manner. However, years of receiving more applications every year than could be processed have resulted in large backlogs in many categories, which in turn have led to long wait times for applicants.

Despite the progress made over the first 18 months of Ministerial Instructions in reducing the backlog of applications and improving processing times for FSW applicants, application levels reached above the level that could be processed in a timely way. As a result, the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism introduced new Ministerial Instructions on June 26, 2010, to better align the supply of applicants with Canada’s labour market needs and our capacity to process them. FSW applicants must now either have a job offer or experience working in an identified occupation. The occupations are identified through an analysis of labour market information and consultations with provinces, territories, stakeholders and the public. For those applying under the occupation list, the government has limited the total number of applications and the number of applications from any one occupation that will be considered for processing to better manage the supply of applications with labour market demand. The limit does not apply to applicants with an offer of arranged employment. In addition, the instructions require all federal skilled worker and Canadian Experience Class applicants to submit the results of an independent language proficiency assessment from a designated testing agency before their application will be considered.

Canada is not only an attractive destination for those applying for permanent resident status. Recent years have seen a rise in the number of people wishing to come to Canada to work temporarily, to study, or to visit. These requests are often time-sensitive and, given the increasing volumes, have a significant effect on operations at missions around the world.

---

2 The list of occupations can be found at [http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/immigrate/skilled/apply-who-instructions.asp#list](http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/immigrate/skilled/apply-who-instructions.asp#list)
Conclusion
The annual levels planning exercise is essential for balancing the immigration program’s many objectives and for meeting the Government’s priorities and commitments, as they arise. The Government of Canada recognizes that for immigration to continue to respond to Canada’s needs, it is critical to receive input from its provincial and territorial partners and from immigration stakeholders across the country. We invite you to respond to our online consultation questions on immigration levels and look forward to receiving your input.
### Appendix A: The Levels Plan for 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant Category</th>
<th>2011 Plan Target Ranges</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC CLASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally Selected Economic Class*</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>80,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants†</td>
<td>33,200</td>
<td>36,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependents†</td>
<td>40,800</td>
<td>43,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincially Selected Economic Class*</td>
<td>76,600</td>
<td>80,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants†</td>
<td>31,900</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependents†</td>
<td>44,700</td>
<td>47,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Nominee Program</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants†</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependents†</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>26,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec-selected Skilled Workers and Business</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>35,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants†</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependents†</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Economic Class—Principal Applicants</td>
<td>65,100</td>
<td>70,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Economic Class—Spouses and Dependents</td>
<td>85,500</td>
<td>90,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Economic Class</td>
<td>150,600</td>
<td>161,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY CLASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses, Partners and Children</td>
<td>45,500</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Grandparents</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Family Class</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>65,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTECTED PERSONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-assisted Refugees</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately Sponsored Refugees</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Persons In-Canada</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependants Abroad of Protected Persons In-Canada</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Protected Persons</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian and Compassionate Grounds/Public Policy</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Holders</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This year admission projections for economic immigration are being presented based on selecting and/or nominating jurisdiction because the direct involvement of provinces and territories in economic immigration has grown. Under the Canada–Quebec Accord Relating to Immigration and Temporary Admission of Aliens, the Government of Quebec has responsibility for selecting immigrants destined to its province, and other jurisdictions participating in the Provincial Nominee Program have the responsibility to nominate foreign nationals for permanent resident status.

†The number of principal applicants and spouses and dependants is estimated based on historical averages, and is included for illustrative purposes only.

### Appendix B: Permanent residents Admissions by category, 2006-2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and partners</td>
<td>45,305</td>
<td>44,912</td>
<td>44,209</td>
<td>43,901</td>
<td>40,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons and daughters</td>
<td>3,191</td>
<td>3,338</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>2,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and grandparents</td>
<td>20,005</td>
<td>15,813</td>
<td>16,599</td>
<td>17,178</td>
<td>15,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family class</strong></td>
<td>70,517</td>
<td>66,242</td>
<td>65,581</td>
<td>65,204</td>
<td>60,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs - principal applicants</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed - principal applicants</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors - principal applicants</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2,832</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>3,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>7,434</td>
<td>8,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers - principal applicants</td>
<td>44,161</td>
<td>41,251</td>
<td>43,361</td>
<td>40,733</td>
<td>48,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>61,783</td>
<td>56,601</td>
<td>60,373</td>
<td>55,220</td>
<td>70,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Experience Class - applicants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>2,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Experience Class - and dependants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/territorial nominees - principal applicants</td>
<td>4,672</td>
<td>6,329</td>
<td>8,343</td>
<td>11,801</td>
<td>13,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/territorial nominees - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>8,664</td>
<td>10,765</td>
<td>14,075</td>
<td>18,578</td>
<td>22,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in caregivers - principal applicants</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>6,157</td>
<td>6,273</td>
<td>7,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in caregivers - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>4,354</td>
<td>6,181</td>
<td>6,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic immigrants</strong></td>
<td>138,251</td>
<td>131,245</td>
<td>149,071</td>
<td>153,491</td>
<td>186,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-assisted refugees</td>
<td>7,326</td>
<td>7,572</td>
<td>7,295</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>7,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately sponsored refugees</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>5,036</td>
<td>4,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees landed in Canada</td>
<td>15,884</td>
<td>11,696</td>
<td>6,994</td>
<td>7,204</td>
<td>9,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee dependants</td>
<td>5,952</td>
<td>5,098</td>
<td>4,057</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>3,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugees</strong></td>
<td>32,499</td>
<td>27,954</td>
<td>21,858</td>
<td>22,848</td>
<td>24,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROC and PDRCC**</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary resident permit holders</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H and C cases</td>
<td>4,312</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>2,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other H and C cases outside the family class / Public Policy</td>
<td>5,902</td>
<td>6,844</td>
<td>7,168</td>
<td>7,374</td>
<td>5,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other immigrants</strong></td>
<td>10,373</td>
<td>11,312</td>
<td>10,735</td>
<td>10,628</td>
<td>8,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category not stated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>251,642</td>
<td>236,754</td>
<td>247,247</td>
<td>252,172</td>
<td>280,636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data for 2010 are preliminary estimates and are subject to change. For 2006-2009, these are updated numbers and may differ from those of Facts and Figures 2009.

** Deferred Removal Order Class and Post-determination Refugee Claimants in Canada.

Source: Citizenship and Immigration Canada, RDM, Preliminary 2010 Data.
Annex B: 2012 Levels
Stakeholder Online Consultation Questionnaire

1. If you wish, please provide your name, organization and contact details in the space provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Which of the following best describes your organization?

   a. Employer / Employee Association
   b. Business / Sector Association
   c. Professional Association
   d. Labour/Union Group
   e. Settlement/Integration service provider
   f. Academic/Public Policy Institution
   g. Private Sponsorship of Refugees Program Agreement Holder
   h. Immigration Consultant / Lawyer
   i. Education Institution / Education Association
   j. Municipal Association / Municipal Government
   k. Community Organization
   l. Other (please specify): ________________

3. Please indicate the province(s) and/or territory(ies) in which you operate. Please check all that apply.

   a. Newfoundland and Labrador
   b. Nova Scotia
   c. Prince Edward Island
   d. New Brunswick
   e. Quebec
   f. Ontario
   g. Manitoba
   h. Saskatchewan
   i. Alberta
   j. British Columbia
   k. Nunavut
   l. Northwest Territories
m. Yukon

4. In recent years, immigration levels have been between 240,000 -265,000 admissions per year (approximately 0.7% of Canada’s population). We would like to know about your experience with the current level of immigration, from the perspective of your organization, and from a national, regional and/or provincial viewpoint.

   a. Overall, would you say your experience with the current level of immigration has been positive, negative or neutral?

      Positive
      Neutral
      Negative

   b. Please explain why your experience has been positive, negative or neutral in the space below.


The Levels Plan must balance several objectives, including economic growth and competitiveness, family reunification and humanitarian protection along with protecting the health, safety and security of Canadians. The immigration system is also subject to operational constraints that limit the number of admissions that can be achieved within a given year. Sometimes, compromises may be required in trying to balance these objectives within the current operational constraints. The following questions seek your views regarding how to find the appropriate balance.

5. Immigration can be positioned to meet a variety of objectives. Please rate the objectives below in order from one to six, where one is not at all important, and six is very important:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Rating (1-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting population maintenance/growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting current labour market needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting long-term economic growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting regionalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting family reunification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting refugees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The following is a list of six factors that might influence immigration levels planning. Please rate the factors below in order from one to six, where one is not at all important, and six is very important when establishing immigration levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating (1-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Economic Issues</td>
<td>Immigrant earnings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty rates among immigrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of incomes within and between host and immigrant populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployment, underemployment and under-utilization of immigrant skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Host Population</td>
<td>Job displacement among the host population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public support for immigration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public support for refugee program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Needs of Immigrants</td>
<td>Access to settlement and integration supports generally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to language training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrant health outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Issues</td>
<td>Socio-economic integration among the second and third generations (post immigration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrant concentration in urban areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-immigrant and inter-ethnic group conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiculturalism and diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of Immigration</td>
<td>Immigration and related program costs at both local and national levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety and security concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Issues</td>
<td>Operational capacity of Canada’s immigration system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex C – Levels and Mix Consultations

News Release – Minister Kenney launches national consultations on immigration levels and mix

Calgary, July 12, 2011 — Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism Minister Jason Kenney has launched a series of cross-country consultations on immigration issues, beginning today in Calgary.

The Minister is meeting with stakeholders and the public to discuss the important issue of immigration levels and mix. Following the Calgary session today, the Minister will meet with stakeholders in Vancouver on July 18, Toronto on July 20 and Montreal on July 22. Online consultations will take place later this summer and will be open to the public.

The purpose of the consultations is to seek feedback on immigration levels, including the appropriate level of immigration for Canada, and the most suitable mix between economic, family class and protected persons. Discussions on system management to provide improved services, such as reasonable processing times, and addressing issues such as fraud, will also be included.

In planning for the total number of people to admit as permanent residents, CIC not only balances immigration objectives but also considers several other factors, including broader government commitments, input from provinces and territories, and current and future economic conditions. The Department must also consider its operational ability to process applications in a timely manner, as well as the capacity of communities to welcome newcomers.

In addition to presenting an opportunity to gather input from stakeholders and the public on key questions facing CIC, the consultations also allow the Department to share with stakeholders and the public some of the considerations and difficult choices involved in managing a global immigration system.

The consultations present an important opportunity to generate greater understanding of the trade-offs involved in setting immigration levels. There are competing visions and diverging goals for the future of the immigration program, and there is no single right answer on what the focus should be. Engaging stakeholders and the broader public in that conversation is a key part of developing a plan that will work for Canada going forward.

