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Abstract

This thesis examines recent Australian and Canadian policies aimed at the dispersal of skilled and business immigrants away from large cities. This thesis fulfils the need to analyse Australian and Canadian regional migration policies that have been pursued for around a decade and are currently undergoing a rapid development, but have not yet been studied extensively.

This thesis commences with a comparative analysis of the policies’ nature and practice. Although the policies are motivated by similar population and socioeconomic trends, and therefore have similar objectives, this thesis shows that the Australian and Canadian responses to common challenges differ partially. The analysis concentrates on how the Australian state/territory and the Canadian provincial/territorial governments address their policies’ objectives. The thesis elucidates the factors that underpin these different approaches, such as the divergent constitutional responsibilities in the matter of immigration, and Australian and Canadian policy understanding of concepts of ‘region’ and ‘skills’. These constitutional and conceptual differences also condition the Australian state/territory and the Canadian provincial/territorial governments’ degree of control over the design and implementation of the policies. The analysis reveals how sometimes divergent policy solutions, so conditioned, are employed to address similar policy objectives. The position taken by this thesis is that the governments use innovative responses and are highly active in that policy sphere. The differences notwithstanding, it is concluded that the design of these policies seems potentially capable of addressing the population and economic objectives.

An evaluation of the actual policies’ outcomes shows however that they have not yet become successful on any considerable scale, with few exceptions evident in both countries. This results from low absolute numbers of regional migrants when distributed among the participating jurisdictions, and a persistent preference for settlement in large cities. In Australia, the latter sometimes contravenes the stated policy intentions. This thesis closes with suggestions on cross-country policy exchanges that could improve policy outcomes and discusses additional solutions, especially relevant in the Australian context, that might be considered as policy results-enhancing measures.
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Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Setting the scene

Regional migration policies aim at directing international migrants away from large cities and into particular locations in the destination nation. They have emerged in Australia and Canada as a response to complex socioeconomic conditions, including the international migration patterns of earlier decades. International migration has been an essential element in the formation of both nations. In Australia and Canada, interrelated trends have been responsible for the introduction of these policies in the mid-1990s. First, urban concentration. The preference for city living among international migrants, as well as the domestic population, is driven by economic opportunities. With growing urbanisation came the related problems of urban congestion, pressures on the infrastructure and land use.

Second, the phenomena of global cities - hubs where the nation’s chief economic activity is concentrated. Immigrant settlement has contributed to the creation of international links, attracting further migration and more business activity. Third, population and economic growth concentrated in major urban areas has led to population and socioeconomic disparity between these and other areas, typically referred to as regions. Regional areas do not benefit from economic development as much as major urban areas and global cities in particular. Their populations are smaller and less diverse, leaving them less able to forge the international links needed to build new business activities and attract international migrants.

Fourth, while regional areas largely miss out on the benefits resulting from the population growth driven by international migration, they do share one important trend with the major urban areas and global cities: the shortage of skilled workers. The shortage of skills is an international phenomenon among industrialised nations; Australia and Canada are not immune. These shortages have complex socioeconomic and cultural antecedents and are manifested in an ageing workforce with an insufficient number of young people joining the workforce to replace them. These trends have triggered the development of Australian and
Canadian regional migration policies that aim to assist regional areas in securing the settlement of skilled migrants.

1.2 Focus of the thesis, statement of objectives and hypotheses

This thesis examines the Australian and Canadian regional migration policies responding to the trends outlined above. It covers the period from the first year of the policy implementation (1996–97) in Australia and the year 1999 in Canada.\(^1\) The policies started off modestly with new migration options being introduced over time. In order to present recent innovations, this thesis incorporates initiatives extending into May 2005. However, some important publications and minor announcements made following May 2005 are also taken account of (some of them cover the studied period despite the later publication date), especially when the publications contain information not available earlier and not obtainable through the author’s own research.

This thesis has two principal objectives. First, to examine the nature and practice of these policies in a comparative perspective. That requires discussing differences conditioning their design and practice (see Sections 1.4 and 1.6 in this chapter). This in turn provides the background for the core comparison of the migration eligibility factors and other policy instruments adopted to implement the regional migration policies in both countries. These are discussed in Chapters Two and Three. An examination of the trends outlined above suggests that encouraging regional settlement requires from the governments an ongoing commitment and novel policy solutions.

This comparative analysis of the nature and practice of the policies is used to test the first three of the proposed hypotheses. All hypotheses in this dissertation are in fact propositions and not methodologically classical hypotheses, but for the purposes of this thesis they are called so. Australia and Canada are highly active in innovative regional migration policies (hypothesis one). Regional migration initiatives are responding to new global population

\(^1\) It is acknowledged that some Canadian provinces operated the policy prior to 1999 (see Table 1.2) but lack of comprehensive information regarding their practice has prompted the selection of the later year. Québec policy has a longer history, going back to early 1990s, and is outlined accordingly.
movements (hypothesis two). Australian and Canadian policies have adopted new models of stakeholder participation to manage the regional migration (third hypothesis).

The second objective of this thesis is to evaluate the success of the policies in diverting the flows of international migrants into regional areas. It is pursued in Chapter Four. Two dimensions are the key determinants of success. First, from a perspective of population-related benefit, the absolute volume of flows into the Australian and the Canadian jurisdictions, and their contribution to the population increase in the jurisdictions, as well as the extent of the migrants' dispersal and retention in regional areas are indicators of success. A fourth hypothesis (proposition) is tested - regional initiatives have been overall very modest to date in adjusting the population flows to regions.

The other dimension of the policies' success is economic. Here, the contribution of regional migrants to the labour force growth and its age structure, filling the skilled shortages in regional areas, the economic development through business migration at large, as well as the impact of employment created by business migrants on local jobseekers are considered. The last hypothesis (proposition) is that the flows that have taken place have not yet had a powerful impact on economic prosperity and sustainability of the Australian and Canadian jurisdictions.

Finally, despite the short histories of the regional migration policies in both countries, it is possible to identify solutions adopted by some governments that could be considered by other governments looking at improving their policies' outcomes. Therefore, this thesis will also highlight such solutions and make policy suggestions.

This dissertation focuses on two groups of migrants - skilled workers and business migrants. Under the regional migration policies of Australia and Canada, not only the offshore applicants but also temporary residents, notably temporary workers and international students, are eligible to migrate permanently. Therefore, this thesis distinguishes between offshore and onshore applicants. Family reunion and migration options for humanitarian entrants are discussed only when they form part of the regional migration policies; otherwise, policies towards these groups lie beyond the scope of this
thesis. This dissertation does not look at the effects of emigration on the countries of origin, and presents the receiving countries’ perspective exclusively.

1.3 Theoretical background

It has been recognised that international migration theories explain different aspects of the migration phenomenon (Massey et al. 1993; Massey et al. 1998). The most recent regional migration policies have not yet provided sufficient evidence to result in a regional migration theory that could be contested or updated. This dissertation does not attempt to propose a theory either. At this stage of research, it is deemed useful to compare the practice of the policies in the two countries. If they become longer-term trends and are replicated by other states this may give an impetus to consider a theory.

This Section summarises selected international migration theories to provide an overview of the basic migration movement forces. References are made, where appropriate, to general skilled and business migration (that is, migration not responding to the visa options promoted under the regional migration policies in both countries) as the most approximate to the regional migration streams. It also contains an overview of selected regional development theories and concepts – those that had practical applications in the past, and those that are particularly relevant to the Australian and Canadian regional migration schemes. Together with the international migration theories, they provide the background for analysis of the regional migration policies.

The neoclassical macroeconomic theory - the oldest modern theory of migration - perceives migration as a means of economic development.² It is associated with the name of Sir W.A. Lewis (1954). Although criticised for its simplicity, it provided a starting point for theoretical discussion. The neoclassical microeconomic theory is more sophisticated, postulating that migration occurs as a result of disparities in expected income and social wellbeing between urban and rural areas (Todaro 1969, 1976). This theory recognises the universal economic factor and may be useful for explaining the economic causes of the

² This theory explains migration as a result of spatial differences in labour and capital endowments and different relative prices. See Lewis 1954; Ranis and Fei 1961; and Todaro 1976.
international skilled and business migration. Yet, the economic cause would only provide part of the explanation. It is worth noting that, regardless of the fact that these policy considerations were made with some less developed countries in mind (Todaro 1969), the point of “making the rural life more attractive” and suggesting that “governments (...) might do better if they devoted these funds [for urban low cost housing projects] to the improvement of rural amenities” are still worth advancing as policy options (1969:147).

Migration can also be understood as an investment in the human capital that accumulates over time. This theoretical approach was proposed by Sjaastad (1962), who explained it as a move prompted by the income available at the destination exceeding that of the origin by more than the cost of migration. Although the economic costs and returns from migration are the principal factors around which this theory is centred, acknowledged are non-economic factors, such as leaving familiar surroundings behind, travelling costs, searching for employment and training. Notwithstanding this theory being principally focused on the individual’s behaviour, Sjaastad also argues that migration depends on the market structure, resource mobility and revenue policies of the state and local governments (1962:93), as these alter incentives for individuals. The micro (including the non-pecuniary costs involved) conditions and macroeconomic conditions (perspectives) complement each other.

“Each approach (...) completes the other and they thus have separate and joint desirability in future migration research” (Todaro 1976:51).

The microeconomic approach has been extended (or, as some say, criticised) in the new economics of migration theory (Stark and Levhari 1982; Stark and Bloom 1985; Stark and Taylor 1989, 1991). These authors argued that the decision to migrate is based not solely on the individual’s choice. It is a family or a household decision/strategy aimed at diversifying, rather than maximising, expected income and overcoming barriers to capital and insurance, allowing, in turn, for local investment. Stark and Taylor (1989, 1991) and Stark and Bloom (1985) placed the family migration decision in the context of relative deprivation of the family in relation to a reference group. These two perspectives are related to remittances. Evidence for reverse motivation for business migration has been found in Australia and Canada in cases of the ‘astronauts’. ‘Astronauts’ denote those
migrants, who by intention or default,\(^3\) shuttle between the new adopted country and the home country seeing to business in both, while family stays in the new country.

Although this theory stresses the fact that migration might improve a family’s situation, the empirical evidence confirming its principles comes mostly from patterns of Mexican migration into United States of America (U.S.A.). Seasonal/return migration and the factors that condition it are of limited use in advancing knowledge about policies for permanent skilled and business migration (including regional migration) in Australia and Canada. The theory makes some propositions regarding the governments’ intervention in diminishing migration but these suggestions are mostly relevant for the country of origin (Stark 1982:17,18; Stark and Levhari 1982:40,41,42,43; Stark and Katz 1986:48,55).

From the mid-1980s there has been a resurgent interest in the role of migrant networks constituting a form of social capital for the migrants-to-be. This point of view was first put forward by Massey et al. (1987). Within the tradition of human capital theory, and seeing migration in terms of costs and returns, this theory argues that social ties linking experienced migrants and potential migrants facilitate migration by lowering the costs and risks involved. This, in turn, increases the probability of future movement, eventually causing the migration stream to gain momentum, from which the process becomes self-perpetuating and independent of the original causes (Massey and Espana 1987; Massey 1987). If migration is seen to be self-perpetuating and occurring on a mass scale, this has significant policy implications. Once started, the network formation is difficult to control and happens regardless of the adopted policy line (Massey et al. 1993:450). Similar to the founding concept of the new economics of migration, networks theory sees migration as a method of diversifying families’ sources of income through remittances. Studies supporting this (Taylor 1986; Massey 1987; Massey and Durand 1992) are based, in majority, on Mexican-U.S.A. migration patterns. Networks lead new migrants to urban areas. The social and economic consequences of that ethnic concentration have given rise to research examining the experiences of migrants in urban ethnic economies, including ethnic small

\(^3\) Evidence gathered from interviews with members (usually spouses) of the ‘astronaut families’ in Canada yield divergent conclusions as to their motivation. See Waters (2001) for comments on planned arrangements and Ley (2000) for a discussion on how business failure in Canada affected the decision to become an ‘astronaut’. Both reasons were found to apply to ‘astronaut families’ in Australia (Pe-Pua et al.1996).
business activities. Such studies were also undertaken in Australia and Canada. Family and community connections typically exist in large urban areas, such as for example Sydney and Melbourne in Australia, and they explain the direction of current migration flows to such metropolises. Regional locations lack similar saturation with networks to facilitate settlement, which is sometimes used as an argument against the success of regional migration efforts (see for example Birrell 2003:15–6,18).

The institutional theory of migration (Goss and Lindquist 1995) extends networks theory. The authors claim that the networks approach to international migration is insufficient; they deny the mass migration phenomenon, and propose that international migration is administered by bureaucratic and commercial relations. Different actors seeking to benefit from migration are involved, including states, recruiters and brokers (1995:330). Although the research underlying this approach comes from temporary Filipino migration, and comments by others mostly regard structures facilitating illegal movements (Massey et al. 1993:450–51), this theory offers a more universal perspective. The states actively recruiting immigrants seek to benefit from their employment or business and a range of intermediaries is often involved in the skilled and business migration process, as well as at the early settlement stage.

Building on the work of Wallerstein (1974, 1980) the world systems theory (Portes and Walton 1981; Sassen 1988, 1991) claims that international migration is a result of the economic expansion of developed nations (former colonial powers, for example), building their wealth at the cost of former colonies and the other less developed nations that supply their migrant workers. Capitalist countries investing in non-capitalist, traditional countries results in an uprooted, mobile population, of which some will move abroad, often to the land of the former coloniser. Conducive to migration is also the military presence of

---

4 There are a number of studies in Australia and Canada looking into the use of ethnic networks and the economic outcomes of independent skilled and business immigrants and/or the ethnic business activities. Research into ethnic business activities in Australia was carried by Lever-Tracy et al. (1991); Lever-Tracy and Ip (2001); Lever-Tracy and al. (2002); Collins (1996, 2000, 2003a, 2003b) and Stromback and Malhotra (1994). For Canadian studies see, for example, Hou and Picot (2003) for analysis of impact that the exposure to one’s own ethnic group has on employment and earnings; Salaff et al. (2002a, 2002b) for the experiences of skilled migrants without prior ethnic ties, who were employed through random ethnic contacts; Ley (2000) for the outcome of immigrant business people in British Columbia, including the impact of the ethnic
developed nations in trouble spots (generating refugee flows) and their cultural/ideological influence (Massey et al. 1998:38–40,41).

World systems theory may only partially explain skilled and business permanent migration to Australia and Canada.\textsuperscript{5} International migration is primarily seen as a by-product of economic expansion. Although the theory rightly concludes that economic expansion abroad is driven by expected higher profits and greater wealth, economic benefits are also expected from purpose-driven domestic immigration policies. The theory claims that immigration management should occur via control of economic operations overseas but concedes that this may be difficult to implement. Independent skilled and business migration policies seem to be driven by a different logic to the theory. They consist of bringing skilled workers and business people into the country while investment abroad occurs simultaneously; moreover, regional migration policies consciously go against the urbanisation trends and concentration of economic activity in ‘global cities’, depicted by this theory.

The migration systems approach originates from the work of Mabogunje (1970), as well as builds on the intellectual framework proposed by Portes and Borocz (1989). Proponents of this approach (Fawcett 1989; Kritz and Zlotnik 1992) recognise that international migration interacts with, and is affected by, international processes like economic relations (often being a continuation of colonial links); activity of transnational institutions organising exchange across countries; cultural influence; flows of information; receiving and sending governments’ policies; demand on labour markets often transmitted through a network of family and friends; advanced means of communication and transportation; and the role of migration facilitating institutions. “Underlying those transnational exchanges and economy; and Marger (2001) for a contrasting account of business immigrants’ success achieved largely without relying on ethnic networks in business.

\textsuperscript{5} Comparing Australian and Canadian economic presence abroad (foreign investments of both countries and Australian major export markets) indicates minimal overlap with the top countries supplying skilled and business migrants, which suggests that the theory is not entirely sufficient to explain skilled and business flows into these countries. Compare foreign investments and major export markets (2002–03) in Austrade (2003:11) and top sources for skilled and business migrants to Australia (2002–03) in Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) 2004a:23. For Canadian foreign investments (2002) see Statistics Canada (2003d:3) and compare with top source countries for skilled and business migrants (2002) in Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) 2003f:97,79). Not only is there little
interactions are a range of political systems and disharmonious levels, rates, and strategies of economic and demographic growth that encourage people to migrate" (Kritz and Zlotnik 1992:1).

This approach is based upon the concept of 'system' - a group of countries (minimum two) that exchange large numbers of migrants. Geographical proximity is not a necessary condition (Kritz and Zlotnik 1992:2,4). Systems may be determined from either end of the flows. Countries in a given geographical region, if characterised by similar migration linkages and levels of economic development, and cultural similarities, constitute a single migration system. Recipient countries in such system should have similar immigration policies and strong economic or political ties with each other. Sending countries should also have similar migration policies although their economic or political ties might be weaker (Zlotnik 1992:20). Strong economic and political ties, typically of dependent nature, with particular receiving countries are more likely and they validate the presence of a system (Zlotnik 1992:20).

Australia and New Zealand are the principal recipient countries in the system of the South Pacific region. Yet, in the South Pacific the flows from outside the region dominate over the internal ones. All countries in the region have strong linkages with Asia, North America and Western Europe, which makes the South Pacific migration system one of several systems that the region belongs to (Bedford 1992:44). Canada and the U.S.A. (with the domination of the latter) are at the core of a single migration system receiving flows from countries from around the world (Zlotnik 1992:21–5; see Massey et al. 1998:62–8). The migration systems approach is not a theory but it represents a promising framework for further studies of international migration, including skilled and business streams into Australia and Canada.

There is no one general theory of regional development and current regional development concepts also promote a number of ways to advance the regions. Partly this is the newness of the discipline. Regional science became a distinct field of study in the 1950s and, while

overlap among those flows, Australia and Canada invest in countries that have never been their colonies. Indeed, these countries are former colonies themselves.
derivative of a number of disciplines that study regions, was especially influenced by economics. Modern regional science grew particularly in the U.S.A. and is associated with the name of Walter Isard (Polese 1999:1). A number of economic theories such as of interregional trade; exports and economic base theories; central places; location theory; regional dualism; dependency theory, and the product cycle theory deal with regional differences as their main or side concern and so have been influential (Higgins and Savoie 1995:55–71; 106–112; 115–122; 128–130; 136–143; 171–2). Their detailed content is covered well in the literature, including the review in Higgins and Savoie (1995), and so it is not discussed here.

It is often noted in the literature that the preceding traditional economic theory dealt inadequately with, or ignored spatial aspects of economic activity (Higgins and Savoie 1995:5-10; Holland 1976:20; Richardson 1969:1–5). While the immediate post-war period was characterised by optimism and a strong economic growth in the Allied nations (Polese 1999:2; Higgins and Savoie 1995:14), it also brought to attention the existence of lagging regions that did not share the general prosperity (Polese 1999:3). A combination of Keynesian theory and the neoclassical theory arguing that free market economies tend to move towards equilibrium after a shock, is perceived as a reason for dealing with regional problems in that post-war period through relatively “light-touch” or market friendly interventions such as incentives and subsidies to firms (Higgins and Savoie 1995:138).

The self-balancing character of the market economy was questioned after WWII especially by the concept of cumulative causation arguing that market forces will carry it further and further away from the equilibrium, when disturbed (Higgins and Savoie 1995:76). Presentations of this idea can be found in Domar (1946), Harrod (1948), Hicks (1950) and Higgins (1955). The principle of circular and cumulative causation was applied to the problem of regional disparities by Myrdal (1957). Market forces may tend to increase, rather than decrease the inequality between regions. Without some policy interference, economic and cultural activities would cluster in certain localities and regions, leaving the rest of the country more or less in a “backwater” state.
According to Myrdal, attraction and polarisation of particular centres and regions draws on or begins with historical accident. The activities commenced there and not somewhere else, meet with success, and result in sustained and continuous growth. That growth occurs at the expense of other localities and regions (Myrdal 1957:26–7). Expansion of one region may have negative ‘backwash effects’ or positive ‘spread effects’ on other regions (1957:27–9; 31–3). The cumulative process evolves through migration, capital movements and trade: upwards in the lucky regions and downwards in the unlucky ones (1957:27). A change or commencement of a process in a locality or a region triggers other changes or processes of similar nature, with effects that cumulate in vicious circles (circular causation). Myrdal believed that neutralisation of the ‘backwash effects’, once a country reaches a high level of development, where the ‘spread effects’ are strong, will in itself prompt the economic development and become an important factor in the cumulative process (1957:34). He advocated state egalitarian policies (the welfare state) to diminish the regional inequalities (1957:39,40,41), even stronger than the dominant U.S.A. driven more market-friendly approach to policy and more congenial to planning approaches that have also been influential, especially in Europe.

The most academically discussed regional development theory was proposed by Perroux (1955). His ‘growth pole’ theory became a basis for regional development policies implemented across the world in the 1960s and 1970s (Higgins and Savoie 1995:89,91). His basic concept of growth poles involved constellations of dynamic, innovating enterprises, often but not always located in urban centres, and generating effets d’entraînement (propulsive effects), which were positive (spread effects), or negative (backwash effects) (1995:91). Early analyses of the growth pole strategies failed to clearly distinguish between the growth pole as a feature of a dynamic space economy, and the growth pole as a key element in a strategy to improve the performance of a regional economic system. In other words, it was unclear what was a natural/spontaneous growth pole, and what a planned/induced growth pole was (Parr 1999:1197).

According to Perroux “…Growth does not appear everywhere at the same time; it becomes manifest at points or poles of growth, with variable intensity; it spreads through different channels, with variable terminal effects on the whole economy” (Perroux 1955:94).
Economic growth then is a result of the effects of disequilibrium and domination, and necessarily occurs unevenly (Parr 1999:1197). This argument of growth poles was located by Perroux in an abstract economic space – a concept he had developed earlier (1950). Polarisation in such space was measured by intensity of interfirm or interindustry transactions (Parr 1999:1197). Perroux acknowledged that a growth pole in an economic space might exist as a territorial entity (1955:101–2).

The concept of a growth pole in a geographic space was developed by Aydalot (1965), Boudeville (1966), Paelinck (1965,1968), Hansen (1967) and Hermansen (1972) (Parr 1999:1197). It was defined as “a set of expanding industries located in an urban area and inducing further development of economic activity throughout its zone of influence” (Boudeville 1966:11). What seems to have confused the regional planners in practice when they commenced introducing strategies based on the concept of the growth pole in the 1960s, was the assumption of an unambiguous correspondence between the abstract economic space and the geographic space. This resulted in an assumption that the natural growth pole could be replicated as a planned growth pole, by locating the propulsive (innovating) industries and by providing infrastructure in particular urban centres. Sometimes, it was presumed that an activation of a growth pole would result in it assuming certain, if not all, of the features of a natural growth pole in a geographic space, for example capacity for innovation, or ability to attract capital from other regions (Parr 1999:1198). The growth pole strategy was applied in very diverse settings. Communities designated as growth poles ranged between 500 in the U.S.A. to some millions in Japan (Higgins and Savoie 1995:103).

That strategy was also applied to achieve different goals. When adopted to revitallise a depressed area (retarded region), employment opportunities in its urban centres would be enhanced. This would involve capital transfers into such an area through various incentives: improved infrastructure, subsidies to private and public corporations and location of particular industries (Parr 1999:1200; Polese 1999:4; Higgins and Savoie 1995:101–2; Holland 1976:42). The growth pole policy could easily become a political bargaining tool. As in Canada, convincing the federal government to designate a particular community as a growth pole was a measure of success of local politicians. The federal government had to
continuously explain why a certain number of communities could not be designated, but at the same time communities not even remotely aspiring to being clusters of propulsive industries were sometimes designated (Higgins and Savoie 1995:387–8). A number of initiatives to lift the lagging (designated) regions were undertaken in Canada in the spirit of this strategy. The particular solutions are discussed by Higgins and Savoie (1995:277–9).

The growth pole strategy was also applied to encourage regional deconcentration. This involved a large metropolitan area and its wider region over which it had a social and economic dominance, the whole entity being referred to as a city region, a polarised region or a metropolis-based region. The growth pole strategy in this case was intended to reduce the dominance of metropolis in employment and population to improve efficiency of the regional economy. Examples of this strategy in Australia are the development of Albury-Wodonga and Bathurst-Orange towns to reduce the dominance of Melbourne and Sydney within their respective states. These projects were largely financed by the Australian federal government (Parr 1999:1201–2).

Interestingly, during the 1960s and 1970s there was a concern about the seemingly irreversible trend towards agglomeration and polarisation in a number of countries. Only the very large metropolitan centres appeared to have the necessary location advantages for the new high-tech industries (Higgins and Savoie 1995:169). Yet, towards the end of the 1970s, it was realised that there had been a polarisation reversal: large cities such as Tokyo or New York were losing populations. Pollution, congestion, high costs of living and renting, and diseconomies of scale were perceived as its motives (Lo and Saïh 1978 in: Higgins and Savoie 1995:169). In Australia, a similar reversal of increasing population concentration in large metropolitan areas (counter-urbanisation) was noted from the 1970s (see Subsection 1.3.1 in Appendix I). In the 1980s though, the population concentration resumed, while in Australia the counter-urbanisation trend slowed down (Bell and Hugo 2000:94).

The belief that national government policies could influence the spatial economic structure and in turn affect the economic trends in the lagging regions did not bring the expected results in practice. As in Canada in early 1980s, in many Western countries the central
government departments responsible for regional development were either closed down, abolished, or reduced in importance (Polese 1999:4–5). There is almost a universal agreement among economists that local subsidies (used by the growth pole strategies) are inefficient and have at best a marginal impact on the location behaviour of firms. Central governments began to deem them wasteful as incentives to firms to locate in lagging regions (1999:5,6). As observed by Polese (1999:8), the failure of growth poles as a policy tool stemmed from many regions and constituencies wanting a ‘fair’ share of the central government commitment and its financial aid, which compromised the aim of the policy to concentrate and sustain public investment in a limited number of locations. Instead, the financial aid was spread over too many areas to please the voters. Also, a mere concentration of industrial investments, infrastructure development, etc. does not guarantee an autonomous and dynamic development. Further main obstacles to that development are institutional, cultural, sociological and geographic and are difficult to change by central planning.

The failure of the growth pole strategies in the 1970s and 1980s brought about a shift in perception about who is responsible for the regional development. Indeed, rather than continuing to be perceived as a national policy issue, regional development has become a local matter (Polese 1999:5,10; Higgins and Savoie 1995:167). For example, in Canada, the federal government has openly advocated that regional development be primarily a provincial matter (Polese 1999:6). Nowadays, development of a region depends on its capacity to organise local stakeholders around common goals, and to adapt and successfully adjust to external pressures. This development is endogenous: the people, their sense of community, their institutions, spirit of innovation and entrepreneurship are all sources of development (Polese 1999:10).

These elements are mentioned by Beer, Maude and Pritchard (2003:16–21) as ingredients of three broad approaches to regional endogenous growth in Australia. These approaches serve to a) enhance the business environment and marketing of a region, b) generate new markets for regional commodities and services, and c) bring together local associations to augment their efforts and impact. Federal, state/territory and local governments participate in the regional development, with the latter two being more significant. Community groups
and the private sector may now be gaining important roles, too (2003:23–9). Since the early 1990s, the states and territories have established the regional development bodies in non-metropolitan Australia, a move that reflected the new notion of locally-driven economic development (2003:25–6). There are a number of local strategies to develop regions and make them more competitive, such as for example product differentiation and value-adding in case of resource-based economies; promoting the ‘new industries’ with growth potential such as tourism; establishing business incubators; retaining and supporting expansion of existing business base, or clustering of firms (2003:84–142).

Under the current federal Australian government priorities, the investment in regional infrastructure has diminished, and since 1996 there has been an emphasis on the services rather than infrastructure provision (Beer, Maude and Pritchard 2003:195,196). Under such circumstances, the regional stakeholders may promote community-based models of service provision, they can apply for federal and state funding for community initiatives and ensure maximum use of existing facilities (2003:216–17). Such a bottom-up approach to regional development termed ‘partnership’ is explicitly promoted under the Australian federal government framework for regions (Department of Transport and Regional Services (DOTARS) 2001). Regional communities manage their own change through involvement of various local community and business stakeholders, with federal support for their community plans and aspirations. The business sector is particularly expected to participate in local planning and action. Importantly, one of the measures to grow the regional businesses and employment are the regional migration schemes (2001:11,16,18). Hence, the federal government migration and regional development policies intersect. In Canada, the federal government supports an identical model of community-driven approach to development, and regional migration initiatives may receive funding as community-driven projects (see for example Western Economic Diversification Canada (WED CA) 2006, 2005). Attention in this thesis is drawn to such regional migration initiatives in Canada that illustrate and build-on this aspect of the current, community-driven regional development concepts.