Invited stakeholders represent a variety of perspectives, including those of employers, labour, academia, learning institutions, professional organizations, business organizations, regulatory bodies, municipalities, settlement provider organizations and ethnocultural organizations.

A report on the consultations will be available on the CIC website once stakeholder and public consultations have been completed.
More information about the online consultations will be available on the CIC website in the coming weeks. Interested participants may sign up online at www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/consultations/index.asp.

Follow us on Twitter at www.twitter.com/CitImmCanada.

For further information (media only), please contact:

Candice Malcolm  
Minister’s Office  
Citizenship and Immigration Canada

Media Relations  
Communications Branch  
Citizenship and Immigration Canada  
613-952-1650  
CIC-Media-Relations@ cic.gc.ca

Backgrounder

- Stakeholder Consultations on Immigration Levels and Mix
Annex D – Levels and Mix Consultations Stakeholder Participants: Roundtables and Online Consultation

Stakeholder Participants: Roundtable Consultations

The following is the list of stakeholder organizations who participated in the roundtables with Minister Kenney and Parliamentary Secretaries Dykstra and Leung.

**July 12, 2011 – Calgary, Alberta**

Alberta Associations of Immigrant Serving Agencies  
Association canadienne-française de l’Alberta  
Building Trades of Alberta  
Calgary Catholic Immigration Society  
Calgary Chamber of Commerce  
Calgary Immigrant Women’s Association  
Calgary Regional Immigrant Employment Council  
Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers  
Canadian Bar Association Immigration Section  
Centre d’accueil pour les nouveaux arrivants francophones  
Immigrant Services Calgary  
Petroleum Human Resources Council of Canada  
SAIT Polytechnic

**July 18, 2011 – Vancouver, British Columbia**

Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada  
British Columbia Chamber of Commerce  
British Columbia Council for International Education  
Business Council of British Columbia  
Canadian Immigration Policy Research Council  
Canada Chinese Investors and Entrepreneurs Association  
Chamber of Shipping of British Columbia  
City of Vancouver  
Community Futures Development Association of British Columbia  
La Fédération des francophones de la Colombie-Britannique  
Fraser Institute  
Immigrant Employment Council of British Columbia
Immigrant Services Society of British Columbia
The Laurier Institution
Multicultural Helping House Society
Multilingual Orientation Service Association for Immigrant Communities (MOSAIC)
RCI Capital Group
TESL Canada
S.U.C.C.E.S.S.
Suki Badh
Vancouver Board of Trade

July 20, 2011 – Toronto, Ontario

Adoption Council of Canada
The Alliance of Sector Councils
Association of Municipalities of Ontario
Canada India Foundation
Canadian Association of Professional Immigration Consultants
Canadian Employee Relocation Council
Canadian Immigration Policy Research Council
Canadian Ukrainian Immigrant Aid Society, Ukrainian Canadian Congress
C.D. Howe Institute
Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks
Chinese Canadian National Council
Destination Canada Info Inc / Canadian Immigrant Magazine
Green and Spiegel LLP
Institute for Canadian Citizenship
Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council
Languages Canada

August 15, 2011 – Mississauga, Ontario

Brampton Multicultural Community Centre
Canada India Foundation
Canadian Supply Chain Sector Council
Centre francophone de Toronto
Centre of Excellence in Financial Services Education (CoE)
Dixie Bloor Neighbourhood Centre
Gateway Centre
Heartland Creditview Neighbourhood Association
India Rainbow Community Services of Peel
Indo-Canada Chamber of Commerce
Jewish Immigrant Aid Services of Toronto
Malton Neighbourhood Services
Mississauga Chinese Business Association
Newcomer Centre of Peel
Peel Multicultural Council
Region of Halton (Halton Newcomer Strategy Group)
Regroupement de développement économique et d’employabilité
Toronto Financial Services Alliance (TFSA)
United Way of Peel Region

**August 15, 2011 – Scarborough, Ontario**

Canada Christian Voice/Canadian Christian Association
Canada-Pakistan Business Council
Canadian Council of Muslim Women
Centre for Information and Community Services of Ontario
Community Development Council Durham
Conseil scolaire Viamonde
Durham Region Unemployed Help Centre
East Metro Youth Services
Filipino Canadian Charitable Foundation (Toronto)
International Christian Voice
Iranian Community Centre (Toronto)
Municipality of Durham Region
Taiwan Entrepreneurs Society Taipei Toronto
Taiwanese Canadian Association of Toronto
Toronto Community and Cultural Centre
Toronto District School Board
Toronto Public Library
YMCA of Toronto
August 16, 2011 – London, Ontario

Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario
Canadian Arab Society
Canadian Horticultural Council
City of London
Collège Boréal
Goodwill Industries
Latino Magazine
London Cross Cultural Learner Centre
London Intercommunity Health Care
Office of Susan Truppe, Member of Parliament, London North Centre
South London Neighbourhood Resource Centre
University of Western Ontario
WIL Employment Connections

Stakeholder Participants: Online Consultations

The following is the list of stakeholder organizations who participated in the online consultation and consented to having their name included on the list of participants. The names below are written the way respondents identified their organizations.

Aerosapce and defence human resources partnership
Akita Drilling Ltd.
Association for New Canadians
Association of Canadian Community Colleges
Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
Automotive Training Standards Organization
Babs Professional Construction Works
BC Heritage Party
Brazolot Migration Group
Bridge Communications & Research
Business Council of BC
Calgary Chamber of Commerce
Canada Hungary Educational Foundation
Canada's Building Trades Unions
Canadian Association For Free Expression
Canadian Association for Immigration Reform
Canadian Cattlemen's Association
Canadian Demographic Association
Canadian Hungarian Heritage Association
Canadian Immigrant Community Services Society
CARO Global Immigration Services
Carrefour d'immigration rurale du Nord-Ouest
Carrefour Jeunesse emploi Lotbinière
Catholic Social Services
CCO
Centre francophone de Toronto
Christian Reformed World Relief Committee
City of Edmonton
Coast To Coast Immigration Consultancy Services Private Limited
Columbia College
Comité Réseau d'Ottawa
Conseil de la coopération de l'Ontario
Conseil des écoles catholiques du Centre-Est
Conseil Économique et Social Ottawa-Carleton (CESOC)
Conseil scolaire de district catholique Centre-Sud (CSDCCS)
County of Simcoe (Municipal Government)
Department of Education
Entreprise Région Grand-Sault
Excel Playgreen Group Inc.
FANE - Immigration Francophone Nouvelle-Écosse
Flexibility Learning Systems
Fluor Canada Ltd.
Flynn Canada Ltd
Globex International Group
Go International Immigration & Education Consultant
Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce
Henry Global Consulting Service Ltd
Higher Options Consulting
Hire Immigrants Ottawa
HyLife Ltd
iGlobal Canada Immigration Services Ltd.
Immigrant Resource Program
Immigrant Settlement & Integration Services
Immigration Watch Canada
India Canada Cultural Association
Island Immigration Consulting
Jewish Family Services of Ottawa
KCIS
Manitoba Immigration Council
Maytree / ALLIES
Migrant Workers Rights - Canada
Migration Concerns Canada Inc.
Mosaic
Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County
N.E.E.D.S. Inc
National Capital Region YMCA-YWCA
New Canadians Centre
Newlife canada
Ontario Mining Association
Petroleum HR Council of Canada
Polytechnics Canada
Provincial Health Services Authority
Rdée Tnl
Regina Regional Opportunities Commission
Rights and Responsibilities Coalition
Royal Society of St. George, BC Branch
SAH East Kootenay Friends of Burma
Saskatchewan German Council
Scribendi Inc.
Sheridan International Trained Professional Network
SIWA - Somali Immigrant Women Association
Sponsorship Agreement Holder
St. Louis Adult Learning & Continuing Education Centres (Waterloo Catholic DSB)
Standen’s Limited
The Conference Board of Canada
The Puratone Corporation
The TDL Group (Tim Hortons)
Three separate corporations
UJP
WestCan Immigration
Western Civilization
Windsor Women Working With Immigrant Women (WWWWiW)
Yukon Tourism Education Council
Zero Population Growth of Canada
Annex E: News Release – CIC launches online consultation on immigration levels and mix

Ottawa, August 29, 2011 — Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism Minister Jason Kenney today launched online consultations on the appropriate level of immigration and the most suitable mix between economic, family class and protected persons.

Immigration has been a sustaining feature of Canada’s history and continues to play an important role in building our country. Canada has one of the highest per capita rates of permanent immigration in the world—roughly 0.8% in recent years—and has welcomed 3.5 million immigrants in the last 15 years.

“The online consultation provides an important opportunity to gather input from stakeholders and the public on key questions facing CIC,” said Minister Kenney. “This is also a chance to highlight some of the considerations and difficult choices involved in managing a global immigration system.”

In planning for the total number of people to admit as permanent residents, CIC not only balances immigration objectives but also considers several other factors, including broader government commitments, input from provinces and territories, and current and future economic conditions. The Department must also consider its ability to process applications in a timely manner, as well as the capacity of communities to welcome newcomers.

The questionnaire is a key component of the cross-country consultations Minister Kenney and his parliamentary secretaries are currently leading on immigration levels and mix. In July, the Minister consulted with stakeholders in Calgary, Vancouver and Toronto. This month, parliamentary secretaries Rick Dykstra and Chungsen Leung held round tables in Mississauga, Scarborough and London. Additional sessions may be planned in the coming weeks and months.

Thus far, the majority of stakeholders present at the consultation sessions expressed a fairly positive view of the current immigration system. They have identified immigration as a critical way to meet labour market needs, citing economic factors as among the most important considerations when establishing immigration levels, followed by integration concerns. Participants have also highlighted the importance of family reunification and the need to address wait times in the parent and grandparent stream.

More than 1,600 people have already signed up to complete the questionnaire. It is available at the following link: www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/consultations/index.asp.

A report on the consultations, including the online questionnaire, will be available on the CIC website in the fall of 2011 or winter 2012.

Follow us on Twitter at www.twitter.com/CitImmCanada.
For further information (media only), please contact:

Candice Malcolm  
Minister’s Office  
Citizenship and Immigration Canada

Media Relations  
Communications Branch  
Citizenship and Immigration Canada  
613-952-1650  
CIC-Media-Relations@cic.gc.ca

*Building a stronger Canada: Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) strengthens Canada’s economic, social and cultural prosperity, helping ensure Canadian safety and security while managing one of the largest and most generous immigration programs in the world.*

**Backgrounder**

- [Stakeholder and Public Consultations on Immigration Levels and Mix](#)
Annex F: Levels and Mix Consultations Background Paper

Purpose

The purpose of this consultation is to seek your feedback on Canada’s immigration program. We are asking for your input on the right level of immigration to Canada – how many – and the right mix between the three immigrant classes to Canada – economic, family and protected persons. Should immigration levels be higher? Which of these areas should be a priority? If we raise levels in one of these areas, where should we take less? We’re also looking for your thoughts on how we manage the system to provide reasonable processing times, improve service, and address issues such as fraud. What follows serves to give you a sense of some of the challenges and realities we face as we strive to best answer these questions.