The aforementioned competitiveness of regions is a key factor enabling them to participate in a modern knowledge-based economy. They may achieve it if they become learners and
innovators. Recently, there have been numerous propositions regarding factors contributing to knowledge acquisition in regions, enabling them to become the so-called ‘learning regions’. These factors include new forms of agglomeration based around knowledge creation; non-material advantages embedded in sets of social relations between firms and institutions; increased sectoral specialisation; resulting from these three factors: the accessibility to ‘tacit’ knowledge easily shared under geographical proximity; cumulative learning processes occurring over time among a community of firms in a locality, and trust in business networks facilitating reciprocal information and knowledge exchange. The ‘learning region’ concept can be applied to less favoured and more advanced regions (MacKinnon, Cumbers and Chapman 2002:301–2). These latter authors though offer a critical review of the contemporary theories of learning and innovation and regional development. Detailed discussion falls beyond the scope of this migration-focussed thesis, but it is important to note that the Australian and Canadian federal governments’ support for regional development encompass funding for innovation and skills development, increasing productivity and competitiveness (DOTARS 2001:18; WED CA 2006:1). Furthermore, the concept and practice of their skilled and business regional migration schemes subscribe to the notion of learning and innovation in a regional context, as they are intended to help regions participate in the knowledge-based economy. Such a role of these schemes, and the community-driven development, provide then a broad, theoretical framework for this thesis though not a detailed part of the investigation, except in terms of their interactive linkages.

In closing review of the selected benchmark regional development concepts of policy significance, it is worth acknowledging the ‘new regionalism’ paradigm. It advocates development of the poorer or struggling regions, which is termed ‘economic normalisation’. The model of normality is the global economy and its assumed imperative for trade-focused development. Normalisation is pursued by a set of interlocking development strategies in regions, with focus on economic rather than sociocultural or environmental issues (Macleod 2001 in: Gleeson 2003:222). To some degree, the European Union (EU) regional policy frameworks reflect the priorities of the ‘new regionalism’. Yet, they also encompass social inclusion and solidarity; environmental renewal; sociocultural development; and urban and infrastructure investment as new regional policy objectives.
These extend beyond the narrow concept of 'new regionalism'. Thus, the EU recognises the contribution to regional well-being made by these forces (2003:222,232). Since it is unlikely that a narrow approach alone will solve the problems of lagging regions, incorporating the other values may be expected to become an even more prominent feature of the regional development strategies in the near future.

1.4 Historical and legal background

This Section deals with three issues. First, it discusses the constitutional differences between Australia and Canada, which influence the nature and practice of the regional migration policies. Second, it provides the policies' historical background. Third, it places them in a broader context of the long-standing interest in regional issues shared by Australia and Canada.

The nature and practice of the regional migration policies in Australia and Canada are rooted in the constitutions of both countries. Differences in formal responsibilities in the matter of immigration between Australia and Canada influence the ways these programs operate. According to the 1900 Australian Constitution, immigration is a Commonwealth prerogative. In Canada, according to the 1867 Constitution Act, immigration is a shared responsibility of the federal and provincial and territorial governments with paramountcy of the federal law. These differences underlie the policies' design and implementation.

In Australia, common rules related to regional migration, contained in the 1958 Migration Act (Attorney-General’s Department 2004a) and 1994 Migration Regulations (Attorney-General’s Department 2004b), apply to all governments participating in these schemes. This means that identical visa subclasses for skilled and business regional migrants are made available to all states and territories and universal eligibility criteria are established at the federal level and apply regardless of the state or territory of intended settlement. The regional policy in Australia encompasses visas administered exclusively by the federal

---

Australian government (DIMIA) and visas where the state and territory governments cooperate by establishing certain own, additional criteria. Therefore, formally, the name of the regional migration policy is the State-Specific and Regional Migration Initiatives (SSRM).  

An application for regional or state/territory sponsored migration is, at the same time, an application for permanent or temporary residency in Australia, whichever is applicable. It bears a DIMIA name, reflecting the federal responsibility for immigration. Consultations with state and territory governments on the entry criteria were part of the design process but the criteria, considering these inputs, were established at the federal level. The governments have determined which areas (regions) of their jurisdictions were the ‘Designated Areas’ (regions); that is, areas eligible for migrants’ settlement. Since the concept of ‘region’ was not precisely defined during the consultations, and it was recognised that regional areas differ “(...) in terms of population growth...economic performance (actual and potential) and availability of infrastructure”, the governments defined them according to their preferences (that is, where they wanted migrants to settle). In consequence, the same schemes can be used in regions that vary greatly in character and geographical location. Sometimes, entire jurisdictions have been made eligible. Regional migration issues are addressed within the framework of DIMIA non-statutory bodies.  

Where the governments are involved in the ‘sponsorship’ of skilled and business migrants, they formally endorse applications of individuals, who must meet all relevant entry criteria.

---

7 The Constitution Act, 1867 (Consolidated with Amendments), Part VI, Section 95, Department of Justice Canada n.d.a.

8 DIMIA used another term - ‘State Specific Migration Mechanisms’ (SSMMs) in “Population Flows: Immigration Aspects 2001 Edition” (DIMIA 2002). The 2002–03 edition (DIMIA 2004n) uses the term ‘SSRM initiatives’. In this thesis the general term ‘regional migration policy (-ies)’ covers the regional visas managed by the federal government (DIMIA) in Australia and visas where the states and territories in Australia are involved, unless it is necessary to distinguish between them. Furthermore, that term is used to refer jointly to Australian and Canadian policies where general observations are made and it is not necessary to distinguish between them.


10 They include the Ministerial Council on Immigration and Multicultural Affairs and associated Standing Committee on Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (gathering Commonwealth, State and Territory officials from relevant departments), which has an advisory function to the former (see Supplementary Information:DIMIA 2004b:5–7). Additional, temporary purpose-driven bodies can also be established. The New South Wales and Commonwealth Working Party on Migration to Sydney and Regional New South Wales is an example.
established for a particular visa subclass at the federal level. Where the governments are not involved, other bodies endorse the application and the applicant must also satisfy all requirements for entry established by the federal law. A permanent (or temporary) visa is granted after all federal health and character checks have been performed to the satisfaction of the federal government (see for example DIMIA 2004j:45–7).

The current policy is not the first attempt in Australia to disperse immigrants. In early post-war years, the two-year bonding system was used by the federal government to allocate displaced persons (DPs) to work in country areas, to fill urgent labour shortages (Kunz 1988:38–42). Placements included for example mining and quarrying, railway construction and maintenance or dam and other major construction jobs (1988:142). Upon the expiration of the contract, many DPs moved to major cities (see for example Hugo 1988-92a:51,69; 1988-92b:80–1,118,121). Another example from that post-war period of attracting immigrants to fill jobs in particular locations is provided by South Australia. That state was attracting British immigrants to settle in its territory by offering them job packages and housing, while they received assisted passage from the federal Australian government (Hugo 1988 in: Hugo 1999:67). The concept of state/territory recruitment returned in the late 1970s, when the Minister for Immigration at that time, Michael MacKellar, announced a new triennial system of immigration planning, involving consultations with states and territories. He also announced then that states and territories would be able to run their own nomination schemes to recruit immigrants fitting their needs (Hawkins 1989:245).

Current SSRM initiatives in Australia date back to the 1995 Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme (RSMS) pilot scheme and the work of two subsequent Commonwealth - State/Territory Working Parties (Parliament of Australia 2001:9; Hugo 1999:68). In March 1997, the relevant Commonwealth, State and Territory ministers adopted a set of key principles recommended by the first Working Party. These principles recommended that the regional initiatives should: be sufficiently flexible to allow States and Territories to use these selectively and in a manner appropriate to their own needs; be non-discriminatory; be grounded in the findings of research; and not impact negatively on employment and training opportunities for existing residents (Hugo 1999:68).
The SSRM initiatives have been instituted at a time of positive economic and employment growth (Department of Employment and Workplace Relations (DEWR) 2006:1; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) 2006:1). This growth has contributed to a tighter labour market, and employers, including in non-metropolitan Australia, have experienced difficulties recruiting and retaining staff (DEWR 2006:i). At the same time local labour shortages in non-metropolitan areas were resulting from internal migration in the immediate period leading to the establishing of the regional schemes. Internal migration of occupational groups in that period is discussed in Appendix I (Subsection I.4.2.). Such circumstances of general and local labour shortage have enhanced the perceived role of the SSRM initiatives.

Table 1.1 below presents the milestones of the Australian SSRM initiatives. State/territory sponsorship indicates where these governments are involved in a migrant’s assessment. The RSMS and the Skilled Designated Area Sponsored (SDAS) category, discussed in Chapter Two, are examples of federal government’s sole responsibility for management of these visas.

**Table 1.1 Key milestones in SSRM initiatives in Australia.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of SSRM introduced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1995</td>
<td>Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme (RSMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1996</td>
<td>Skilled-Regional Linked category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1996</td>
<td>Skill Matching Scheme and Skill Matching Database (SMD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1997</td>
<td>State/Territory Sponsored Regional Established Business in Australia (REBA) category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1997</td>
<td>State/Territory Nominated Independent (STNI) category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1999</td>
<td>Skill Matching Visa (SMV) class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1999</td>
<td>Skilled-Regional Sponsored (SRS) category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2001</td>
<td>SRS became the Skilled Designated Area Sponsored (SDAS) category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2001</td>
<td>Visa cancellation provisions for RSMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-July 2002</td>
<td>SMD/SMV enhancements (early registration and trial removal of initial fee - maintained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2002</td>
<td>Concessions for regional sponsorship of temporary business migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2003</td>
<td>Two-stage business skills visas (temporary followed by permanent visas) for State/Territory Sponsored Business Skills Migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>Overseas students who study and reside in regional Australia or a low population metropolitan area for at least two years eligible for 5 additional points on General Skilled Migration points test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2004</td>
<td>Two-stage Skilled-Independent Regional visa (SIR) (temporary followed by permanent visa) sponsored by state/territory governments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** a) The forerunner of SDAS (2001) - a regional family-linked skilled migration visa was the Regional Family category from the then Concessional Family Class visa introduced in November 1996. It was subsequently renamed Skilled-Regional Linked and replaced by Skilled Regional Sponsored (SRS) in July 1999. Neither of the categories was points tested but basic criteria applied. Parliament of Australia 2001:71,73.

**Sources:** DIMIA 2004d; 2005i.
In Canada, according to the principle of shared responsibility in immigration matters, the 1976 Immigration Act made it mandatory for the Minister to consult the provinces in the planning and the decision-making process, which included provincial advice on the regional demographic needs and labour market considerations (Hawkins 1989:71,79; Young 1992:7). The mandatory cooperation with provinces took the form of annual consultations (Hawkins 1989:88). The Act also enabled the Minister to enter into agreements relating to immigration with a province or a group of provinces to facilitate the formulation, coordination and implementation of policies and programs (Hawkins 1989:71; Young 1992:8). The 1978 Immigration Regulations that complemented the Immigration Act introduced the ‘designated occupation’ and ‘designated area’ concepts to meet skill shortages and to provide means to steer migrants away from the major metropolitan areas (Hawkins 1989:77,79). Seven federal-provincial agreements were established in the late 1970s, consisting of ongoing consultation and cooperation in areas of immigration, demography and employment (1989:246).

The provisions of the 1976 Act are maintained and fine-tuned in the current Immigration and Refugee Protection Act referred to as IRPA (Department of Justice Canada 2004a), which has replaced the 1976 Act. IRPA and the accompanying regulations (see below) have been in force since June 2002. Under IRPA, it is still mandatory for the Minister to consult with the provinces over the distribution of immigrants in Canada, considering regional economic and demographic requirements and measures to be undertaken in order to facilitate their integration into the society.\footnote{ Immigration and Refugee Protection Act 2001 (IRPA), Agreements (10(2)). Department of Justice Canada 2004a.} In addition to regular annual meetings of federal, provincial and territorial ministers, there are meetings at lower ministerial levels (for example, an Immigration Planning Table established in 2001) as well as meetings of various working groups, for example, a federal/provincial/territorial working group on the Provincial Nominee Programs (CIC 2003b:14; 2003h:1). They are referred to in brief as PNP.\footnote{ Immigration and Refugee Protection Act 2001 (IRPA), Agreements (10(2)). Department of Justice Canada 2004a.}

Under IRPA, the Minister can enter into agreements with the provinces and territories to facilitate the coordination and implementation of immigration policies and programs. They
have legislation under which they can enter into such agreements (CIC 2004d:5). That provision is the legal foundation for the PNPs that are established by such federal-provincial agreements. In consequence, each agreement has slightly different terms and since the governments may tailor their programs under the agreements to meet their individually identified needs, they may differ among each other in terms of skills and business expertise sought after. The agreements usually establish provincial/territorial-federal committees for the purposes of policy planning and consultations. In comparison to the Australian states and territories that dispose of identical visa subclasses, the Canadian provinces have more independence in tailoring the entry criteria and designing their own migration categories. In fact, they entirely manage them, as opposed to the federally established criteria for the skilled and business regional migrants in Australia.

To enable implementation of the agreements provided for in IRPA, a Provincial Nominee (PN) Class was established by Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations. They provide also for a Québec Skilled Worker Class, which covers all individuals issued the Certificat de sélection du Québec (Québec Selection Certificate). That reflects the particular selection powers of this French-speaking province. Québec operates the largest immigration program among the provinces, one that has been evolving since the early 1970s. Table 1.2, which presents an overview of the current federal-provincial agreements, shows the major milestones in the development of the Québec policy.

As in Australia, the federal government retains control over health and security checks. A permanent resident visa is issued by CIC to a provincial nominee or a Québec-selected migrant if all necessary criminal, security, health and other checks, as required by the federal government, have been satisfactorily performed. These may constitute inadmissibility grounds and are specified in IRPA (Division 4).