Overview

Immigration has been a sustaining feature of Canada’s history and continues to play an important role in building our country. From Confederation to the global transformations of recent years, hard-working people have come to Canada from all over the world with their skills and entrepreneurial talents, to reunite with family members, or to seek security and stability. Collectively, they have contributed to the development of Canada’s economy, society and culture. In fact, Canada has long been a destination of choice for immigrants. We have one of the highest per capita rates of permanent immigration in the world—roughly 0.8% in recent years—and have welcomed 3.5 million immigrants in the last 15 years. Canada is also a leader in granting newcomers the full range of rights and responsibilities that come with citizenship. Indeed, on average, 80% of permanent residents become citizens within four years of arriving.

The current immigration system must manage multiple objectives. Immigration has a role both in helping to meet the labour market needs of today and in helping to build the skilled workforce of the future. It helps reunite families, build strong communities, and, in keeping with a proud Canadian tradition, supports global humanitarian efforts through the resettlement of refugees and providing assistance to asylum seekers.

The immigration system also protects the health, safety and security of Canadians, a responsibility that Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) shares with security partners such as the Canada Border Services Agency, the RCMP, CSIS, and the Public Health Agency of Canada.

The federal framework guiding immigration and refugee protection policy is the 2002 Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA). It also identifies a
relatively long list of objectives for Canada’s immigration program. There are 18 in all. Among them:

- to support the development of a strong and prosperous Canadian economy, in which the benefits of immigration are shared across all regions in Canada;
- to see that families are reunited; and
- 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.

But while IRPA sets out the objectives, it does not talk at all about which of these objectives is a priority, or about the balance between those objectives.

This is the function of the annual levels plan.

Section 94 of IRPA requires that the Minister table a report in Parliament, on or before November 1 of each year, which includes (among other requirements) the number of foreign nationals projected to become permanent residents in the following year. The “levels plan” provides a range for each category of permanent resident and has traditionally been limited only to a single year of admissions, as set out in the Act.

In planning for the total number of persons to admit as permanent residents, CIC not only balances immigration objectives but also considers several other factors, including:

- Government of Canada priorities and commitments;
- Input solicited from consultations with provinces and territories and stakeholders;
- Current and future economic conditions, as well as labour market needs; and
- The capacity of the economy and of communities to welcome newcomers.

**Government of Canada Priorities and Commitments**

At the highest level, the levels plan must support the Government of Canada’s commitment to an immigration system that continues to balance the three pillars of immigration. Beyond this, the levels plan must also address a range of emerging priorities and commitments, including:

- Doing more to meet immediate and regional skills shortages while continuing to respond to longer term, national labour force needs;
- Accommodating growing demand in the family class while continuing to expedite processing for immediate family members (spouses/partners and children);
- Meeting Canada’s commitments to improve our asylum system and resettle more refugees from abroad; and
• Improving processing times for new applicants while sustaining progress on working through applications in the backlog.

Consultations with Provincial and Territorial Partners and Stakeholders
Levels plans reflect input received from provincial and territorial governments, as well as that solicited from key stakeholders across Canada. Under the Constitution, immigration is a shared responsibility between the federal and provincial/territorial governments. Efforts are also made to address specific regional needs, such as supporting francophone minority communities outside of Quebec. CIC has negotiated agreements with most of the provinces and territories. Quebec, in particular, is involved in selecting and integrating its own immigrants under the Canada-Quebec Accord. Other provinces have signed provincial nominee programs allowing them to select a certain number of economic class immigrants to meet regional needs.

Economic Conditions and Labour Market Needs
CIC takes into account current and projected economic and labour-market conditions when planning admissions. There is a balance between meeting immediate job needs, and ensuring immigrants have skills that will allow them to adapt and succeed as the economy changes. The size of the labour market must also be considered. Similar to other countries, Canada is facing significant demographic challenges such as an aging population and slowing labour force growth. Although immigration cannot address these problems alone, it will be a factor in helping to build the labour force of tomorrow. In this respect, provincial and territorial input on labour market issues is one of the key factors influencing economic immigration to Canada.

Capacity to Welcome Newcomers
With a range of programming and significant funding allocated for settlement and integration, the Government of Canada works closely with the provinces and territories to ensure that newcomers have access to the supports they need to find their place in Canadian communities. For 2011-2012, CIC has allocated over $600 million in settlement funding to provinces and territories outside Quebec. Under the Canada Quebec Accord, Quebec will receive over $250 million. It is important to note that increases in levels have impacts on our communities and the costs related to helping newcomers integrate and succeed. The capacity to welcome immigrants cannot be separated from levels planning.

Demand to Immigrate Greatly Exceeds Capacity
CIC strives to process applications in a timely manner, but it is an ongoing challenge for CIC to meet the IRPA objectives simultaneously. Every year, we receive many more applications than can be processed resulting in large backlogs in many categories, which in turn have led to long wait times for applicants.
In the case of economic immigrants this “over supply” can be seen as an opportunity for both the federal and the provincial and territorial governments to set higher selection criteria for the immigrants we welcome without having a concern that we may not have enough successful applicants.

In addition to the volume of applications, growing concerns regarding fraud and program integrity add to the processing burden as more time is needed to verify documentation, interview individual applicants and to conduct investigations.

Innovative approaches to managing these seemingly-competing objectives, maintaining positive outcomes for immigrants and refugees, and alleviating pressures is key to realizing a modern and efficient immigration system and to ensuring continued public support for the program. CIC is making a number of changes to make our immigration system more modern and efficient to address the issues noted above. Although increasing levels would be one way to mitigate some of these pressures, it would require broad buy-in from the public, and additional funding. Is that likely? If an increase in levels doesn’t happen, there are clearly a number of pressures that make trade-offs inevitable.

**Three Questions**

As identified at the outset of this document, the purpose of these consultations is to seek your views on our immigration program. The consultations will explore a number of issues related to three main questions:

- What is the appropriate level of immigration for Canada?
- What is the appropriate mix between economic immigrants, family class immigrants and protected persons (refugees)?
- How can we better manage the system to make it more efficient so that we have reasonable processing times, less fraud, greater fairness and better outcomes for newcomers?

**What is the appropriate level of immigration for Canada?**

Canada has long been a destination of choice for immigrants. Much of Canada’s success with and public support for immigration is based on the positive outcomes of immigrants and their contribution to our economy and society.
For the past 25 years, Canada has maintained immigration levels averaging between 225,000 and 250,000 immigrants per year. In 2010, Canada admitted close to 281,000 permanent residents, the highest level since 1957.

As natural population growth in Canada slows, with fertility rates below replacement levels, immigration will be an increasingly important source of population and labour force growth. In 2009-2010, for example, the number of births exceeded the number of deaths in Canada by about 134,000, while net international migration (including inflows and outflows of permanent and temporary migration and of Canadian-born individuals) added about 255,000 individuals to the population, accounting for about two thirds of population growth. That being said, research underscores that immigration is not a viable remedy for population aging. A 2009 study by the C.D. Howe Institute concludes that improbably huge increases in immigration (i.e. from the current 0.8% to nearly 4% of the population) in the short term would be required to stabilize Canada’s current old-age dependency ratio.

With an aging population, the number of retirements from the labour force is increasing, currently reflecting the “bulge” of aging baby boomers. Very soon, the number of new entrants from Canadian schools and universities will equal (or fall short of) the number of retirees, leaving immigration responsible for all labour force growth. The number of school leavers is expected to be in the order of 400,000 per year -- while the number of immigrants entering the labour force directly on arrival each year is in the range of about 130,000. Without immigration, labour force growth would shrink, making overall economic growth more difficult to achieve. So while immigration will help to alleviate labour shortages and contribute to regional needs, it is not the “silver bullet” for the aging of the population.

Cracks have also begun to emerge over the past two decades. There is much research to show that certain groups of immigrants have been living with very low incomes, potentially risking prospects for themselves and their children. This has been evident mainly in major urban centres in Canada. Outcomes for those in the flagship Federal Skilled Worker (FSW) category faltered in the 1990s and at the beginning of the 2000s. However, a recent evaluation has shown that changes made in 2002 to the FSW selection criteria have had a significant impact on improving outcomes. In particular, the evaluation shows that a strong knowledge of English or French and having pre-arranged employment have been very important in increasing the earnings of principal applicants in this category. These two factors – capacity in one of Canada’s official language and having a job – are also necessary (but perhaps not sufficient) for the economic success of all immigrants to Canada.
If this is the case, then one question which is often asked is “What is the right level of immigration?” There is no correct answer to the question of the “right level”. Much depends on who is selected (the “mix”) and where they go (are they going to areas with available jobs, where there is supporting infrastructure like housing, schools, hospitals, etc. or to areas where immigrants are highly concentrated and where existing support may be stretched to meet needs). Immigrants tend to go first to where they have family and friends, and only to smaller centres if there is a job available for them. Many of the provinces that are having difficulty retaining their own population have challenges retaining immigrants – for the same reasons.

Canada is a vast country, with widely varying geography and industrial mix. One part of the country may be in recession, while another region is experiencing strong growth. The “right” level will depend on a careful balancing of competing pressures – of commitments to family reunification, refugee resettlement and selecting immigrants to support economic growth; ensuring infrastructure and settlement support is in place; and that jobs are available. At the end of the day, success of the program depends on positive outcomes.

What is the appropriate mix between economic, family class and protected persons (refugees)?
Here is how the mix breaks down currently. About 60% of the immigrants who come to Canada annually are in the economic class. About 26% come in the family class. The remaining approximately 14% are primarily protected persons (refugees) but includes others taken for humanitarian and compassionate reasons.

It is worth noting that less than half of those who come in as economic immigrants are principal applicants – their spouses and dependants are also included in this category. However, a large portion of these spouses and dependents (along with those in the family class and refugees) eventually join the labour market and become economic actors as well.

Economic immigrants are chosen because of what they can contribute to the Canadian economy.

They include:

**Federal Skilled Workers**
Selection is based on a transparent points system, where education, age, experience, official language proficiency, arranged employment in Canada, and adaptability are assessed. These traits help ensure that new FSWs are flexible and adaptable to finding success in Canada’s labour market. The
recent FSW program evaluation has confirmed that this is, in fact, accurate, as applicants selected under this system enjoy stronger economic outcomes than most other economic immigrants. Since November 2008 additional eligibility criteria have been put in place to manage the intake of applications, help reduce the backlog and enhance the labour market responsiveness in this program. Eligibility is now limited to applicants with experience in identified occupations in demand and those with job offers from Canadian employers, all of whom must have their official language ability assessed by a reliable third party.

**Quebec Skilled Workers and Business Immigrants selected by Quebec**
Under the authority of the Canada-Quebec Accord, Quebec sets its own levels and selects its own skilled workers and business immigrants. Selection criteria for the former generally align with the attributes assessed under the FSW program; criteria for the latter, particularly investors, are harmonized with the federal program. The Government of Canada retains authority for overall levels-setting as well as for admissibility to Canada.

**Provincial and Territorial Nominees (PNP)**
These are economic immigrants nominated by individual provinces and territories, subject to agreements with the federal government, to meet the specific regional needs of the nominating government. The program recognizes that provinces and territories are well placed to recognize and react to labour market needs in their jurisdiction. The program was introduced in 1998 and has grown rapidly in recent years, from 1252 individuals in the year 2000 (or 0.6% of all admissions) to 36,428 individuals in 2010 (or 13% of the total flow). There are now PN agreements in place with all jurisdictions except Nunavut, offering more than 50 separate streams for admission. Many are employer driven, draw on available pools of TFWs at all skill levels, or are founded on extended family relationships with or without accompanying job offers. Many also include international student streams with different thresholds and entrepreneurial streams with varying requirements for business establishment, investment and management.

**Canadian Experience Class (CEC)**
Based on evidence that those who have worked and studied in Canada have better outcomes, the Canadian Experience Class was introduced in 2008. The category is open to certain skilled temporary foreign workers and international foreign students who have Canadian work experience and who meet a minimum language requirement. In 2010, there were 3900 admissions in this category. However, in recent years there has been substantial growth in the number of temporary foreign workers and foreign students working and studying in Canada. In 2010, Canada admitted just
over 96,000 international students and 182,000 temporary foreign workers. With increasing numbers, and growing awareness of the program, the number of applicants in this category is expected to increase.

**Business Immigrants**
Individuals are selected based on their potential to contribute to the Canadian economy through investment, business establishment and/or job creation. They must meet a minimum investment capital requirement. In 2010, 1,239 entrepreneurs and self employed individuals were admitted, but the majority were in the investor category with 2,622 principal applicants and 6,950 dependents. In 2010 changes were made in the Immigrant Investor Program to raise the minimum net worth required of applicants from $800,000 to $1.6 million, and the investment requirement from $400,000 to $800,000, to better align with international trends. More recently, on July 1, 2011, an annual cap of 700 new investor applications was introduced to address the large backlog in this category by better aligning intake of new applications to processing commitments.

**Live-in Caregivers**
Live-in Caregivers come to Canada initially on a temporary basis, to meet needs for caregiving in Canada. Once they have completed 24 months of work, living in the employer's home as a caregiver, in the four years since arriving in Canada, they may apply for permanent residence from within Canada, for themselves and eligible dependents. In 2010, 7700 principal applicants and 6200 dependents were granted permanent resident status, up from 3500 and 3350 respectively in the year 2006. The inventory of applications in process for permanent residence currently stands at just under 29,000 individuals. As the demand for temporary live-in caregivers increased dramatically until 2009, this will have downstream impacts on applications for permanent residence within future Levels plans.

Yet evidence suggests many live-in caregivers leave the profession once they become permanent residents. If there is a sustained need for such employment this may point to challenges in this line of work, including the reality that if there are other choices, people will not freely engage in “live-in” arrangements. There are also some indications that a portion of this movement is a hidden form of family reunification. Analysis from visa offices processing LCP applications suggests that in some of the regions, as many as 40% of live-in-caregivers come to work for relatives in Canada, raising the question of whether such employment would be available for non-family members.
Family Class

Approximately 26% of the immigrants who come to Canada each year do so under the family class. Most countries don’t have a family class program. Ours is one of the most generous in the world.

Canadian citizens or permanent residents over the age of 18 may sponsor their immediate family members, subject to sponsorship agreements of 3 (spouses/partners, children) to 10 years (parents and grandparents). It is important to note that in addition to this, close to two-thirds of economic class immigrants are actually family – i.e. the spouses/partners and dependent children of principal applicants, which means a minority of economic class immigrants (principal applicants) are actually selected according to their skills and experience.

Applications for sponsorship of spouses/partners and dependent children receive priority processing, but this commitment, and the need to balance family reunification with other immigration objectives, has resulted in a backlog of nearly 165,000 persons as of March 31, 2011 in the Parents and Grandparents category. Wait times for recent applicants in this category are already long, and could continue to get worse if not action is taken.

Refugees/Protected Persons/Humanitarian

The remaining approximately 14% of immigrants to Canada come from this group. Canada has a long-standing international commitment to assist in the resettlement of refugees for whom no other durable solution is available. In addition, Canada’s refugee determination system adjudicates refugee claims by individuals within Canada. Canada has two major refugee categories for permanent residence: resettled refugees, (including those sponsored from abroad by the Government and those sponsored by private organizations) and those who have made successful refugee claims from within Canada. There are also categories to address exceptional humanitarian or public policy cases on an individual basis. There are currently applications representing 71,000 individuals waiting to be processed – including 10,000 government assisted refugees, 25,000 privately sponsored refugees and 20,000 in the humanitarian/public policy categories. As reforms to the refugee determination system proceeds and the backlog of refugee claims is drawn down it can be expected that the number of successful claimants requesting permanent resident status will increase. At the same time, as part of the same refugee reform package, the Government has committed to increasing the number of resettled refugees by 2500 to 14,500 per year.
Temporary Residents

There are three broad categories of temporary residents – visitors, international/foreign students and temporary foreign workers. While all three categories place demands on the department’s resources, the temporary foreign worker and international student programs are most relevant for this consultation. Both have experienced significant growth in recent years (TFW intake has risen from 116,000 in 2000 to over 182,000 in 2010 and Canada annual foreign student entries have grown by 34% since 2006) in absence of additional funding, which means the Department is doing far more processing than before without additional resources.

Temporary Foreign Workers

In 2010, Canada admitted 182,000 individuals in the temporary foreign worker category. Permits may be issued for only a few days, or up to a few years, depending on the nature of the job or the program. Taking into account foreign workers already in Canada, on December 1, 2010, there were 283,000 individuals in Canada as temporary foreign workers. Again, some of them might be present in the country for only a limited period of time, while others, like live-in caregivers, will remain in the country for three to four years.

The temporary foreign worker program meets several needs. It provides work permits to individuals with job offers in order to meet specific labour market needs, such as the live-in caregiver program, the seasonal agricultural worker program, highly skilled individuals entering under NAFTA or other agreements, intra-company transferees, the low-skilled program or to meet other labour market shortages, as approved by HRSDC with a “labour market opinion”.

As a result, it is estimated that about 70% of people admitted under the temporary foreign worker program are admitted to meet identified shortages, while the remaining 30% are given permission to work in any job.

There has been very strong growth in the number of TFW entries over the past decade. This growth can be largely attributed to the youth exchange and Live-In Caregiver programs, the low skilled worker pilot program, as well as work permits issued to spouses of skilled TFWs. Many might assume that TFW entries are solely driven by labour market shortages and employer demands for specific workers – even during the recession. However, not all TFW entries are tied to specific labour market needs. For example, the youth exchange program (which is not driven by employer demand and does not require labour market opinions) accounted for half of the growth over the past decade and continued to increase through the recession. This program, operating under the name International Experience Canada, is a
reciprocal program that gives young foreigners an opportunity to experience life in Canada while permitting Canadian youth to also broaden their horizons through work outside Canada. Meanwhile, entries under the low skilled pilot program increased to 26,300 in 2008 but declined to 15,000 in 2010.

There is another issue to consider in the growth of TFWs over the past decade. It is the issue of their role in the labour market. The TFW program was created to fill temporary gaps, but an increasing number appear to be used to address long-term, low-skilled labour gaps. Some commentators have raised concerns that employers are using the TFW program as a substitute for necessary adjustments such as investments in capital or adjustment in wages. On the other hand, if TFWs are indeed needed on a sustained basis, should there be better pathways to permanent residency for these workers? Currently, programs such as the Live-in Caregiver Program, the CEC, and many streams of provincial nominee programs, provide important avenues for persons to transition from temporary to permanent status in Canada in order to avoid the undesirable “guest worker” effect. Should pathways to permanent residence be a consideration for other TFWs? If so, what role should employers play in preventing the TFW program from displacing other, perhaps more beneficial options in the longer term such as capital investment or wage adjustments, discussed above. As well, with limited resources, how do we address the necessary trade-offs of other economic categories to increase TFW numbers?

**International Students**

Students across the country with Canadian education and work experience, official language ability, and an ease and familiarity with Canadian society are an excellent source of immigrants. These international students possess the outlook, skills and experience Canada needs to be a more innovative society that is able to compete and prosper in a global, knowledge-based economy. At the same time, there are concerns that facilitating transition to permanent status creates an incentive for some to use “study” as a pretext to access permanent resident status. Given these benefits, should CIC find ways to better target international students and further develop this potential immigrant pool? How do we ensure that the incentives are there to ensure that only those students who can truly contribute (skills, work experience, official language ability) benefit from “fast track” to permanent residence?

**Making difficult decisions about the mix**

As has been noted, there is substantial pressure to bring in more people in most, if not all categories. Clearly this cannot be accommodated within
current, or even modestly raised levels, meaning difficult choices have to be made.

Within the economic category there is growing demand from the provinces and territories to raise levels for provincial nominee programs. These programs have grown substantially over the past few years. There is an obvious argument that provinces and territories know their own needs best. But growth in these programs has come with increased questions around evaluation of results and accountability. Increases in provincial programs put pressure on the federal programs, and need to be balanced with the federal government’s primary role in managing immigration for the country. The Federal Skilled Worker program also has higher and more transparent criteria – outlined in regulations – including a “points test” to assess skills, knowledge and experience.

With pressure to increase the PNP, a growing inventory of live-in-caregivers eligible for permanent residence, the logic of taking in more TFWs and students who have experience in Canada, and the long list of investors prepared to add significant resources to the economy, there are clearly difficult decisions in the economic category.

Within the family class, the parents and grandparents category provides another dilemma. Wait times that are long, and growing, are not sustainable. Not only that, but at the current rate of application intake, this backlog will continue to grow and will potentially double in the next ten years. One partial answer might be to increase the number of yearly admissions over a number of years. But this would require a reduction in the economic class or an increase in overall immigration to Canada. However, that alone will not address the backlog problem. Over the longer term decisions will need to be made about the number of new applicants that are accepted in this stream and a more sustainable path for the program.