Currently, the agreements fall into two categories: Immigration Framework Agreements (FAs) and provincial/territorial agreements on nominees - the PNPs. The first category

---

12 *Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations*, Part 6, Division 1, 87(1-2) (Provincial Nominee Class). Part 6, Division 1 (86 (1-2)) (Québec Skilled Worker Class), Department of Justice Canada 2004b.
13 *Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations*, Part 3; Part 4, Division 3 (29, 30(1a), 30(4), 31-34); Part 5, Division 6 (70(1a-e), 70(2b), Department of Justice Canada 2004b.
outlines specific responsibilities including consultation on legislative policy, policy and program changes that may affect the other party, and information sharing (CIC 2003b:13). British Columbia and Manitoba additionally have assumed responsibility for the design, administration, delivery and evaluation of settlement and integration services to newcomers (2004g:1–2). Québec, which currently has the most comprehensive agreement of all jurisdictions, in addition to information presented in Table 1.2, assumes full responsibility for orientation and integration services (2003b:13).\footnote{Québec’s immigration program is not formally named PNP like elsewhere in Canada, and therefore migrants selected by this province are not referred to as ‘nominees’. This term is used in this thesis to refer to skilled and business migrants nominated by other provinces. ‘Québec-selected migrants’ refers to skilled and business migrants selected by Québec, unless a distinction is necessary between the skilled and business categories. Where general comments are made, a joint term ‘provincial migrants’ denominates the nominees and the Québec-selected migrants.}

The PNP5s enable provinces and territories to nominate - according to their regional or local needs - an agreed number of migrants, who will contribute to their economic development (CIC 2003b:13). Table 1.2 below shows that PNP5s are renewable (or may have no expiry date at all) and that the agreed number of nominees may be raised. PNPs can exist separately or as annexes to FAs. A FA is not necessary on order to have an agreement on provincial nominees. The agreements from the 1990s that had been signed before the new Immigration Act (and immigration regulations) came into force had been referring to the 1976 Immigration Act and 1978 Immigration Regulations (both were removed from publicly available websites after the new legislation has been enforced).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/territory</th>
<th>Framework Agreement (FA) - provides a mechanism for cooperation, including information sharing and a requirement to consult on legislative, policy and program changes. May give a province specific selection powers.</th>
<th>Provincal/Territorial Nominee Program (PNP) - enables provinces/territories to identify each year an agreed number of candidates whose admission they consider to be of significant benefit to their economic development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario <strong>ON</strong></td>
<td>Letter of Intent with Respect to Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement: signed 7 May 2004. Negotiations in progress.</td>
<td>Does not have PNP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province/territory</td>
<td>Framework Agreement (FA)</td>
<td>Provincial/Territorial Nominee Program (PNP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As anticipated at the beginning of this section, Australia and Canada share a similar, long-standing interest in regional variation. This commonality no doubt derives from the similar physical and human geography of both countries. They both stretch across vast lands that are unevenly and sparsely populated, and their respective populations are highly concentrated in urban areas. There exist considerable intracountry differences in the population levels among their jurisdictions (see Subsection I.3.1 in Appendix I). In each country, a planned immigration program has played an important role in the nation building process. Now the Australian and Canadian immigration programs have been enhanced to include more sophisticated objectives of addressing regional variations and specific needs of regions through new migration schemes.

That concern for regional affairs is expressed in many other, similar forms in both countries. One manifestation is the composition of the Senates in the federal Parliaments. Each Australian state has an equal number of senators regardless of the state’s population. This is specifically designed to ensure that views of smaller states are not neglected. Each territory has two senators (Parliament of Australia 2003b:2). The Canadian Senate also reflects the principle of equal representation of geographical regions. Over 50 per cent of the seats are allocated to less populated parts of the country. Senators are expected to consider the regional impact of the legislation and policies (Library of Parliament 2002:12,23).

Dealing with regional disparities further occurs at the institutional level. In Australia there is the Commonwealth Grants Commission (CGC), established in 1933, which is an advisory body to the federal government (Commonwealth Grants Commission (CGC) 2006:1). It recommends the Goods and Services Tax (GST) revenue distribution among the jurisdictions (Northern Territory Treasury (NTT) 2005:42). It applies the principle of fiscal equalisation, whereby all states and territories should be capable of providing the average standard of state-type public services, while making average efforts to raise revenue from their own sources. The payments recommended by the Commission can be spent according to the governments’ priorities (CGC 2006:1).
Other intergovernmental transfers in Australia include the National Competition Payments and Specific Purpose Payments (SPPs). The latter are earmarked for specific purposes such as particular programs and/or functions. The Australian federal government can require matching funds by states and territories. Health and education are examples of areas, where the SPPs grants are directed (NTT 2005:41,48,50,52).

The equivalent of the Australian CGC is the fiscal equalisation program in Canada. It was set up by the federal government in 1957, following earlier recommendations (1937). Fiscal equalisation reduces disparities between regions to achieve a national standard in public services and to equalise provincial governments’ revenues (Savoie 1992:26). It ensures that all provinces have sufficient revenues to offer reasonably comparable level of these services, at reasonably comparable rates of taxation (Department of Finance Canada (DF CA) 2006b:1). The funds come wholly from the federal budget, which means that residents of all provinces contribute. Equalisation does not take funds from the richer provinces – only the poorer ones are equalised up (Brown 2002 in: Bakvis and Skogstad 2002:63–4). Payments under this program are unconditional [as in Australia]: the governments are free to spend them on public services according to their own priorities (DF CA 2006b:1).

There are also other intergovernmental transfers similar to Australia: the Canada Health and Social Transfer (CHSF) and cost-shared programs. The latter are in fact economic and regional development agreements (Brown 2002 in: Bakvis and Skogstad 2002:63). Since 2004, the CHSF has been operating as two separate transfers: the Canada Health Transfer and the Canada Social Transfer (DF CA 2006a:1). These transfers and the equalisation program fall under the federal Department of Finance.

Apart from the fiscal aspect of responding to regional differences, Australia and Canada have federal departments dealing with regional development. In Australia, the portfolio of DOTARS includes, among other things, regional development, delivery of regional and rural specific services and matters relating to local government (Australian Government n.d.:14). The Department conduits information about relevant government polices and programs to regional Australia (DOTARS 2006b:2). DOTARS has regional
Regional concerns underpin various regional policies in Australia and Canada and they have now become reflected in the immigration programs themselves. The regional migration policies under review here enable the Australian state/territory governments and the Canadian provincial/territory governments to participate in the migrants’ selection. They represent another form of intergovernmental cooperation in federal states. In that particular instance, it is also a manifestation of yet another dimension of cooperation aiming to advance the regions. Pursuing regional migration policies through intergovernmental cooperation, and making their focus on advancing the human capital of regions and on business development, originates from the same basic regional concerns that had given rise to both fiscal equalisation schemes and that are manifested in the federal-state/territory/provincial politics, for example an idea of equable sharing in national progress, including in its spatial reflection.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the nature and practice of the regional migration policies in Australia and Canada are embedded not only in the constitutional division of power but arise also from the common interest in regional variation. While in Canada immigration is a shared responsibility of the governments, the more that regional migration schemes are being developed too in Australia, the more a question can be raised as to whether the state/territory involvement in this represents a shift in power in their direction, bringing the de facto outcomes at least closer together as between the two countries where formal constitutional allocation of immigration power is indeed different.

1.5 Practical context of the thesis

Some similar factors have influenced the introduction of the regional migration policies in both countries. Principally, these involved the population distribution and growth
patterns and resultant socioeconomic differences between the areas of exceptional population concentration and growth, as opposed to other areas.

Generally, the Australian and the Canadian populations are concentrated in major urban areas, which in Australia are mostly capital cities. That concentration has been fuelled by the legacy of decades’ worth of immigration policies in both countries. International migrants are the major drivers behind the exceptional population growth in some of these areas. One of the consequences of their settlement preferences is uneven population distribution in both countries and lower population growth rates in these other areas where few migrants settle. This uneven population distribution, caused partially by the migrants’ settlement, represents the first underlying factor behind introducing the regional migration policies.

Another factor exacerbating uneven population distribution in both countries is internal migration. This contributes to further population growth in some areas, while at the same time causing population stagnation or even decline in the areas of origin. Some major urban areas are not immune to internal out-migration, resulting in population stagnation or decline (compounded by few migrant arrivals). The phenomenon of out-migration is another cause, alongside concentrated migrants’ settlement, behind introducing the regional migration policies. Sometimes, the jurisdictions from where the internal migration originates have relatively small population bases, and a further purpose for instituting the policies is to increase population levels in these areas. Rural and remote areas in both countries are similarly concerned about their small or declining populations and their consequences. The population projections for all jurisdictions in Australia and Canada generally confirm the continuation of population growth and decline trends where they are already occurring, thus providing further impetus for the policies.

While the populations of Australia and Canada are generally ageing, unfavourable demographic profiles are more pronounced in some jurisdictions than in others. These unfavourable demographic profiles are often found in jurisdictions, or areas within these jurisdictions, with sustained out-migration of local residents and low inflows of international migrants. These out-migrants are usually young, attracted by better
economic opportunities elsewhere in the country. In turn, this affects the labour force supply, including the availability of specific skills, and it contributes to skill shortages. Another reason behind the skill shortages, common in both countries and not exclusive to areas of population stagnation or decline, is simply that insufficient numbers of young people are entering the labour force and taking up these specific positions. In both countries, this has to be considered in the context of ‘baby boomers’ nearing retirement age, and their impending withdrawal from full employment. Hence, the demand for particular skills in specific areas of both countries is another motivation for instituting the regional migration policies.

In both countries, the desire to share some of the benefits that international migration has been bringing to some major urban areas in form of skills, entrepreneurship, business investment, international business links and the like underlies the policy motivations. Clearly, then, the population concentration is the principal reason for the policies, and is driven, to an extent, by economic opportunities and this underlies continued economic development in areas of high population concentration. To enhance these opportunities in areas of non-migrant concentration and in areas of out-migration in both countries, the policies target both skilled migrants and business migrants. A broad background of population and socioeconomic trends summarised here, covering the period of 1991–2001 in Australia and Canada, can be found in Appendix I. The thesis word limit precludes including its content in the main body of the thesis. Although the origin of the population concentration goes back a few decades, such trends, evident at the time of writing, have prompted the governments to conceptualise and design the policies from around mid-1990s.

1.6 Concepts and data

This Section deals with three issues. It commences with an overview of the Australian and Canadian approaches to defining permanent and temporary migrants – two most important groups studied in this thesis. Second, it shows differences in the Australian and Canadian applications of two key concepts (terms): ‘skills’ and ‘regions’ in the context of their respective regional migration policies. Interpretation of the two terms impacts on the
design and outcomes of these policies. The Section closes with a discussion on the types of data used in this thesis, their quality as well as the impact of the latter on the evaluation of the policies that are or could be offered.

The term ‘settler arrivals’ used by DIMIA in Australia refers to arrivals of individuals holding permanent visas (regardless of stated intended period of stay), New Zealand citizens who intend to settle and others who are eligible to settle, for example overseas-born children of Australian citizens (DIMIA 2003b:39). Such definition is close to the United Nations’ (UN) definition of ‘migrants for settlement’. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) uses the term ‘permanent arrivals (settlers)’ with reference to the same groups, which makes the statistics coherent (ABS 2003e:4–5).

CIC in Canada defines ‘permanent residents’ as people who have been granted permanent resident status in Canada (CIC 2005b:110). Statistics Canada, on the other hand, uses a term ‘landed immigrant’. Such person “is not a Canadian citizen by birth, but who has been granted the right to live permanently in Canada by Canadian immigration authorities” (Statistics Canada 2004a:204). Both Canadian definitions are guided by the same principles as the UN definition of ‘migrants for settlement’. They are also comparable to the Australian ‘settler arrivals’. This thesis adopts country-specific terminology. The term ‘(settler) arrivals’ is used in reference to permanent migrant arrivals in Australia and ‘landings’ in reference to permanent resident landings in Canada. The provincial migrants in Canada obtain permanent resident status.

In Australia, some regional skilled migrants and the majority of the state/territory sponsored migrants enter initially on temporary visas. Temporary migrants are citizens of one country who acquired the right to a time-limited stay in another country. In the context of the regional migration policy in Australia, those individuals enter on specific temporary visas that subsequently enable them to apply for the onshore status conversion.

---

15 Permanent international migration signifies a lasting change of the usual place of residence from one country to another. The UN-proposed definition of ‘migrants for settlement’ specifies that they are “[f]oreigners granted the permission to stay for a lengthy or unlimited period, who are subject to virtually no limitations regarding the exercise of an economic activity. Some countries grant settlement rights to foreigners on the basis of certain criteria such as (a) employment-based; (b) family-based; (c) ancestry-based; (d) entrepreneurs or investors and (e) foreign retirees (UN 1998:45–6).
into a permanent regional migration visa, provided all criteria have been met. Furthermore, individuals categorised in some traditionally temporary categories, such as for example students, are also eligible for a status conversion.\(^\text{16}\)

CIC’s and Statistics Canada’s definitions of temporary migrants are not identical. CIC uses the ‘temporary residents’ term, which covers people lawfully in Canada under the authority of a temporary resident permit. Temporary residents include foreign workers, foreign students, the humanitarian population and ‘other’ temporary residents (CIC 2005b:113).\(^\text{17}\) By comparison, Statistics Canada uses the term ‘non-permanent residents’. This covers persons who have been granted the right to live in Canada temporarily and includes refugee claimants living in Canada, work permit holders, student permit holders and minister’s permits. Included are also family members born outside Canada currently sharing a residence with the aforementioned groups (Statistics Canada 2004a:204).

Not only do the Canadian terms differ at home. None of them is fully comparable to the Australian approach, as they contain the refugee claimants. In the context of the provincial programs, the employment authorisations (temporary foreign workers) and student authorisations calculated by CIC are important because these two groups are eligible for a status conversion onshore under the programs.

The ‘skills’ and ‘regions’ are two key concepts in the regional migration policies and they are being interpreted slightly differently for the purposes of the Australian and Canadian policy. In general, the skills of skilled migrants under these policies in both countries are assessed by looking at their formal education and work experience (occupational skills). Such an approach follows the international spirit of assessing skills by referring to

---

\(^\text{16}\) The UN (1998) does not provide an exhaustive list of movements that fall under the category of temporary migration. It recognises that it is often work-related and related to seeking refugee status. Temporary migrants are an enormously diverse group. They can be for example foreigners in need of protection; diplomatic personnel living temporarily abroad, foreign students or migrant workers (1998:9,24,45). Therefore, the Australian categories of temporary migration align with the international approach.