These issues point to difficult questions in levels planning. Should the levels plan primarily reflect the number of people who want to immigrate to Canada? Do we continue to admit more people in a category simply because there are more applications? Surely, the levels plan should reflect Canada’s needs and strategic priorities?

**How can we manage the system in a way that provides reasonable service standards and processing times?**

Clearly, there are stresses in the system. In the parents and grandparents category, there are currently about 165,000 individuals with applications in process. As of December 2010, there were over 500,000 individuals
(principal applicants and their dependents) with applications in process as federal skilled workers. Altogether, there are presently over 1 million people awaiting a decision across all categories and more joining daily.

There is also currently a legal obligation to process all applications in the inventory. Significant resources are required to manage the backlog and implementing reasonable service standards is difficult in the face of long and growing wait times in many categories.

In light of this imbalance between the number of applications we receive and the number of people we can accept, CIC has begun to take steps to limit the intake of applications. A noteworthy example is the legislation introduced in 2008 (“Ministerial Instructions”) which removes the obligation to process all applications and enables the Minister to better manage new application intake and stop backlog growth. Ministerial Instructions allow the Minister to limit intake to align with CIC’s capacity to process in a reasonable timeframe. Applications that do not meet the criteria of the “instructions” do not have to be processed to decision and fees are refunded to applicants. It should be noted that the legislation specifies that the instructions cannot be applied to refugees overseas or in Canada or to humanitarian and compassionate requests made from within Canada.

Thus far, this authority has been used only in the economic class. The first two sets of Ministerial Instructions11 focused largely on the FSW program. The first limited applications to a certain number of occupations in demand, or to those who had arranged offers of employment. The second refined the occupation list, and capped the number of applications that would be accepted. Combined, they helped the department process applications in the backlog, reducing this volume by 50% from its peak of 641,000, and improving processing times for new applicants.

A key lesson learned is that effective management of the intake on new applications is critical to reducing backlogs and improving wait times.

Recent changes to the Immigrant Investor Program criteria provide another example of the application of Ministerial Instructions. When changes were made to double both the net worth of an investor and the required investment in Canada12 - (as outlined above) - Ministerial Instructions were used to stop taking applications until the new regulations came into force. This prevented a flood of applications under the old criteria, which in the past, would have had to be processed by the Department against the criteria in place at the time of application.

Most recently, on June 24, 201113 a third set of Ministerial Instructions was announced. These measures have: reset the annual cap on new FSW
applications to 10,000 overall and 500 per eligible occupation; introduced an annual cap of 700 on new Immigrant Investor applications; and introduced a temporary moratorium on federal Entrepreneur program applications. It should be noted that caps on new application intake will not affect admissions as levels will comprise new applications as well as those in the backlog for the foreseeable future.

While progress has been made in some areas, much work remains in addressing backlogs and improving wait times. A key question for consideration is whether and how Ministerial Instructions could be used to manage intake across other categories particularly those with large and growing backlogs like the parents and grandparents category.

While the sheer volume of applications is a major challenge in managing our immigration system, it is far from the only one. Fraud, for example, is a growing concern that contributes to longer processing times. Immigration fraud can take many forms. Immigration applicants in all immigration categories may engage in fraud against our immigration system, and some seek assistance from unscrupulous immigration consultants or other third parties, such as labour recruiters or document counterfeiters. Some fraud happens here; most happens overseas. Some examples include the use of fake documents, bogus marriages and lying to an officer or on an application form. Higher incidences of fraud across all categories mean that significantly more time is needed to verify documentation, interview individual applicants and conduct investigations. CIC strives to strike an appropriate balance between facilitating the movement of people and upholding the integrity of the immigration program.

Foreign credential recognition (FCR) is an example of another complex challenge that the Department faces. The Foreign Credentials Referral Office (FCRO) was established in May 2007 at CIC to provide internationally-trained workers with the information, path-finding and referral services they need in Canada and overseas to help succeed in the Canada labour market and put their skills to work in Canada more quickly. The FCRO works with federal partners at Human Resources and Skills Development Canada and Health Canada, and collaboratively with the provinces, territories, regulatory bodies, professional associations and employers to improve foreign credential recognitions processes in Canada.

As the provinces and territories are responsible for assessing and recognizing the credential of internationally-trained workers, there are differences in the process across jurisdictions. Progress is being made through the *Pan-Canadian Framework for the Assessment and Recognition of Foreign Qualifications* – a joint commitment made by federal, provincial and
territorial governments to ensure that foreign qualifications are recognized in a fair, consistent, transparent and timely manner.

As announced in Budget 2011, the Government of Canada committed to the provision of financial assistance for internationally-trained workers seeking to have their foreign credentials recognized in Canada. Human Resources and Skills Development Canada and CIC will test ways, using micro-loans, to help internationally-trained workers cover costs to skills upgrading.

Further questions for the Consultations

It is evident that action is required to better manage the program and application intake in particular and that Ministerial Instructions are an effective tool to achieve these objectives. While Canada’s pro-immigration consensus is enviable, there are competing visions and diverging goals for the future of the program. The annual Levels Plan is the key strategic tool for balancing these competing visions and goals.

Ideally, an immigration system for the 21st century should have flexibility to readily adjust priorities across categories and applicants should be provided with reliable service standards.

In this context, your views are sought on the following questions:

On levels:
- Over the next five years, should immigration levels be maintained, increased or decreased, relative to the average 250,000 of the past decade? Why? What evidence would support these immigration levels?
- What is our capacity to absorb current levels of immigration, and help newcomers integrate and succeed? What if levels were to increase?
- What level of immigration are Canadians prepared to welcome and support?

On the mix:
- How should we balance social and economic objectives of the program?
- How important is it that the federal government maintains a primary role in managing immigration for the country? In a world of limited capacity and scarce resources, how should the federal and provincial and territorial governments balance their joint responsibilities and their individual priorities and needs?
- How should regional and national interests be best balanced? Are the appropriate programs in place to meet high skill, low skill, short term and long term economic objectives?
- How important should factors like immigrants’ language skills, age and education be when selecting economic class immigrants?
- What is the appropriate balance between national/provincial/employer/stakeholder roles in selecting immigrants?
- In the face of growing demand for low-skilled workers, how should this need be met and should we be exploring further pathways to permanent residence for such temporary workers?

**On the system:**
- Should Ministerial Instructions be used to limit intake in other categories, such as parents and grandparents? What criteria should be used?
- Recognizing that backlogs consist of people who have applied, paid fees, and have been waiting for an answer for a number of years, should reducing the backlog/inventories and improving service standards be the highest priority? (e.g. Federal Skilled Workers, Parents and Grandparents...)?
- Or should there be a balance between reducing the inventories and accepting new applications?
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Ministerial Instructions in Brief

Canada receives many more immigration applications than can be accepted every year. As part of ongoing efforts to better align application intake with priorities for immigration, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) has taken steps in the last three years to better manage the number of new applications it will consider in certain categories of the federal economic immigration stream. To date, Ministerial Instructions, which constitute the most effective tool to manage processing pressures, have been issued three times.

In November 2008 the first Ministerial Instructions were issued with two specific objectives:

- To make the Federal Skilled Worker (FSW) program more responsive to national labour market pressures; and
- To reduce the FSW backlog of 641,000 persons by 50% by 2013 — and shorten wait times from 6 years to 6-12 months.

The Instructions established eligibility criteria for processing new FSW applications in order to align the intake of new applications with the capacity to process them. In effect until June 2010, the first Instructions limited processing to those new FSW applications that met identified labour market needs, such as whether the applicant had experience in at least one of 38 identified occupations in demand, had a confirmed job offer from a Canadian employer, or were a temporary foreign worker or international student with skilled work experience.

A second set of Ministerial Instructions replaced the first in June 2010. These Instructions were designed to sustain progress on reducing the FSW backlog, which had been reduced by nearly 50% and to keep pace with an evolving labour market as Canada was emerging from the recession. The main feature of this new set of Instructions was the introduction of a cap on the total number of new FSW applications to be processed (20,000 per year), with no more than 1,000 applications to be processed in any one occupation on a revised list of 29 occupations. The cap did not apply to applicants with arranged employment offers. It was decided that a cap, which was introduced to respond to the unforeseen surge in application intake under the first Instructions, was the only way to guarantee that application intake was aligned with CIC’s capacity to process them. A cap would ensure that, within FSW levels room, CIC could process new applicants needed by the Canadian economy along with applicants already in the inventory. Beyond the cap and a new occupation list, these Instructions also required that all new FSW principal applicants, as well as those in the Canadian Experience Class, submit the results of a test of their proficiency in either English or French and implemented a temporary moratorium on the
intake of new Investors Class applications while regulatory changes were made in that program. The moratorium was lifted in December 2010.

Most recently, the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism issued a third set of Instructions, which took effect on July 1st. These Instructions again focused on the FSW program by reducing the overall cap on new FSW applications to be processed from 20,000 to 10,000 per year, with a corresponding halving of the occupation sub-caps from 1,000 to 500, again exempting applicants with confirmed job offers from Canadian employers. The list of 29 occupations was unchanged. In addition, a cap of 700 new applications per year was introduced in the Investors Program in order to take action on the very large backlog in that program. Finally, a temporary moratorium on new applications in the federal Entrepreneur Program was also introduced while that program undergoes review.
## Appendix A: The Levels Plan for 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant Category</th>
<th>2011 Plan Target Ranges</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC CLASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally Selected Economic Class*</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>80,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants†</td>
<td>33,200</td>
<td>36,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependents†</td>
<td>40,800</td>
<td>43,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincially Selected Economic Class*</td>
<td>76,600</td>
<td>80,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants†</td>
<td>31,900</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependents†</td>
<td>44,700</td>
<td>47,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Nominee Program</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants†</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependents†</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>26,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec-selected Skilled Workers and Business</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>35,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Applicants†</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and Dependents†</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Economic Class—Principal Applicants</td>
<td>65,100</td>
<td>70,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Economic Class—Spouses and Dependents</td>
<td>85,500</td>
<td>90,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Economic Class</td>
<td>150,600</td>
<td>161,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY CLASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses, Partners and Children</td>
<td>45,500</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Grandparents</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Family Class</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>65,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTECTED PERSONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-assisted Refugees</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately Sponsored Refugees</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Persons In-Canada</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Protected Persons</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian and Compassionate Grounds/Public Policy</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Holders</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This year admission projections for economic immigration are being presented based on selecting and/or nominating jurisdiction because the direct involvement of provinces and territories in economic immigration has grown. Under the Canada–Quebec Accord Relating to Immigration and Temporary Admission of Aliens, the Government of Quebec has responsibility for selecting immigrants destined to its province, and other jurisdictions participating in the Provincial Nominee Program have the responsibility to nominate foreign nationals for permanent resident status.