\(^\text{17}\) The humanitarian population comprises refugee claimants and temporary residents allowed to stay in Canada on humanitarian grounds and who are not categorised as either foreign workers or foreign students. The ‘other’ category covers temporary residents who are not under the authority of a work permit or a study permit and who are not refugee claimants. See CIC (2005b:113). Earlier CIC statistical publications
classifications of education and occupations (see Appendices II and III). Assessment of skills for the purposes of regional migration in Australia is based on the Australian Standard Classification of Occupations (Second Edition), called in this thesis ASCO-II (see Appendix IV). It aligns closely to its international counterpart; in fact, the previous classification (ASCO-I (1986)) has been a role model for developing the International Standard Classification of Occupations - ISCO-1988 (ABS 1997:4). ASCO-II, published by ABS, has been in force since mid-1996. Occupations eligible for regional skilled migration (RSMS is an exception and is discussed in Chapter Two) are selected from the first four highest ASCO-II Major Groups (Major Group One: ‘Managers and Administrators’; Major Group Two: ‘Professionals’; Major Group Three: ‘Associate Professionals’ and Major Group Four: ‘Tradespersons and Related Workers’). This selection is called the ‘Skilled Occupation List’ (SOL)\(^{18}\) and is an essential element of the Australian skilled migration. Independent skilled migrants are also subject to that selection.

Other classified occupations from the highest skill levels, but not included on SOL, are ineligible for regional skilled migration (RSMS is an exception). SOL also illustrates how the application of skill classification affects policy outcomes - only people with highest skill levels are eligible for the independent and regional skilled migration. This approach reflects the fact that there are uniform eligibility criteria for the regional migrants established at the federal level.

The Canadian provincial policy approach to determining the skill levels of their migrants differs from the Australian model. The provinces do not need to follow the federal government’s requirements regarding the eligible skill levels for federal migration. The Canadian federal approach is more flexible than the federal Australian approach. The National Occupational Classification (Second Edition), called in this thesis NOC-II (see Appendix V), has been produced by Human Resources and Development Canada

\(^{18}\) SOL is available from DIMIA 2005n.
(HRDC) and is a directory of all potential jobs in Canada. It has been in force since 2001. Occupations eligible for federal independent skilled migration are similar to those eligible in Australia for federal independent and regional skilled migration. They cover the highest skill levels A (occupations usually requiring university education) and B (occupations usually requiring college education or apprenticeship training) and the skill type 0 (covering management occupations; refer to Appendix V).

Formally, federal skilled migration to Canada is guided by a Restrictive Occupations List, which makes some occupations ineligible for skilled migration, but this list has been blank for some time (last revisited in May 2005). This means that CIC makes all occupations from the NOC-II skill levels A, B and the skill type 0 eligible and there is no pre-selection tool that operates akin to SOL in Australia. Since there may be no match among the migrants’ skills and the labour market, each provincial government (the Yukon Territory offers only business migration, see Subsection 2.2.1 in Chapter Two) has responded by individually determining its skilled shortages. In doing so they do not necessarily follow the eligible skill levels and skill type 0 requirements. For example, they may extend/lower the eligibility for being nominated to skill level C (occupations usually requiring secondary school and/or occupation-specific training). Chapter Two compares the Australian and the Canadian provincial policy applications of ‘skills’.

The other key concept for the regional migration policies is ‘region’. Generally, the delineation of ‘regions’ results from some underlying, pre-existing characteristics and/or can be purpose-driven, to characterise areas according to some selected criteria. ‘Regions’ can be described in terms of common statistical characteristics exhibited by adjacent areas. Such contingent areas are called ‘homogenous regions’ (Hall 1970:14). Contingency is an important criterion, distinguishing a homogenous ‘region’ from homogenous ‘areas’ that simply fall within stated statistical ranges (1970:14). Homogenous ‘regions’ commonly underpin regional development policies. Knowing the characteristics of a ‘region’ for example in terms of unemployment rates, income levels,

---

19 In this thesis, two institutions of similar names are referred to: Human Resources and Development Canada (HRDC) and Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC). This is a consequence of HRDC separating into two separate departments in December 2003: HRSDC and Social Development Canada (SDC).
population growth rates or population density, policies to reduce such disparities in relation to other 'regions' or the national average can be designed. Many other criteria to define such 'regions' may be used. The homogenous 'regions' approach is recognised in the Australian and the Canadian literature (see for example Harris and Dixon 1978:5,10; Brewis 1972:46) and applied in practice.

For purposes of general regional planning and policy, the administrative understanding of 'regions', where they conform to the administrative boundaries of subnational entities, is useful. The administrative approach is practiced in both countries. In Australia, 'regions' have been defined as an area smaller than a state but larger than a local authority area, in effect consisting of amalgamations of the local authority areas\(^ {20} \) (Harris and Dixon 1978:10). In the last decade though, 'regional' has taken an extra meaning in Australia. It has become synonymous with 'non-metropolitan', referring to all areas outside of the 'Major Urban' areas in the ABS classification. These have populations of 100,000 or more (see Box I.1 in Appendix I and an example of application of this interpretation by Hugo (2002) in Subsection I.4.1 in this appendix). In Canada, regional policy is decentralised among four federal government departments based in regions and responsible for the development of selected administrative units within them.\(^ {21} \)

The interpretation of 'region' under the Australian and Canadian regional migration policies here is based on the administrative and the homogenous definitions of 'region'. In Australia, the administrative approach responds to the population and socioeconomic trends of the 1991–2001 (such as for example population changes resulting from internal migration). They are outlined in Section 1.5 and discussed in detail in Appendix I. Instituting the regional migration policy in the second part of that decade was parallel to

\(^{20}\) This approach can be found in regional development programs administered by DOTARS in Australia, where regions consist of adjacent Local Government Areas (LGAs) (DOTARS 2005:1, 2004:1). LGAs are geographical areas administered by the incorporated bodies of local government called Local Government Councils. Boundaries of LGAs are a foundation for Statistical Local Areas (SLAs), which are base spatial units used to collect and disseminate statistics other than collected from the Censuses (ABS 2001b:9).

\(^{21}\) These are the departments mentioned already at the end of Section 1.4: ACOA, Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions and WED CA (OECD 2002:18). Their competence extends over selected Census Divisions (CDs), stakeholders from which are eligible for funding (see, for example, Industry Canada 2003:1). CDs are adjacent municipalities joined together for purposes of regional planning and managing common services. CDs are
an increased interest from the part of the Australian federal government in regional affairs. That interest was partially a result of the realisation of the political preferences of regional voters (Beer, Maude and Pritchard 2003:195–6). The Howard governments (in power since 1996) have been directing the regional policy to non-metropolitan Australia, with a particular emphasis on the provision of services. This involved creation of a new Department of Transport and Regional Services (which took over the regional functions from the previous Department of Housing and Regional Development) and more focus on region-based programs (2003:196–7, 23–4).

This administrative interpretation of ‘region’ under the regional migration policy in Australia rules out some metropolitan areas (mostly large cities) from taking regional migrants. The majority of visas available to skilled regional migrants restrict their settlement to ‘regional or low population growth areas’ or ‘regional or low population growth metropolitan areas’ (see, for example, DIMIA 2005d:14, 2004m:2). For the purposes of this policy, regional Australia, as per administrative and homogenous understanding of ‘region’, is defined as any Statistical Division (SD)22 with a population of less than 200,000 at the 2001 Census. Low growth metropolitan areas are those, which experienced less than 50 per cent of national average population growth between 1996 and 2001 Censuses (DIMIA 2004m:41). In the policy practice, that means that ‘regions’ for the purposes of the skilled migration are typically all other areas except Sydney, Newcastle, Wollongong, Brisbane and Perth. Melbourne (the second largest city) is a special case. It is eligible for certain regional visas (see Table 2.1 in Chapter Two) but it may be difficult to settle there under other regional visas. As a result of state/territory governments’ skills audits, certain skilled visas may be restricted to regional areas. Business migrants are encouraged to establish businesses in regional, rural or low growth

---

22 Statistical Division (SD) - in the Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC) is a general purpose spatial unit, the largest and most stable spatial unit within each State and Territory. In aggregate, SDs cover the whole of Australia without gaps or overlaps. They should be ideally delimited on the basis of socioeconomic criteria and should, where possible, cover contiguous whole LGAs. SDs outside capital cities should represent relatively homogeneous regions characterised by identifiable social and economic links between the inhabitants and between the economic units within the region, under the unifying influence of one or more major towns or cities. A Capital City SD should be defined to contain the anticipated development of the city for a period of at least 20 years. See ABS (2001b:14–5).
areas (see Subsection 3.2.1 in Chapter Three). Appendix 1 (particularly Subsections I.3.1, I.3.2 and I.5.2) discusses reasons for encouraging migrant settlement outside these cities.

Eligibility of some capital cities in Australia for regional migrants’ settlement could lead to concerns that the policy outcomes could potentially be diminished. Yet, some unfavourable trends in these jurisdictions established in statistical terms (homogenous understanding of ‘regions’), or certain common, unfavourable characteristics justify inclusion of all areas within their administrative boundaries as eligible. Hence, as elsewhere, these certain disadvantages underlie the administrative approach. This may be the case for example of Tasmania and South Australia (see Subsection I.3.2 in Appendix I).

In Canada, the regional dispersal of migrants is also pursued on an administrative basis, yet the provincial policies for mending the intrajurisdictional population and economic dichotomies between the largest cities and the remaining areas are not typically based on a rigorous approach similar to the one adopted in Australia. The regional migrants’ settlement is generally not conditioned by a government’s decision formally designating certain areas as ‘regions’ on the basis of their poorer economic indicators and/or smaller population base. Instead, all areas within administrative boundaries of the participating Canadian provinces and the Yukon Territory are eligible for their settlement. This is a modified administrative approach in comparison to selected administrative units falling under the authority of the four Canadian federal departments dealing with regional development (see above). Making entire provinces and the Yukon Territory eligible for settlement further suggests that Canada’s policy application of the homogenous understanding of ‘region’ deviates slightly from that of Australia.

This is indeed the case and it is based on two factors. First, the migrants’ strong preference for settlement in the three largest Canadian cities: Toronto, Vancouver and Montréal is a motivation for making other provinces entirely eligible. Their homogeneity is measured by one principal factor: smaller inflows of immigrants (and their population and economic consequences). Internal migration trends affecting some entire jurisdictions are an accompanying rationale for such an approach (see particularly Subsections I.3.1,
1.5.2 and 1.3.2 in Appendix I). The Canadian regionalisation policy then allows for the provincial/territorial migrants to settle in all provinces and the Yukon Territory, including all cities, towns and the remaining areas.

This illustrates a difference between the Australian and the Canadian policy interpretation of ‘region’. In Canada, the population and economic differences between Toronto, Vancouver and Montréal on the one hand, and the remaining largest cities and the rest of the jurisdictions on the other hand, show that regionalisation is largely concerned with population and economic dichotomies at Canada level (interprovincial differences with special attention to Toronto, Vancouver and Montréal). In Australia, the intrastate population and economic dichotomies (that is, differences between the capital cities and the rest of the jurisdictions) are targeted by the policy. However, as noted earlier, certain disadvantages relevant to entire jurisdictions, such as for example South Australia or Tasmania, underpin encouraging settlement in all areas under their authority including capital cities, under this policy.

Second, making the entire Canadian provinces and the Yukon Territory eligible for regional migrants’ settlement stems from the application of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This is a constitutional guarantee to all citizens and permanent residents of the right “to move to and take up residence in any province; and to pursue the gaining of a livelihood in any province”. This prevents the governments from geographically restricting migrants’ settlement, as opposed to Australia. Overall, the Canadian policy understanding of ‘region’ is broader than in Australia.

Making entire jurisdictions eligible could lead to a concern that such arrangements could potentially diminish policy outcomes, logically expected to also benefit areas outside large Canadian cities. However, the needs of these areas are not ignored. Under guaranteed mobility rights, the Canadian provinces, including British Columbia and Québec, where Vancouver and Montréal are located, address these intraprovincial dichotomies using ‘soft measures’- incentives. They enable even small communities to

---

23 Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Schedule B), Constitution Act, 1982 (79), Part I, 6(2a-b). Department of Justice Canada n.d.b.
obtain and retain immigrants. Among those measures are, for example, employment offers, community support, points for regional settlement or lower financial criteria for business people. Some of these measures are also used to attract immigrants to regional Australia. Unlike in Australia, Canada pursues on a considerable scale, innovative, rigorous and formal cooperation among the provincial governments and regional and community stakeholders. The Canadian and the Australian strategies in this matter are discussed in Chapter Two.

The publicly available data relating to regional migrants in Australia and the provincial/territorial nominees in Canada reflect the recent history of the policies in both countries and are quite fragmented. Original interviews were performed in both countries to complement that data. Here, the discussion centres only on the publicly available data, while Section 1.8 talks in detail about the interviews.

Primary and secondary sources are used in this thesis. Visa requirements (eligibility factors) for skilled and business migrants are sourced from the Australian federal and state/territory websites and the Canadian provincial/territorial websites. That material has a qualitative nature. DIMIA (Australia), CIC (Canada) and the state/territory (Australia) and provincial (Canada) annual statistics and other information related to the programs’ operation are also used. Annual and Census data published by ABS and Statistics Canada are used, too.

Supplementary information of mixed qualitative and quantitative nature was located in other Australian and Canadian sources, such as research papers, survey reports, occasional studies or conference presentations available electronically. Such extensive use of electronic data is owed to the fact that the policies in both countries have undergone rapid development in the period following the completion of the fieldwork research in Australia and Canada (2003) and the majority of primary or analytical data are now available electronically. The policies’ development is an encouraging feature but its result was that some of the information collected during 2003 interviews in both countries has become outdated.
DIMIA and DIMIA-commissioned data are the principal sources of information in Australia, reflecting the ultimate federal responsibility for immigration matters in Australia. The flagship DIMIA annual publication "Population Flows" and its annual reports to parliament are useful sources of information. Results of occasional surveys of some regional skilled visa holders commissioned by DIMIA are now available and represent important data sources. Generally, there is more comprehensive information available on the regional and state/territory skilled migrants than on the state/territory sponsored business migrants. This is possibly because the skilled component of the schemes dominates over the business component: it brings more people into the country and it has created a greater volume of research. Hence, a more detailed evaluation of the skilled schemes may be offered. It is nevertheless restricted by the varying degree of detail in data, which may partially result from the fact that some skilled schemes have, since their inception, been bringing greater number of people than other skilled schemes, and have consequently received more attention.