### Appendix B: Permanent residents Admissions by category, 2006-2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and partners</td>
<td>45,305</td>
<td>44,912</td>
<td>44,209</td>
<td>43,901</td>
<td>40,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons and daughters</td>
<td>3,191</td>
<td>3,338</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>2,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and grandparents</td>
<td>20,005</td>
<td>15,813</td>
<td>16,599</td>
<td>17,178</td>
<td>15,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family class</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,517</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,242</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,581</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,204</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,207</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs - principal applicants</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed - principal applicants</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors - principal applicants</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2,832</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>3,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>7,434</td>
<td>8,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers - principal applicants</td>
<td>44,161</td>
<td>41,251</td>
<td>43,361</td>
<td>40,733</td>
<td>48,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>61,783</td>
<td>56,601</td>
<td>60,373</td>
<td>55,220</td>
<td>70,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Experience Class - principal applicants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>2,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Experience Class - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/territorial nominees - principal applicants</td>
<td>4,672</td>
<td>6,329</td>
<td>8,343</td>
<td>11,801</td>
<td>13,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/territorial nominees - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>8,664</td>
<td>10,765</td>
<td>14,075</td>
<td>18,578</td>
<td>22,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in caregivers - principal applicants</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>6,157</td>
<td>6,273</td>
<td>7,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in caregivers - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>4,354</td>
<td>6,181</td>
<td>6,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic immigrants</strong></td>
<td><strong>138,251</strong></td>
<td><strong>131,245</strong></td>
<td><strong>149,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>153,491</strong></td>
<td><strong>186,881</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-assisted refugees</td>
<td>7,326</td>
<td>7,572</td>
<td>7,295</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>7,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately sponsored refugees</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>5,036</td>
<td>4,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees landed in Canada</td>
<td>15,884</td>
<td>11,696</td>
<td>6,994</td>
<td>7,204</td>
<td>9,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee dependants</td>
<td>5,952</td>
<td>5,098</td>
<td>4,057</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>3,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugees</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,499</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,954</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,858</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,848</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,693</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROC and PDRCC**</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary resident permit holders</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H and C cases</td>
<td>4,312</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>2,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other H and C cases outside the family class / Public Policy</td>
<td>5,902</td>
<td>6,844</td>
<td>7,168</td>
<td>7,374</td>
<td>5,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other immigrants</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,373</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,312</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,735</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,628</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,848</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category not stated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>251,642</strong></td>
<td><strong>236,754</strong></td>
<td><strong>247,247</strong></td>
<td><strong>252,172</strong></td>
<td><strong>280,636</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for 2010 are preliminary estimates and are subject to change. For 2006-2009, these are updated numbers and may differ from those of Facts and Figures 2009. ** Deferred Removal Order Class and Post-determination Refugee Claimants in Canada. Source: Citizenship and Immigration Canada, RDM, Preliminary 2010 Data.
### Application Inventory on December 31st, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Line</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010 (Sep 30)</th>
<th>2010 (Dec 31)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td>513,628</td>
<td>538,526</td>
<td>618,241</td>
<td>668,676</td>
<td>562,676</td>
<td>614,713</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Skilled Workers (pre-C50)</td>
<td>486,548</td>
<td>509,585</td>
<td>586,139</td>
<td>612,985</td>
<td>400,005</td>
<td>339,570</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Skilled Workers (C50)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>111,520</td>
<td>128,769</td>
<td>144,883</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Selected Skilled Workers</td>
<td>26,980</td>
<td>26,941</td>
<td>29,132</td>
<td>31,060</td>
<td>33,801</td>
<td>30,160</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Immigrants</td>
<td>46,412</td>
<td>41,802</td>
<td>44,858</td>
<td>51,137</td>
<td>76,767</td>
<td>107,260</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Business Immigrants</td>
<td>37,370</td>
<td>35,869</td>
<td>37,665</td>
<td>43,984</td>
<td>69,120</td>
<td>97,310</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Business Immigrants</td>
<td>9,042</td>
<td>5,933</td>
<td>7,193</td>
<td>7,153</td>
<td>7,647</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/Territorial Nominees</td>
<td>11,248</td>
<td>13,984</td>
<td>18,380</td>
<td>26,516</td>
<td>30,905</td>
<td>39,194</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in Caregivers</td>
<td>10,575</td>
<td>11,379</td>
<td>16,012</td>
<td>20,742</td>
<td>27,600</td>
<td>28,484</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Experience Class</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>4,256</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Class</strong></td>
<td>581,763</td>
<td>603,691</td>
<td>694,491</td>
<td>754,897</td>
<td>702,137</td>
<td>693,907</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses, Partners, Children and Others</td>
<td>61,513</td>
<td>59,998</td>
<td>54,485</td>
<td>58,378</td>
<td>55,553</td>
<td>51,433</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Grandparents</td>
<td>107,994</td>
<td>108,261</td>
<td>103,402</td>
<td>110,689</td>
<td>110,741</td>
<td>147,769</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Class</strong></td>
<td>159,507</td>
<td>163,859</td>
<td>157,887</td>
<td>169,087</td>
<td>166,294</td>
<td>199,202</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Assisted Refugees</td>
<td>9,002</td>
<td>9,099</td>
<td>12,297</td>
<td>11,999</td>
<td>12,723</td>
<td>12,264</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately Sponsored Refugees</td>
<td>14,885</td>
<td>14,528</td>
<td>14,882</td>
<td>17,661</td>
<td>19,558</td>
<td>22,546</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Persons in Canada</td>
<td>15,310</td>
<td>17,963</td>
<td>10,289</td>
<td>8,911</td>
<td>9,407</td>
<td>8,205</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents Abroad</td>
<td>8,032</td>
<td>6,649</td>
<td>6,684</td>
<td>7,674</td>
<td>6,778</td>
<td>6,773</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;C and Public Policy</td>
<td>39,178</td>
<td>31,305</td>
<td>31,595</td>
<td>28,346</td>
<td>26,158</td>
<td>21,468</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Holders</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Class</td>
<td>87,299</td>
<td>80,172</td>
<td>75,995</td>
<td>72,965</td>
<td>74,846</td>
<td>72,110</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>249%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>829,565</td>
<td>848,547</td>
<td>929,230</td>
<td>998,299</td>
<td>945,321</td>
<td>967,070</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Sources: dw sveb/Development/CASIMI_caps_e-c50 from download of January 4, 2011; CPC-Reports & WIP

*Other includes DRCC, PDRCC, missing and/or invalid data

### Estimated Years of Admissions for the Current Immigration Inventory

With no new intake as of March 2011, and no policy changes, some programs already contain enough applications to result in upwards of 7 years of new admissions at 2011 immigration levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th># of Years of Admissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Grandparents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Business</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Business</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FSW (Backlog, M1, and M2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately Sponsored Refugees</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in Caregivers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Persons in Canada</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian and Compassionate</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSW, M1, and M2 Only</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents Abroad of PPIC</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAFs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSW</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNP</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses, Partners &amp; Children</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Experience Class</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Yearly Permanent Residents as a Percentage of Canada’s Population, 1860 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>6,276</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>18,294</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>50,050</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>123,624</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>133,665</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>187,732</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>203,870</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>235,935</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>259,960</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>283,935</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>308,935</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>333,935</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>358,935</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>383,935</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>408,935</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Canada - Permanent residents, 1860 to 2009

**Graph Description:**
- The graph illustrates the number and percentage of permanent residents in Canada from 1860 to 2009.
- The x-axis represents the years (1880 to 2000), and the y-axis represents the number of permanent residents.
- The percentage is calculated as a part of Canada’s total population.
Annex G: Levels and Mix Online Stakeholder and Public Consultation Questionnaire

About this consultation
This past July, Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism Minister Jason Kenney, along with Parliamentary Secretaries Rick Dykstra and Chungsen Leung, launched a series of cross-country consultations on immigration issues.

As part of this process, this online consultation aims to seek your feedback on Canada’s immigration program. We are asking for your input on:

a) the right level of immigration to Canada (how many?); and
b) the right mix between the three immigrant classes to Canada (economic, family and protected persons).

Should immigration levels be higher? Which of these areas should be a priority? If we raise levels in one of these areas, where should we take less?

A report on the consultations, including a summary of this online consultation questionnaire, will be available on the CIC website in fall 2011 or winter 2012.

Before you begin
The online consultation will take about 20 to 30 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary and we appreciate your time and input. Prior to completing the questionnaire, please read the background document. This serves to give you a sense of some of the challenges and realities we face as we strive to best answer the difficult questions involved in managing Canada’s immigration system.

Are you responding as an individual or a representative of an organization?

- Individual
- Representative of an organization
- Representative of a provincial or territorial government

Do you live in Canada?

- Yes
- No
Individual: Living in Canada

Which best describes your residence status in Canada?
- Canadian citizen
- Permanent resident
- Temporary resident
- Other, please specify: ______________________

In which province or territory do you live?
- Yukon
- Northwest Territories
- Nunavut
- British Columbia
- Alberta
- Saskatchewan
- Manitoba
- Ontario
- Quebec
- Newfoundland and Labrador
- Prince Edward Island
- Nova Scotia
- New Brunswick

Individual: Not living in Canada

Please indicate which country you live in:
- ______________________
- Prefer not to respond

Do you live in a rural/small town or metropolitan/urban community?
Rural and small town refers to an area with a population of less than 50,000 people. A metropolitan or urban community refers to an area with a population of more than 50,000 people.
- Rural/Small town
Which best describes you?
- Employed
- Self-employed
- Unemployed
- Student
- Retired
- Prefer not to respond
- Other, please specify: ______________________

Your age group is:
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 +
- Prefer not to respond

What is your gender?
- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to respond

Representative of an organization------------------------------------------
Please provide your name, organization and contact details in the space provided below:
Name (optional): 
Organization: 
Phone: 
Email: 
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Do you consent to CIC making the name of your organization public on the list of participants?
- Yes
- No

Which of the following best describes your organization?
- Employer/Employee Association
- Business/Sector Association
- Professional Association
- Labour/Union Group
- Settlement/Integration service provider
- Academic/Public Policy Institution
- Private Sponsorship of Refugees Sponsorship Agreement Holder
- Immigration Consultant/Lawyer
- Education Institution/Education Association
- Municipal Association/Municipal Government
- Community Organization
- Other, please specify: ______________________

Is your organization located in Canada?
- Yes
- No

Representative of an organization located in Canada

Please indicate the province(s) and/or territory(ies) in which you operate. Please check all that apply.
- Newfoundland and Labrador
- Nova Scotia
- Prince Edward Island
- New Brunswick
- Quebec
- Ontario
- Manitoba
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☐ Saskatchewan
☐ Alberta
☐ British Columbia
☐ Nunavut
☐ Northwest Territories
☐ Yukon
☐ All of the above

Representative of an organization not located in Canada

Please tell us in which country or countries your organization operates.

☐ ______________________
☐ Prefer not to respond

Representative of a Provincial or Territorial government

Please provide your name, province or territory and contact details in the space provided below:

Name (optional): [space for name]
Province or territory: [space for province or territory]
Phone: [space for phone number]
Email: [space for email address]

Do you consent to CIC making the name of your province or territory public on the list of participants?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Please indicate the province(s) and/or territory(ies) in which you operate. Please check all that apply.

☐ Newfoundland and Labrador
☐ Nova Scotia
☐ Prince Edward Island
☐ New Brunswick
A. Levels

What is the appropriate level of immigration for Canada? Canada has long been a destination of choice for immigrants. Much of Canada’s success with and public support for immigration is based on the positive outcomes of immigrants and their contribution to our economy and society. For the past 25 years, Canada has maintained immigration levels averaging between 225,000 and 250,000 immigrants per year. In 2010, Canada admitted close to 281,000 permanent residents, the highest level since 1957. Canada has one of the highest per capita rates of permanent immigration in the world—roughly 0.8% in recent years—and has welcomed 3.5 million immigrants in the last 15 years. It is important to note that increases in levels have impacts on our communities and the costs related to helping newcomers integrate and succeed. The capacity to welcome immigrants cannot be separated from levels planning. For more information, see “What is the appropriate level of immigration for Canada?” in the background document.

How familiar are you with Canada’s immigration system?
- (1) Not at all familiar
- (2)
- (3)
- (4) Somewhat familiar
- (5)
- (6)
- (7) Very familiar
Over the next five years, do you think Canada’s immigration levels should be maintained, increased or decreased, relative to the average 250,000 of the past decade?

- Maintained
- Increased
- Decreased
- Do not know

If you believe levels should increase or decrease, what is the appropriate level of immigration for Canada?

- 50,000 or less per year
- 50,000-100,000 per year
- 100,000-150,000 per year
- 150,000-200,000 per year
- 200,000-250,000 per year
- 250,000-300,000 per year
- 300,000-350,000 per year
- 350,000-400,000 per year
- 400,000 or more per year
- Other, please indicate: ______________________
- Do not know

Please explain:

_________________________________________________________________

Immigration can be positioned to meet a variety of objectives. Please rank the objectives below in order of importance (i.e. one is the most important, 2 is the next most important, 6 is the least important, etc.) when establishing immigration levels.

Supporting long-term economic growth

Meeting current labour market needs

Encouraging immigration to all regions of the country

Assisting family reunification
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Please explain:

The following is a list of six factors which influence immigration levels planning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Economic Issues</td>
<td>• Immigrant earnings&lt;br&gt;• Poverty rates among immigrants&lt;br&gt;• Distribution of incomes within and between Canadian and immigrant populations&lt;br&gt;• Unemployment, underemployment and under-utilization of immigrant skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Canada</td>
<td>• Job displacement among the Canadian population&lt;br&gt;• Public support for immigration&lt;br&gt;• Public support for refugee program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Needs of Immigrants</td>
<td>• Access to settlement and integration supports generally&lt;br&gt;• Access to language training&lt;br&gt;• Access to housing&lt;br&gt;• Immigrant health outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Issues</td>
<td>• Socio-economic integration among the second and third generations (post immigration)&lt;br&gt;• Immigrant concentration in urban areas&lt;br&gt;• Inter-immigrant and inter-ethnic group conflict&lt;br&gt;• Multiculturalism and diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of Immigration</td>
<td>• Immigration and related program costs at both local and national levels&lt;br&gt;• Safety and security concerns&lt;br&gt;• Environmental sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rank the factors below in order of importance (i.e. 1 is the most important, 2 is the next most important, 6 is the least important, etc.) when establishing immigration levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Issues</th>
<th>Operational capacity of Canada’s immigration system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Immigrant economic issues
- Impact on host population
- Basic needs of immigrants
- Integration issues
- Sustainability of immigration
- Resource issues

Please explain:

Do you have any additional comments related to immigration levels?
B. Mix

What is the appropriate mix between economic, family class and protected persons (refugees)?

The current immigration system must manage multiple objectives. Immigration has a role both in helping to meet the labour market needs of today and in helping to build the skilled workforce of the future. It helps reunite families, build strong communities, and, in keeping with a proud Canadian tradition, supports global humanitarian efforts through the resettlement of refugees and providing assistance to asylum seekers.

Here is an approximate overview of how the mix breaks down currently:

- 60% (roughly 156,800 to 161,300 persons) of the immigrants who come to Canada annually are in the economic class;
- 26% (roughly 58,500 to 65,500 persons) come in the family class; and
- the remaining approximately 14% (roughly 30,900 to 38,200 persons) are primarily protected persons (refugees) but includes others admitted for humanitarian and compassionate reasons.

It is worth noting that less than half of those who come in as economic immigrants are principal applicants – their spouses and dependants are also included in this category. However, a large portion of these spouses and dependents (along with those in the family class and refugees) eventually join the labour market and become economic actors as well.

For more information, go to “What is the appropriate mix between economic, family class and protected persons (refugees)” in the background document.

Assuming Canada maintains the current level of immigration, what is the appropriate mix between economic immigrants, family class immigrants and protected persons (refugees)?

Select the percentage for each immigration class, so that all three add up to 100 percent. Status quo: 60% economic, 26% family class, 14% protected persons (refugees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic immigrants</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family class immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected persons (refugees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Making difficult decisions about the mix
As noted in the background document, there is substantial pressure to bring in more people in most, if not all categories. Clearly this cannot be accommodated within current, or even modestly raised levels, meaning difficult choices have to be made.

Within the economic category there is growing demand from the provinces and territories to raise levels for provincial nominee programs. These programs have grown substantially over the past few years. There is an obvious argument that provinces and territories know their own needs best. But growth in these programs has come with increased questions around evaluation of results and accountability. Increases in provincial programs put pressure on the federal programs, and need to be balanced with the federal government’s primary role in managing immigration for the country. The Federal Skilled Worker program also has transparent criteria – outlined in regulations – including a “points test” to assess skills, knowledge and experience.

There are clearly difficult decisions to be made in the economic category. A number of factors must be considered to ensure that the programs are balanced to meet the economic needs of the country. Among them, pressures to increase the Provincial Nominee Program, a growing inventory of live-in-caregivers eligible for permanent residence, and questions around whether to take in more Temporary Foreign Workers. There are also considerations related to international students who have experience in Canada, and the long list of investors prepared to add significant resources to the economy.

Within the family class, the parents and grandparents category provides another dilemma. Wait times that are long, and growing, are not sustainable. Not only that, but at the current rate of application intake, this backlog will continue to grow and will potentially double in the next ten years. One partial answer might be to increase the number of yearly admissions over a number of years. But this would require a reduction in the economic class or an increase in overall immigration to Canada. However, that alone will not address the backlog problem. Over the longer term, decisions will need to be made about the number of new applicants that are accepted in this stream and a more sustainable path for the program.

These issues point to difficult questions in levels planning. Should the levels plan primarily reflect the number of people who want to immigrate to Canada? Do we continue to admit more people in a category simply because there are more applications?
The following questions will focus on the appropriate mix between three categories of immigration:

- Economic
- Family
- Protected Persons (Refugees)

Questions about managing the immigration system, service standards and processing times have also been included within the Economic and Family categories.

**ECONOMIC CLASS**

Economic immigrants are chosen because of what they can contribute to the Canadian economy. As outlined in the background document, there are a number of categories within the economic category.

Federally-selected:

- Federal Skilled Workers (FSW)
- Canadian Experience Class (CEC)
- Business Immigrants and Live-in Caregivers

Provincially-selected:

- Quebec Skilled Workers and Business Immigrants selected by Quebec
- Provincial and Territorial Nominees (PNP)

It is important to note that close to two-thirds of economic class immigrants are actually family – i.e. the spouses/partners and dependent children of principal applicants, which means a minority of economic class immigrants (principal applicants) are actually selected according to their skills and experience.

**How familiar are you with Canada’s economic immigration programs?**

- (1) Not at all familiar
- (2)
- (3)
- (4) Somewhat familiar
- (5)
- (6)
- (7) Very familiar
Consider what you have read about Canada’s economic immigration programs. Should the annual number of economic admissions each year be:

- Increased
- Decreased
- Remain the same
- Do not know

Increased

Assuming that total immigration levels remain the same, if you favour increasing economic immigration, which of the other two categories should be decreased?

- Family class
- Protected persons class (refugees)
- Both family and protected persons classes
- Do not know

Decreased

Assuming that total immigration levels remain the same, if you favour decreasing economic immigration, which of the other two categories should be increased?

- Family class
- Protected persons class (refugees)
- Both family and protected persons classes
- Do not know
The 2010 proportions of the economic class are as follows:
Economic Class Admissions for 2010 (186,881 persons)


Assuming Canada maintains the current level of immigration, what is the appropriate distribution between federal and provincial economic programs?

Note: The total proportions below automatically include an estimated 20% for the Quebec Skilled Workers and Business Immigrants, as these are governed by the Canada-Quebec Accord.

Federal

Provincial

Please explain:
Selection of Economic Immigrants

Citizenship and Immigration Canada takes into account current and projected economic and labour-market conditions when planning admissions. There is a balance between meeting immediate job needs, and ensuring immigrants have skills that will allow them to adapt and succeed as the economy changes. The size of the labour market must also be considered. Similar to other countries, Canada is facing significant demographic challenges such as an aging population and slowing labour force growth. Although immigration cannot address these problems alone, it will be a factor in helping to build the labour force of tomorrow. In this respect, provincial and territorial input on labour market issues is one of the key factors influencing economic immigration to Canada. Quebec is involved in selecting and integrating its own immigrants under the Canada-Quebec Accord. Other provinces have signed provincial nominee programs allowing them to select a certain number of economic class immigrants to meet regional needs.

Within the economic category there is growing demand from the provinces and territories to raise levels for Provincial Nominee Programs. These programs have grown substantially over the past few years. Provincial programs encourage immigration to all regions of the country and allow provinces and territories to respond to local labour market needs. At the same time, the growth in these programs requires on-going program integrity measures and evaluation of results in the interest of accountability. Increases in provincial programs put pressure on the federal programs, and need to be balanced with the federal government’s primary role in managing immigration for the country. The Federal Skilled Worker program highlights many best practices in economic immigration programming such as transparent criteria – outlined in regulations – including a “points test” to assess skills, knowledge and experience.

There are clearly difficult decisions to be made in the economic category. A number of factors must be considered to ensure that the programs are balanced to meet the economic needs of the country. Among them, pressures to increase the Provincial Nominee Program, a growing inventory of live-in-caregivers eligible for permanent residence, and questions around whether to take in more Temporary Foreign Workers. There are also considerations related to international students who have experience in Canada, and the long list of investors prepared to add significant resources to the economy.
In your view, who should have the greater say on which economic immigrants Canada should accept?