The two-stage visa process for state/territory business migrants (see Table 1.1 above) has been in force since March 2003. Only after filling an obligatory monitoring survey, which occurs two years after initial entry, are these migrants eligible to apply for permanent residence status (DIMIA 2004g:5). This means that 2005 is the first year when they can do so. Before any evaluation of the effectiveness of this two-stage process and business migrants' performance can be done, more time needs to pass. Due to the recent history of the new rules, no other publication, to the author's knowledge, has been released that gives insight into migrants' performance, their retention and the economic impact of their operations on the areas where they are located.

Neither statistics nor other data published by the state/territory governments and DIMIA annual publications are complete and perfectly comparable across the Australian jurisdictions and across years, which results from the short history of the policy. For example, DIMIA has been presenting regional migration outcomes in different formats and with a different degree of detail. In combination with the incompleteness of the state/territory data, this restricts the scope of analysis, evaluation and recommendations that may be made in this thesis.
In Canada, the provinces and the Yukon Territory design and implement their programs independently of each other and of the federal government. Therefore, the programs’ statistics, qualitative, and mixed data come principally from their sources. They are not fully comparable across years (reflecting partially the fact that the programs have not all started in the same year) and jurisdictions. Disparities in numbers of landing migrants result in some jurisdictions publishing detailed data when the numbers are considerable. In jurisdictions receiving smaller numbers of nominees the annual landings may be reported. The imperfect comparability of data, as in Australia, restricts the scope for intra-Canadian comparisons, and, in addition, dictates the degree of possible comparisons with the Australian policy outcomes.

Provincial sources are used when it is necessary to distinguish between skilled and business provincial migrants because the CIC flagship annual publication “Facts and Figures: Immigration Overview” and the annual reports to the parliament do not provide that information. Skilled nominees, as in Australia, represent a higher proportion than business nominees in the provincial programs (this also holds for the Québec-selected skilled migrants), which is reflected in the data, and as a consequence, in the policy evaluation offered in this dissertation. While in Australia the monitoring survey of business migrants is a federal undertaking and its results will be eventually published, in Canada the business nominees’ numbers in each jurisdiction would need to be sufficiently high (and preferably comparable, which would enable a cross-country comparison) to justify such a survey. This may still be some time away. Furthermore, an interprovincial agreement on establishing such a performance survey for provincial business migrants would need to be developed in the future for comparative purposes.

As in Australia, a permanent format for presenting statistics on provincial nominees has not yet been established. It is expected that as the policies in both countries develop, more detailed statistics and data will be generated.

All in all, although the short life span of the policies in both countries results in fragmented and not fully comparable data, which in turn restricts the evaluation that is offered in this thesis, that evaluation is useful for two reasons. First, the available
statistical and other data from various sources form nevertheless a substantial evaluation material and allow for the policies' outcomes to date to be systematically assessed from a cross-country perspective, which has not been done before. In the course of that evaluation, the outcome-enhancing, cross-country policy exchanges may be highlighted.

Second, enumeration of eligibility factors and policy instruments for which no comprehensive aggregate data currently exist, and their assessment that can be offered is limited or can not be undertaken at all at this stage, serves to identify the future data collection and research priorities. This can be found at the beginning of Chapter Four. They are proposed to be investigated to complement the existing data and to encourage a broader and a more comprehensive policy evaluation. Such an evaluation would likely lead to better informed future enhancements of the policy.

1.7 Governments’ objectives in regional migration policies

The selected quotations from governmental documents below indicate that the Australian and the Canadian governments have similar policy objectives, although, as illustrated, the governments may give slightly different emphasis to some aspects of their policies. Generally, these objectives involve addressing the uneven population distribution (improving the dispersal of immigrants), supporting population growth, responding to skill shortages and pursuing economic development by means of business migration. Entire jurisdictions, or areas within their jurisdictions, may be subject to these policies, stemming from the trends summarised in Section 1.5 and enlarged on in Appendix I. The quotations below additionally illustrate how the constitutional division of power in Australia and Canada is reflected in the design of these dispersal policies.

In Australia, where immigration is a federal prerogative, the official aims of the SSRM initiatives are laid out as follows:

> *the Australian Government, in consultation with State and Territory Governments and regional development authorities has introduced a range of State-specific and Regional Migration (SSRM) initiatives designed to help State and Territory Governments to:
* • address skill shortages that exist in their jurisdictions
* • attract overseas business people to establish new or joint ventures in their regions, and
* • encourage a more balanced settlement of Australia's skilled migrant intake.*
These initiatives include flexible criteria, which recognise the special circumstances of rural and regional areas, to help deliver young, skilled, English speaking migrants to areas of Australia where they are most needed. (...) This enables State and Territory Governments and regional employers to influence the number and profile of skilled migrants settling in their areas in line with their skill needs and development objectives (Facts Sheet 26. State/Territory Specific Migration, DIMIA 2005g:1; emphasis added).

In Canada, where immigration is a shared responsibility of the federal and provincial/territorial governments, aims agreed between these governments are spelled out in individual agreements. An example from British Columbia indicates that:

[t]he objectives of this Agreement are: (...) d) to provide British Columbia with a mechanism to influence immigration and related planning, policies, and programs in such a way as to support its particular social, demographic, economic development and labour market priorities, including skills shortages; e) to foster an effective partnership between Canada and British Columbia to contribute to regional development and balanced growth throughout British Columbia (...) (Agreement for Canada-British Columbia Co-operation on Immigration 2004, CIC 2004a:5; emphasis added).

Provincial nominees in Canada may be nominated for purposes that include (but are not limited) to:

(...) meeting critical skill shortages in British Columbia, the immigration of key individuals of businesses that wish to locate in British Columbia and the establishment or enhancement of new and existing businesses (Agreement for Canada-British Columbia Cooperation on Immigration 2004. Annex C. Provincial Nominees, CIC 2004b:2).

Similar formulas are contained in agreements with the remaining Canadian jurisdictions. These three quotations show that governments in Australia and Canada see skilled and business migration to regions as one of the measures to support their broad economic development objectives. Their policies are also driven, in addition to these broad labour force and business enhancement objectives, by specific regional population distribution objectives. Governments in Australia and Canada summarise further the rationale for regionalisation of skilled and business immigration as follows.

DIMIA (2004n):

(...) [s]kills are critical in supporting business growth and development objectives. They are pivotal to employment growth and sustainability. Like other developed nations, Australia is also subject to profound demographic changes relating to both domestic and global economic adjustment and pressure. With rapidly changing and emerging industries there is strong
international competition for skills. The Australian Government recognises that a balanced migration program plays an important role in contributing to the social, demographic and economic development of regional Australia and low growth population areas (2004n:37).

CIC strikes a similar chord. Its special study (2001f) states that:

[a] the present time there is a growing interest in a more balanced geographic distribution of immigrants throughout the country. It stems from a number of developments:
- the increasing concentration of immigrants in the three largest cities, which has taxed the capacity of these cities to accommodate immigrants as the flow of immigrants has been at a sustained high level for fifteen years;
- increasing involvement of the provinces in the selection of immigrants, coupled with concern about outmigration and the size of the population in some of the smaller provinces and Quebec, and a growing interest in sharing in the perceived benefits of immigration;
- increasing emphasis on the size and quality of the labour force as a prerequisite for economic development (from Introduction and Overview:i).

A noteworthy aspect of the rapid policy development has been the steady flow of population/immigration strategies and reports containing policy recommendations released by the state/territory governments in Australia and the provincial governments in Canada. Their release has been triggered by broad socioeconomic and specific population distribution pressures. Skilled and business migration plays a central role in each. “Population Policy for South Australia” (Government of South Australia 2004) and “Open Up Saskatchewan” report (Lorjé 2003) recognise the impact of these pressures and commit to, in case of South Australia, and recommend, in Saskatchewan, an increase in the migrants’ arrivals and wide-ranging initiatives to manage them. In South Australia, the rationale for the population policy, aiming at reaching a population of two million by 2050 (Government of South Australia 2004:8), is as follows:

[b]ased on current trends the South Australian population is projected to peak at around 1.6 million and then go into decline in less than 25 years. With the inevitable shift of the ‘baby boomer’ generation into retirement, the State’s working age population is projected to decline even sooner - within the next decade (...) We must refuse to accept the inevitability of the population decline and recognise the need to respond to the ageing of our population (from Premier’s foreword, 2004:1).

South Australia needs responsible population growth. We have to foster healthy ageing; encourage active social, cultural and economic participation for all; promote social integration of new arrivals; and ensure the long-term sustainability of the economy and the community (including those in our regional areas) (2004:8).
Among the strategic objectives and targets of the policy is the improvement of South Australia’s net migration performance by increasing the share of the national migration intake (involving specific targets for business, skilled and humanitarian migrants); number of expatriates and potential interstate migrants returning or relocating to South Australia and reducing the net outflow of young and skilled people (Government of South Australia 2004:9,11). South Australia also intends to encourage community-linked migration and will negotiate with the federal government for greater community involvement in sponsorship of potential migrants (2004:12).

(...) The Federal Government will introduce two new regional visa classes in the second half of 2004 [SIR and Investor (Retirement) Temporary]. Proactive use of these new visas, along with other existing State Specific and Regional Visa mechanisms, is the key element of the State’s migration strategy (2004:11).

The approach to immigration, including the use of regional visas, is concurrent with other government actions addressing the population and socioeconomic trends.

Saskatchewan recognises similar challenges.

Saskatchewan is home to a little more than one million people. (...). Why doesn’t everyone want to live here? (...). What’s wrong with having only a million people? (...). Saskatchewan population is aging. In that we are very similar to practically every jurisdiction in North America. We have a negative growth rate, fewer births than deaths. (...). We have net out-migration, more people leaving than arriving, and the most mobile part of our population is our young adults. (...). Saskatchewan can no longer afford to be a net exporter of young people. Consultations with business groups, industry associations and Crown Corporations indicate a looming labour shortage. (...). Saskatchewan’s large cohort of Aboriginal youth is our best competitive advantage (...). Even so, the numbers of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal young people in our province simply don’t support a scenario where we can replace our retiring workforce, let alone expand (from Introduction, Lorjé 2003:3,5).

In view of such trends, “[i]t is time for compelling public policy and action (...). Retention efforts, while necessary, fall short of addressing population and labour supply challenges. We need to turn our attention to attraction as well as retention” (Lorjé 2003:5). Further, increasing the numbers under the PNP are called for and recommendations are made as to the role of communities and other stakeholders in facilitating immigration and improving retention (2003:23–6).
The concerns of the government of Victoria in Australia are about how to manage the growth.

There are now, for the first time, five million of Victorians. This milestone is an appropriate time to think about choices we need to make to shape the future of the community we live in. Over the next two decades it is projected our population will grow by another 20 per cent, or one million people. That would mean, by 2025, there would be six million Victorians. (...) How can we manage this growth to ensure that it is sustainable and beneficial for all Victorians? How do we spread this growth fairly across the State so we all share the benefits? (...) Population growth is crucial to our economic future because sustainable economic growth and sustainable population growth are inextricably linked. (...) We need a critical mass of people with entrepreneurial skills, the ability to absorb new technology and ideas, and the capacity to share knowledge and build relationships across cultures (from Premier's Foreword, Beyond Five Million: The Victorian Government's Population Policy, Department of Premier and Cabinet Victoria (DPC VIC) 2004).

To manage this growth, the population policy “(...) provides a framework for policies designed to increase migration, (...) increase regional population growth and respond to the challenges of demographic change” (DPC VIC 2004:2). Four key growth objectives make part of the government’s population vision:

[1] To reach a total population of six million people by 2025.
[2] To achieve regional population growth of 1.25 per cent by 2006, resulting in total population of 1.75 million people in Provincial Victoria by 2025.
[3] To maintain and build on our current levels of migration attraction of 25 per cent of Australia’s total skilled migrant intake.
[4] To increase the number of migrants settling in Provincial Victoria (DPC VIC 2004:3).

The last objective corresponds to a commitment that the economic, social and cultural benefits of migration, and the diversity stemming from migrant communities, be not confined to metropolitan areas (DPC VIC 2004:17). In order to promote the dispersal of these benefits:

[1] The Victorian Government is committed to maximising the outcome of these programs [increasing the involvement of the state/territory governments in skilled and business migrants selection] to grow Victoria’s share of Australia’s migrant intake and the proportion of migrants settling in Provincial Victoria” (2004:18).

This will be particularly delivered through initiatives of ‘Victoria’s Skilled Migration Strategy’ - part of the broader population policy, assisting in achieving the dispersal aims (DPC VIC 2004:21; Victorian Government 2004:n.p.). Cooperation with regional
communities and the promotion of the new SIR visa are an inherent part of that strategy (DPC VIC 2004:21;32).

The population policy of the Northern Territory government responds to contrasting trends.

The Northern Territory is the most sparsely populated State or Territory of Australia, with about 200,000 people recorded in the 2001 Census, representing approximately 1 per cent of the Australian population. (...) We have a large Indigenous population—nearly 30 per cent of Territorians are indigenous compared to 2.3 per cent for the whole of Australia. The non-Indigenous population also differs from the national profile in many ways—it is younger, much more mobile and has higher employment rates and income levels (Northern Territory Government 2005:4).

According to this policy, one of the component actions to support population growth in the Northern Territory and achieve a population target of about 300,000 in 20 years and up to half a million by 2050 is to “[d]evelop the Northern Territory Business and Skilled Migration Strategy to strengthen, broaden and diversify our business and employment skills base” (Northern Territory Government 2005:14,16). This strategy will involve the optimisation of “(...) Northern Territory Government participation in the regional migration schemes” (2005:16). The strategy aims to attract the benefits that business and skilled migration can bring to the Northern Territory.

The anticipated benefits include population increase, increased business investment and skilled resource capacity, expanded trade links and enhanced consumer and business choice. In addition, productivity, the capability to develop and offer an increasingly diverse range of goods and services, export potential and the ability to respond to emerging market demand may be enhanced. Further to the economic benefit, the Northern Territory’s social and cultural heritage is enriched by increasingly diverse and multicultural presence (from Introduction, Australia’s Northern Territory Business and Skilled Migration Strategy 2005-2010; Department of Business, Industry & Resource Development Northern Territory (DBIRD NT) n.d.a:4).

The migration strategy also expresses the government’s commitment to working with various stakeholders, including migrants and ethnic communities (DBIRD NT n.d.a:8). This strategy is linked to broader development aims presented in the Territory’s population policy (Northern Territory Government 2005).

In smaller Canadian jurisdictions like Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, immigration, including the PNPs, is perceived as a vital component of ensuring growth in face of a
looming population decline. The Nova Scotia Immigration Strategy identifies common challenges:

We are facing a number of demographic and economic challenges—slow population growth, an aging population, low birthrate, out-migration of our young people, urbanisation, low immigration numbers—all of which may lead to labour shortages, slowing demand for goods and services, and increasing fiscal pressures in the years to come. (...). Immigration is one way by which Nova Scotia can help meet our long-term population, economic, and labour force needs (Province of Nova Scotia 2005:1).

To respond to these trends, the government has set the immigration targets as follows: “70 per cent retention rate for the 2006–2011 census period; 3,600 annual immigrant arrivals within four years of full strategy implementation” (Province of Nova Scotia 2005:7). The retention, a particularly important issue across Atlantic Canada, is going to be addressed through a strategy involving a wide-ranging cooperation with stakeholders (2005:19). Such cooperation is an element of strengthening the existing PNP program to attract more migrants (2005:13–4). Also, immigration is a component of other economic and development-related policies (2005:5).

The above examples indicate that state, territory and provincial governments in Australia and Canada are undertaking similar actions to respond to population and economic challenges. They intend to do it by involvement in immigration, cooperation with various stakeholders and by undertaking concurrent domestic policies and actions. The above examples also demonstrate different challenges that those subnational governments have to address (compare for example Victoria and the Northern Territory). Other Australian and Canadian governments have also released similar policies.24

24 In Australia, similar policies have been released by Tasmania (Department of Premier and Cabinet Tasmania (DPC TAS) 2001) and Queensland has published a Position Statement on Immigration (Department of Premier and Cabinet Queensland (DPC QLD) 1999). The Tasmanian document refers to use of the regional and state/territory sponsored visas and the Queensland statement considers regional settlement in general. In the Australian Capital Territory, attention is drawn to addressing the skills shortages and advancing the economic development (see link from Business ACT 2005a gateway site). In Canada, an immigration strategy has been released by Alberta (Government of Alberta 2005), which targets a significant increase of landings, enhancement of its PNP and other concurrent actions. Prince Edward Island has released its population strategy in 2000 (Government of Prince Edward Island (GPE 2000)) and now is working on its immigration strategy, which will include plans to convince former residents to return (Canada.com 2005:1). Newfoundland and Labrador is developing its provincial immigration strategy, which will be linked to other provincial policies. Discussion paper is available (DHRLB NL 2005). Québec used to operate on the basis of multi-year provincial immigrant dispersal targets (see for example Ministère des Relations Avec Les Citoyens et de l'Immigration Québec (MRCI QC) 2001a:24) but it has now moved
1.8 Research approach

This thesis draws on publicly available information from governments' websites and publications. No similarly extensive comparative analysis of Australian and Canadian regional migration policies has been undertaken before and this study has a pioneering character. It is hoped that this dissertation can fill the gap in the literature. The recent history of the policies in both countries means that there are not a lot of documented historical data to draw on nor there are any large banks of statistical analyses. That required an original field research (interviews), which was performed in Australia and Canada in 2003. That research provided insight into the nature and practice of the policies and complemented the official statistics.

That publicly available data and the aforementioned interviews are the foundation for the evaluation of the policies here. The evaluation involves examining the policy process in Australia and Canada for the skilled and business components of the respective programs, and the policies' success. Review of the process focuses on the migration eligibility factors and other policy instruments (for example support rendered to migrants by external stakeholders) discussed in detail in Chapters Two and Three. Numerical data found in Chapter Four also inform this.

In relation to outcome evaluation, success is judged in this thesis according to the extent to which the principal governmental objectives behind these regional migration policies, as outlined in Section 1.7, are being met by the policies that have been now put in place in Australia and Canada. These objectives relate to population outcomes and economic impacts of the migrant dispersal. In the case of the population outcomes, the skilled and business migrant streams are assessed jointly in each country. The economic impacts are evaluated separately for the skilled and business migration streams in each country (see beginning of Chapter Four for explanation why such different approaches are adopted). Assessment is to be qualitative, as the governments have resisted setting numerical
targets, so that more informal but ordered judgements as to minimal (modest) and considerable changes can be offered instead.

Nevertheless, those evaluations are conditioned upon numerical information, which seeks to define change from past patterns in the quantity and quality dimensions of regional population trends. Given the very recent nature of the explicit regional migration polices under review here, attention is paid to incipient patterns of impact emerging over time after establishment of these schemes and to their potential for cumulation over a longer time span. Suggestions are further forthcoming on the basis of the comparative experience of the policies of the two countries and the changes in those policies already made, as to whether there are lessons emerging to date as to mechanisms for enhancing the achievement of the governmental objectives further.

Given that the ultimate purpose of this study is to evaluate the success of the Australian and Canadian provincial policies, and considering the data limitations (see Section 1.6), the research was designed to make maximum use of the existing data, supplemented by the structured interviews. The type of data collected for this study can be categorised into qualitative, quantitative and mixed (quantitative and qualitative). That holds for the publicly available data for which the sources were identified in Section 1.6. The interviews discussed below provided qualitative material.

The research objectives and hypotheses stated in Section 1.2 guided the data selection and analysis. The first step of data analysis serves to understand the policy process from a comparative perspective. It involves studying the aforementioned migration eligibility factors for all relevant migration streams and other supporting policy instruments. The generic categories in which they are presented in Chapters Two and Three were conceptualised for organisational purposes at the initial research stage. That analysis is pursued through triangulation of qualitative data, especially the interviews and public domain institutional information. More general observations emerging from this detailed analysis lead to a conclusion about the Australian and Canadian management strategies for their respective policies.
That comparative analysis provides the basis for characterising how the policies address their intended objectives, as per the adopted approach to policy review. The second step of the analysis involves then triangulation of quantitative statistics, complemented by information of mixed quantitative and qualitative nature, and interview data, to evaluate the policies’ success.

Studying the practice and evaluating outcomes of the Australian and Canadian regional migration policies enables to relate them to some regional development concepts described in international literature (see Section 1.3). The community-driven regional development and the concept of ‘learning region’ are relevant here. Attention is drawn in the analysis to solutions illustrating the practice of these two concepts. On that basis, and particularly on the basis of evaluation in Chapter Four, Chapter Five considers whether their principles have been adopted by the regional migration policies and to what effect, and whether they may offer useful frameworks for pursuing these policies to contribute to regional development in the future.

The interview data mentioned above a few times already was collected in three trips. The first research trip between March–April 2003 in Canada was followed by two trips in Australia (in August 2003 and between October–November 2003). They were guided by the ethical rules pertaining to personal interviews, as set by the Australian National University. Interviews in Australia and Canada were subject to slightly different ethical protocols as the consent to undertaking research was granted in the case of Australia on more restricted terms than in Canada, reflecting changes introduced in the period between the trips. To maintain coherence in presenting information collected during the Australian and Canadian fieldtrips, all interviewees remain only personally known to the author and they are not directly quoted. Where information drawn from the interviews is used, it is based on interviews’ transcripts made from recordings (where respondents gave their consent) and/or personal notes.

Using interviews, electronic resources and periodical publications (often also downloaded electronically) for this study has its strengths and weaknesses. In the case of the interviews, the principal research procedure was a pre-arranged, open-ended style
interview with selected officials. Such an interview design had the advantage of allowing for the adjustment of the questions, depending on the institutional affiliation of the interviewee and the issues that were being discussed as they emerged during the conversation. Respondents were encouraged to elaborate and clarify their answers. The flexibility provided by such an interview design enabled the investigation to obtain fuller answers to the questions, and in turn produce richer material for analysis. Second, the response rate was guaranteed, as each interview was confirmed prior to the meeting (see exceptions below). Third, a basic, standardised set of themes for discussion in Canada and Australia enabled a symmetric analysis of the data collected in both countries, in line with the intention of this comparative study.

The disadvantage of pursuing interviews was that much of the time of the entire research project was dedicated to designing, performing, transcribing [tapes] and analysing the collected Australian and Canadian data. Second, the responses, as in any such interaction, could have been influenced by the author’s (interviewer’s) attitude or tone, and therefore render (modestly) biased outcomes. Further, pre-existing author’s biases may have affected the selection of themes for discussion and interpretations they received in the thesis. Likewise, the obtained responses could have been influenced by the interviewees’ private attitudes and opinions towards the discussed issues, and in consequence have some impact on the status accorded those comments, where private views were not acknowledged explicitly, and hence in the interpretation offered in this study.

As far as the electronic documentation is concerned, the frequent updates were both the blessing and the curse in the research process. On the one hand, the opportunity to check for updates in the concerned Australian and Canadian jurisdictions rendered the data most up-to-date. On the other hand, their availability and temptation to stay on top of the most recent developments (including checking for the newest periodical publications available electronically), whilst learning the navigation after each website layout change, made that method the most time consuming. It also draws attention to the more general and growing problems of research reconstruction of past policies in a fast-changing electronic environment.
In absence of exhaustive comparative literature on the subject studied, the data triangulation strategy served to judge the validity of the obtained information and to perform research of high quality. Despite the weaknesses of the data collection strategies, at this early attempt to present and evaluate a number of regional schemes in two countries, the richness and recency of the material was important. In some instances, the interview material would become outdated by the time of completion of this study and [where the information so obtained could potentially have been subject to the interviewer’s and interviewees’ biases] instead the official government or other authoritative publications would become available for use, hence diminishing the scope for analysing a potentially biased material.

In relation to the interviews, the respondents were selected initially through referrals (once the contact has been established, further referrals were often offered) and through author's own efforts in locating additional respondents, mostly through their online contact details. Interviewees represented various institutions (see Table 1.3a). Their recommendation as suitable interviewees guaranteed that they possessed and could share knowledge relevant to this thesis’s topic. In the case of respondents located through their online contact details, those who had confirmed their interest and expertise in, or advanced knowledge of the policies in question (resulting from (a) their direct participation in their operation, or (b) activities in areas relevant for the policies’ outcomes (such as for example initiatives undertaken by regional city councils), or (c) relevant research interests), were approached for interviews.

With minor exceptions, the respondents were senior and middle management officials and the interviewed academics were senior researchers and teachers who have contributed to the understanding of international migration in both countries. On occasions where a last minute cancellation of an interview would have caused a gap in interviewing people who influenced the operationalisation of the policies, an interview with an arranged replacement, often recommended by the initially confirmed interviewee, took place. Issues that could not be covered were typically explained through further electronic or telephone communication. Only on one occasion in Canada an interview request was declined altogether. Where time and funding constraints restricted travel to
some locations for interviews, direct electronic communication was used to learn about operationalisation of the policies. Electronic governmental publications were also used in such instances. The stages of the policies’ development were well covered by the governmental annual reports and other publications and were sometimes recalled by the government respondents.

Table 1.3a. Interviews performed during field research in Canada and Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of individual and institutional affiliation</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior government officials (directororial level and a senior policy analyst in CIC) from DIMIA and CIC, a case officer from DIMIA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior government officials (directororial and middle management levels, and senior policy analysts/officers) from Provincial and State/Territory governments</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors and middle management officials from education and skills assessment bodies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors, middle management officials, and case officers from migrant settlement agencies (various names in Canada) and Migrant Resource Centres (MRCs) in Australia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of local business communities (directors of Business Enterprise Centres, a leader of a local business community with operational role in the policy a))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management officials and a policy officer from recruitment agencies for Overseas Trained Doctors (OTDs)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior economic development and senior multicultural policy officers from regional city councils</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 (+1 of Sydney city councils)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior researchers and teachers from universities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal conversations with individuals from any of the above institutions not recorded as interviews</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
a) That operational role refers to the function of a Regional Certifying Body (RCB). See definition in Table 2.3, Chapter Two.

Constraints of time and funding limited the interviews to institutional representatives only. The difference in the total number of interviews conducted in Canada and Australia, as illustrated by Table 1.3a, owes particularly to time (visa) and funding constraints in the case of the former that were available to the author.
Table 1.3b: Themes covered in interviews in Canada and Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultative mechanisms at the Federal-Provincial/State/Territory level for designing and implementing the policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent statistics on Canadian provincial and Australian regional skilled and business migrants requested from the federal officials</td>
<td>Degree of responsibility of the State/Territory governments for managing the regional migration schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of independence of the Provincial governments in designing and managing their policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and consequences of breaching visa conditions under the Canadian provincial and Australian regional policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders participating in the implementation of the Canadian provincial and Australian regional policies and their role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies of most active and successful regional towns and communities in attracting migrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility criteria under the Canadian provincial and Australian regional schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary workers and international students as potential groups for dispersal under the Canadian provincial and Australian regional programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of identifying skill shortages targeted under the Canadian provincial and Australian regional policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of skills of Canadian provincial and Australian regional skilled migrants(^a)</td>
<td>Particular skill shortages targeted under the Canadian and Australian policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not discussed</td>
<td>Issues in attracting and retaining health professionals in regional Australia(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location, types of businesses that Canadian provincial and Australian regional business migrants establish, and their level of investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government support services offered to Canadian provincial and Australian regional skilled and business migrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recourse of provincial skilled nominees to migrant settlement agencies(^b)</td>
<td>Recourse of regional skilled migrants to MRCs(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of marketing of the Canadian provincial and Australian regional schemes internally and marketing results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of marketing of the Canadian provincial and Australian regional schemes internationally, countries and/or regions targeted and marketing results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersal and retention outcomes for Canadian provincial and Australian regional migrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of the Canadian provincial and Australian regional policy (opinions sought from Provincial/State/Territory governments and academics)(^c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties and/or public opinion/attitudes to Canadian provincial and Australian regional migration(^d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
\(^a\) Not discussed in initially intended length due to word limit.
\(^b\) Incidence of positive response turned out to be so low that it did not warrant a discussion in the thesis.
\(^c\) Many of the proposed ideas were introduced by the time this thesis was finished and they are covered as existing policies’ solutions.
\(^d\) Not discussed in the thesis because these issues could only be commented on by few interviewees and the credibility was somewhat reduced by expressing assumptions rather than evidence-based facts.