- Federal government
- Each provincial/territorial government for its jurisdiction
- Employers
- All of the above, working together
- Do not know

Please rank the following objectives for economic immigration, where 1 is least important and 6 is most important.

- Skilled workers who meet specific labour market needs, including to fill specific job openings
- Skilled workers with more generic skills to help build Canada’s long-term labour force
- Workers, at a range of skill levels, who meet regional/sectoral needs
- Candidates who have advanced post-secondary credentials (e.g., PhDs)
- A broad range of candidates representing a wider variety of skill and education levels
- Candidates who will invest significant levels of capital and/or create jobs

Please explain:
Research shows that factors like an immigrant’s language skills, age and education account for up to 60 percent of their economic success. Rate the importance of each factor below for an immigrant to succeed in Canada’s labour market.

In this scale, 1 is 'not at all important,' 4 is 'somewhat important' and 7 is 'extremely important'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Do not know/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong skills in one of Canada’s official languages (oral/written/reading/comprehension)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks (e.g., friends or relatives already established in Canada)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or diploma from a Canadian post-secondary institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or diploma from a non-Canadian post-secondary institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior work experience in Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior work experience abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A job offer in Canada before they arrive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other factor(s):**

**Do you have any additional comments about the economic category?**

---
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TEMPORARY RESIDENTS
There are three broad categories of temporary residents – visitors, international students and temporary foreign workers (TFWs). While all three categories place demands on the department’s resources, the temporary foreign worker program is most relevant in the context of this consultation.

Temporary Foreign Workers

The TFW program meets several needs. It provides work permits to foreign individuals with job offers in order to meet specific labour market needs. The number of temporary foreign workers in Canada has risen from 116,000 in 2000 to over 182,000 in 2010. TFWs enter in all types of occupations including managerial, professional, technical, trade, and lower skilled occupations.

The TFW program was created to fill temporary gaps, but important avenues exist for TFWs to transition from temporary to permanent status in Canada, and the number of TFWs who transitioned to permanent residence has increased from less than 12,000 in 2000 to close to 33,000 in 2010. In general, pathways for TFWs to transition to permanent residence are intended primarily for skilled TFWs through programs like the Canadian Experience Class, but avenues are available for some lower-skilled TFWs to also transition to permanent residence through programs such as the Live-in Caregiver Program, and many streams of provincial nominee programs.

In the context of these consultations, some commentators have raised concerns that if lower-skilled TFWs are indeed needed on a sustained basis, there should be additional pathways to allow for permanent residency for these workers.

How familiar are you with the Temporary Foreign Worker program?

- (1) Not at all familiar
- (2)
- (3)
- (4) Somewhat familiar
- (5)
- (6)
- (7) Very familiar
Do you think additional pathways to permanent residence should be established for low-skilled temporary foreign workers?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

---

If you indicated that additional pathways to permanent residence should be established for low-skilled temporary foreign workers, please explain:

- They already have Canadian work experience
- They have proven themselves with their Canadian employer
- Canada needs more low-skilled workers
- Other, please explain: ______________________
- Do not know

---

Assuming that total immigration levels remain the same, if you favour increasing pathways for lower-skilled TFWs to permanent residence, which economic immigration category should decrease as a result?

- Federal Skilled Workers (FSW)
- Canadian Experience Class (CEC)
- Business Immigrants
- Provincial and Territorial Nominees (PNP)
- Other, please explain: ______________________
- Do not know

---

If you indicated that additional pathways to permanent residence should not be established for low-skilled temporary foreign workers, please explain:

- Canada needs to invest in and hire Canadians
- Canada does not need more low-skilled workers
- Other, please explain: ______________________
- Do not know
Assuming that total immigration levels remain the same, if you favour decreasing pathways for lower-skilled TFWs to permanent residence, which economic immigration category should increase as a result?

- Federal Skilled Workers (FSW)
- Canadian Experience Class (CEC)
- Business Immigrants
- Provincial and Territorial Nominees (PNP)
- Other, please explain: ______________________
- Do not know

Do you have any additional comments on temporary foreign workers?  
________________________
FAMILY CLASS

Approximately 26% of the immigrants who come to Canada each year do so under the family class. Canada’s family class program is one of the most generous in the world.

Canadian citizens or permanent residents over the age of 18 may sponsor their immediate family members, subject to sponsorship agreements of 3 (spouses/partners, children) to 10 years (parents and grandparents). It is important to note that in addition to this, close to two-thirds of economic class immigrants are actually family – i.e. the spouses/partners and dependent children of principal applicants, which means a minority of economic class immigrants (principal applicants) are actually selected according to their skills and experience.

Applications for sponsorship of spouses/partners and dependent children receive priority processing, but this commitment, and the need to balance family reunification with other immigration objectives, has resulted in a backlog of nearly 165,000 persons as of March 31, 2011, in the parents and grandparents category. Wait times for recent applicants in this category are already long, and could grow steadily longer if no action is taken.

How familiar are you with the family immigration program?
- (1) Not at all familiar
- (2)
- (3)
- (4) Somewhat familiar
- (5)
- (6)
- (7) Very familiar

Consider what you have read about the Family immigration programs. Should Family immigration admissions each year be:
- Increased
- Decreased
- Remain the same
- Do not know
Increased-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
**Assuming that total immigration levels remain the same, if you favour an increase to family immigration, which of the other two categories should be decreased?**
- Economic class
- Protected persons class (refugees)
- Both economic class and protected persons classes
- Do not know

Decreased-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
**Assuming that total immigration levels remain the same, if you favour a decrease in family immigration, which of the other two categories should be increased?**
- Economic class
- Protected persons class (refugees)
- Both economic class and protected persons classes
- Do not know
Parents and Grandparents
As previously mentioned, within the family class, the parents and grandparents category provides another dilemma. Wait times that are long, and growing, are not sustainable. Not only that, but at the current rate of application intake, this backlog will continue to grow and will potentially double in the next ten years. One partial answer might be to increase the number of yearly admissions over a number of years. But this would require a reduction in the economic class or an increase in overall immigration to Canada. However, that alone will not address the backlog problem. Over the longer term decisions will need to be made about the number of new applicants that are accepted in this stream and a more sustainable path for the program.

How parents and grandparents sponsorship works:
- Any permanent resident or Canadian Citizen who is 18 years or older may sponsor a parent or grandparent and any of their accompanying dependants (children under 22 years).
- The sponsor must have a minimum income and undertake to provide basic needs for a 10-year period.
- During those 10 years, parents and grandparents are not eligible for public pensions (Old Age Security/Guaranteed Income Supplement), however they do have full access to medical care.
- Within the family class, spouses, partners and children are allotted the number of admissions required to meet demand on an annual basis. Parents and grandparent numbers allotted are dependent on many factors including the overall number of immigrants allowed into Canada and priorities in the family and economic streams.

Every year we receive more applications in the parent and grandparent category than can be processed, resulting in a backlog of applications (165,000 persons as of March 31, 2011) and long wait times for applicants.

How familiar are you with the parents and grandparents immigration program?
- (1) Not at all familiar
- (2)
- (3)
- (4) Somewhat familiar
- (5)
- (6)
- (7) Very familiar
Consider what you have read about the parents and grandparents immigration program. How important is it to maintain this category?

- (1) Not at all important
- (2)
- (3)
- (4) Somewhat important
- (5)
- (6)
- (7) Very important

What do you consider to be the most important element of the parents and grandparents program?

- Allows for family reunification
- Allows newcomers to better integrate in Canada since they have their family network with them
- Allows newcomers to work since their parents and/or grandparents can care for their children
- Allows for the transfer of cultural identity to the next generation
- Other, please specify: ______________________
- Do not know

In your opinion, should parents and grandparents be given the same application processing priority as spouses, partners and children?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

How should Canada handle the current backlog of parents and grandparents applications? Select all that apply.

- Increase the number of parents and grandparents allowed into Canada each year
- Limit the number of people allowed to sponsor their parents and grandparents
- Do not accept any new applications until backlog is eliminated
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☐ Not applicable – the parents and grandparents program should be eliminated
☐ Other, please specify: ______________________
☐ Do not know

Please explain:

In your opinion, what is the most important change that should be made to the parents and grandparents immigration program?

☐ Require that the majority of their children live in Canada
☐ Require parents and grandparents to pay higher fees to cover the cost of social services
☐ Require sponsors to be better financially established before they are eligible to sponsor
☐ Require sponsor to be a Canadian citizen
☐ Require that the parents and grandparents be able to communicate in one of Canada’s official languages
☐ Allow only those parents and grandparents to apply who are fully financially dependent on their sponsor and have no other close relatives in their own country who are able to assist them
☐ Other, please specify: ______________________
☐ Do not know

Do you have any additional comments about the parents and grandparents immigration program?
PROTECTED PERSONS (REFUGEES)

The remaining approximately 14% of immigrants to Canada come from this group. Canada has a long-standing international commitment to assist in the resettlement of refugees for whom no other durable solution is available. In addition, Canada’s refugee determination system adjudicates refugee claims by individuals within Canada.

Canada has two major refugee categories for permanent residence: resettled refugees (including those sponsored from abroad by the Government and those sponsored by private organizations) and those who have made successful refugee claims from within Canada. There are also categories to address exceptional humanitarian or public policy cases on an individual basis.

There are currently applications representing 71,000 individuals waiting to be processed – including 10,000 government assisted refugees, 25,000 privately sponsored refugees and 20,000 in the humanitarian/public policy categories. As reforms to the refugee determination system proceed and the backlog of refugee claims is drawn down it can be expected that the number of successful claimants requesting permanent resident status will increase. At the same time, as part of the same refugee reform package, the Government has committed to increasing the number of resettled refugees by 2500 to 14,500 per year.

How familiar are you with the protected persons category?

- (1) Not at all familiar
- (2) (3)
- (4) Somewhat familiar
- (5) (6)
- (7) Very familiar

Consider what you have read about the protected persons category. Should the annual number of entries accepted in this category each year be:

- Increased
- Decreased
- Remain the same
- Do not know
Increased

Assuming that total immigration levels remain the same, if you favour an increase in protected persons admissions, which of the other two categories should be decreased?

- Economic Class
- Family Class
- Both Economic Class and Family Classes
- Do not know

Decreased

Assuming that total immigration levels remain the same, if you favour a decrease in protected persons admissions, which of the other two categories should be increased?

- Economic Class
- Family Class
- Both Economic Class and Family Classes
- Do not know

Do you have any additional comments on the protected persons category?

Thank you for your comments on Canada’s immigration levels and mix.

Do you have any additional comments you would like to add?