Table 1.3b shows that many similar themes were discussed in the interviews in Canada and Australia. First, the content analysis of the transcripts revealed that not all collected information has proven equally productive (although it provided a broad picture of various aspects of the policy) and therefore this thesis draws on selected interviews. Second, the selection process involved reading the interview transcripts, where available
simultaneously with the relevant published data, to determine whether any of the sources (interviews or published material) provided a better coverage of a particular topic.

Often, the original data collected through interviews and published data (now mostly electronic) complemented each other, as for example in the case of skill shortages targeted under the Canadian provincial and Australian regional migration policies, or as in the international marketing strategies for the schemes. Using both the interview and published data enhanced the validity of comments, and better grounded the final evaluation. In other cases, such as for example in assessing some aspects of the economic impact of the business streams, the original interview data constituted the only basis for evaluation.

In some instances, the respondents would comment briefly and then advise the researcher to use the official publications (such as legal acts, annual reports, statistical data, etc.), or would provide, as part of the interview, copies of reports, studies and other published material to complement their response/fully address the question. Where such data could be obtained, the information provided verbally by the respondents was not used, as the recommended materials provided a better coverage. The final review prior to submission of this dissertation has proven this approach to be the most effective in observing the formal thesis word limit. That was for example the case for analysis of consultative mechanisms for designing and implementing the policies in Australia and Canada, and for analysis of the extent of responsibility of the governments for designing and managing their regional schemes.

The dynamic character of the policies and implementation of new solutions over the course of this study, rendered some comments and suggestions for improvements offered by the respondents simply outdated. That is for example the case of international students in Canada, or future of the policies in both countries. In such cases, the interview data were not recalled and the most-up-to-date information was used instead. By contrast, it turned out that the interviews were sometimes undertaken too early to better understand the emerging political parties’ and public opinion views on regional migration, as noted in Table 1.3b.
The decision to pursue comparative research - of the Australian and Canadian provincial policies - was made for a number of reasons. But the basic common factor is that their similarities reduce the array of variables that otherwise need to be controlled for in reaching explanation of regional migration policies, yet those polices are sufficiently different that interest still exists in their alternative nature, operation and impact. More specifically, Australian and Canadian policies operate under the similar circumstances of relatively small populations, as opposed to some European countries, such as France or Germany, and the U.S.A. Furthermore, unlike in these other countries, their populations are unevenly and sparsely distributed across very large land areas. As a consequence, and as shown in the preceding sections, Australia and Canada largely share stated reasons for, and objectives of the policies under review here. A second reason is their similar stage of economic and social development and their strong reliance upon Whitehall-type derived political institutions, though in federal form in each country. This means in qualitative research that data of comparable character and detail (although still not comprehensive) can be provided. The engagement of similar stakeholders in the policy process in both countries (see Table 1.3a) allows for symmetry in such analysis. Third, that similar population context in which the policies are embedded, the comparability of data and engagement of similar stakeholders provide a basis for drawing transferable policy lessons from this research and the likelihood of strong interest in evidence-based findings, given the like polities in both countries, as a basis for policy improvement – an attraction to researchers in the modern era of valuing research impact as well as research quality.

In a study like this one, the conditions under which policy lessons can be drawn from one country to another are particularly important. In a broad sense, policy transfer is "(...) a

---

25 There is a growing body of literature on the policy lesson drawing/policy transfer issues and studying the conditions of a policy transfer, which are discussed here, represents only one strand of research. Bennett (1991b) discusses common determinants of public policy convergence; Bennett and Howlett (1992) critically review selected policy change theories based on notions of learning; Evans and Davies (1999) propose a multilevel model of policy transfer to analyse it from a structure and agency point of view; Dolowitz and Marsh (2000) develop a conceptual framework to explain the relationship between voluntary and coercive (forced) transfer and links between policy transfer and policy ‘success’ or failure; and Evans’s book (ed. 2004a) critically reviews the policy transfer literature and offers a profound collection of policy transfer case studies between countries. Additional case studies can be found for example in Radaelli (2000) who focuses on policy transfers within the EU and in Bennett (1991a) examining how interests of the policy importing country are manifested in the policy debate, based on case studies of Canada and
process, in which knowledge about policies, administrative arrangements, institutions etc. in one time and/or place is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements and institutions in another time and/or place” (Dolowitz and Marsh 1996:344). “Lesson drawing is future oriented, drawing on current experience in other countries to improve national policy” (Rose 2001:1). The conditions commonly accepted by the literature as conducive to policy transfer are discussed below and are related to the broad environment of the regional migration policies in Australia and Canada. That environment was found above to be facilitating this study. Next, objects of policy transfer and different degrees/types of that transfer are presented.\textsuperscript{26} Such an approach best enables answering the question about the possible extent of policy transfer in the particular case of regional migration policies in Australia and Canada.

Lesson-drawing is contingent. The choice of a country from which to draw a lesson depends on a number of factors. Faced with dissatisfaction with a program performance, policymakers start searching near – in countries that are perceived as similar. The definition of proximity is subjective and depends upon cognition: what is known is appreciated more than the unfamiliar (Cyert and March 1963 in: Rose 1991:13).

First, a psychological (not geographical) proximity is important. National histories and cultures influence the institutions and political values – the policymakers should then look for lessons in countries, where they feel comfortable (Rose 2001:8). The reliance of Australia and Canada on British-type political institutions listed as one factor facilitating this comparative study, and the similar historical, political, and cultural character of both countries provide an illustration of the psychological proximity point made by the literature. Australia is more likely to look for policy lessons in Canada than for example

\textsuperscript{26} These different degrees/types of policy transfer can be found in the process-centred approaches to policy transfer represented for example by Rose (1991,1993). Other approaches to policy transfer analysis are: ideational; comparative; and multilevel ones (Evans 2004b in Evans (ed) 2004a).
in Indonesia. Ideological compatibility of two nations is another aspect of that proximity. In a country governed by social democrats, drawing lessons from a country governed by liberals may be unsuccessful because a program goals may not be acceptable, despite its means may be (2001:7). The value/ideological consensus between two nations is therefore conducive to the policy transfer and its success (Robertson in: Dolowitz and Marsh 1996:354).

Third, similar financial and bureaucratic (personnel and organisational capacities) resources are conducive to a policy transfer. Rich countries do not look for solutions in poorer countries. Their greater resources enable them to do much better than the lower income countries. The opposite may not be true – international aid agencies may recommend programs from developed countries to be adopted in the developing ones (Rose 2001:8). Comparable stage of economic and social development in Australia and Canada noted above as another similarity in their broad polices’ environment, and facilitating their explanation, shows that the two countries meet the similar resources precondition. Fourth, not a mere availability of evidence on programs being pursued (publications) but its accessibility in English (a modern lingua franca) constitutes another factor conducive to a policy transfer (2001:8). Such comparable data in the English medium are available for Australia and Canada, thus showing that these countries meet another precondition for a policy transfer noted in the literature.

Functional interdependence, where two or more countries share a problem, and where they must look to the other to achieve an effective outcome, is another factor relevant to lesson-drawing (Rose 1991:17). Interdependence is common for example in military defence, central banking and environmental issues (2001:8). Lesson-drawing in immigration policy sphere is also based on functional interdependence. Sharing reasons and objectives of their respective policies by Australia and Canada, noted above as one reason for pursuing this comparative study, illustrates at the same time a case of functional interdependence. Australia and Canada naturally look to each other for effective solutions. Evolution of other aspects of their national immigration policies, and of other countries too, is likely also based on functional interdependence.
Different objects may be subject to a policy transfer: policy goals; structure and content; policy instruments or administrative techniques; institutions; ideology; ideas; attitudes and concepts; and negative lessons (Dolowitz and Marsh 1996:349–50). Five degrees/types of policy transfer can be found in the literature. Copying being the first degree consists in adopting a more or less intact program already in effect elsewhere. This is the simplest form of lesson-drawing. It is often possible within a nation, where different institutional and contextual variables remain constant (Rose 1991:21,22). Copying an intact program from abroad is difficult to imagine as local history, culture and institutions must be considered. The next degree of lesson-drawing is then emulation (adaptation). This involves adapting the original program to different national circumstances (1991:21; 2001:12–3). If a country wants to emulate or catch up with another’s success quickly, existence of a similar institution to implement the imported lesson is necessary. Although institutions themselves may be transferred, adding a new program to an existing agency’s portfolio is the most straightforward strategy but it is not always possible (2001:16).

Hybridisation is yet another degree of lesson-drawing. It combines compatible elements of programs being operated in two or more countries. If a lesson is drawn from a unitary to a federal system, the delivery system may follow the unitary model, but the financing method may be based on the importing country’s own standards. All the elements in a hybrid program can be observed in action, but in different places (Rose 2001:13). Another degree of lesson drawing is synthesis – a combination of elements familiar in similar programs in different countries. The result is a whole that is distinctive. Yet, as the result is synthetic with no counterpart elsewhere, its potential effectiveness is more difficult to evaluate (1991:22). Inspiration is the last form of lesson-drawing, provided identifiable links can be established between the foreign model and the freshly inspired program at home. If no evidence of a foreign program’s analysis can be found in the new program at home, it is based on pure speculation and cannot be considered a lesson-drawing (2001:13). On the basis of these degrees/types of policy transfer and objects of this transfer, Chapter Five classifies the proposed policy lessons accordingly.
1.9 Thesis structure

The framework for this dissertation draws upon the standard structure of policy analysis and implementation. Given the issue, in this case regional migration policy, the standard policy process analysis distinguishes definition of policy objectives from the process of the policy implementation. In relation to objectives, the focus is on the objectives of governments in developing policies. Attention must necessarily be paid by these governments to objectives of the migrants they would be seeking to attract under these policies. No interviews with the migrants’ themselves were performed for the purposes of this thesis and therefore their objectives are derived from alternative sources (see Subsection 1.5.1 in Appendix I).

Apart from the historical legacy and the constitutional constraints on policy prerogatives in this field introduced earlier, the framework used to analyse objectives builds on the work of Appendix I. The governments’ objectives are conditioned by the external environment provided by the population and socioeconomic trends of each country. The migrants’ objectives are, likewise, conditioned by that environment in the countries of potential settlement.

Policy implementation for regional skilled migration presented in Chapter Two builds on two operational concepts of ‘regions’ and ‘skills’, and provides evidence for each country. Chapter Three deals with the related field of regional business migration. Chapter Four tackles the central task of this thesis. Based on the analysis undertaken in Chapters Two and Three, it evaluates how successful the Australian and the Canadian regional migration policies have been so far in meeting their population and economic objectives: supporting population growth; addressing the uneven population distribution (achieving a better dispersal of migrants, including retention outcomes); responding to skill shortages and enhancing economic development through business migration. Other considerations include the migrants’ contribution to labour force growth and its age structure, as well as the impact of employment creation on local jobseekers in the case of business migrants. Successful and promising solutions are highlighted as they may serve as useful policy lessons for the countries involved and may inform future policy
development in Australia and Canada. Chapter Four also evaluates outcomes of the regional migration policies in the context of the selected current regional development theoretical concepts. Chapter Five reiterates the major findings on the nature and practice of the policies and their success in meeting their objectives. It notes solutions and arrangements observed throughout the research and the thesis writing process that are likely to influence future policies’ practice and results, as well as proposes solutions to enhance the policies’ outcomes. It also considers the regional migration policies in light of selected current regional development concepts. Finally, this chapter proposes future research priorities.

In closing of this chapter, Table 1.4 presents an overview of the discussed similarities and differences between Australia and Canada.

Table 1.4. Summary of similarities and differences between Australia and Canada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countries of immigration, where immigrants have preferred to settle in largest metropolitan areas</td>
<td>Countries span vast lands and are sparsely populated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar socioeconomic trends of population concentration in large metropolitan areas. Internal outmigration has contributed to population stagnation (or decline) in some areas. Such areas have particularly unfavourable demographic structures</td>
<td>Widespread skill shortages in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition of Australian and Canadian Senates, fiscal equalisation schemes and existence of federal departments dealing with regional development in both countries reflect long-held interest in regional issues</td>
<td>Shared regional migration policy objectives: address uneven population distribution (improve immigrant dispersal); support population growth; respond to skill shortages, and pursue economic development through business migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional migration policies aim to more evenly distribute skilled and business migrants, in line with these objectives. They are another manifestation of interest in regional issues</td>
<td>Regional migration policies aim to more evenly distribute skilled and business migrants, in line with these objectives. They are another manifestation of interest in regional issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many state/territory and provincial governments have released their own population policies and/or immigration strategies</td>
<td>Many state/territory and provincial governments have released their own population policies and/or immigration strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration – (constitutional) federal responsibility</td>
<td>Immigration – (constitutional) shared federal and provincial/territorial responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government has made available to states/territories the same regional migration schemes with identical eligibility criteria. Jurisdictions influence these criteria only to a degree</td>
<td>Provinces have their own migration provincial programs established independently of the federal Canadian government. Each province has established its own, individual eligibility criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a scheme is introduced, it may be taken up by state/territory government</td>
<td>Provinces run their migration programs under renewable agreements with federal government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Skill’ levels under regional migration policy – defined as per ASCO-II. Only highest ASCO-II Major Groups from SOL may apply for regional skilled visas (exceptions limited)</td>
<td>Specific ‘skill’ shortages under regional migration policy – individually identified by provincial governments or provincial employers. Not all governments refer to NOC-II and some allow entry of lower skilled workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement allowed in ‘regional or low population’</td>
<td>Settlement allowed in ‘regional or low population’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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growth areas' and 'regional or low population growth metropolitan areas'. Business migrants encouraged to establish businesses in regional, rural or low growth areas. 'Regional' Australia – any SD with < 0.2m inhabitants in 2001 Census. 'Low growth metropolitan areas' – those with < 50% of national population growth between 1996 and 2001 Censuses. Largest metropolitan areas typically ineligible for regional settlement

| Initial settlement of regional migrants restricted to eligible areas | Provincial migrants can settle anywhere in Canada | Regional settlement (includes large cities). Provincial migration policies disperse immigrants away from Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver (MTV) |
Chapter Two
Regional skilled migration policies in Australia and Canada and their implementation

2.1 Introduction

This chapter compares the eligibility criteria and the policy instruments used in the Australian and the Canadian regional skilled migration streams. First, it discusses the skilled entry options and specific eligibility factors. The focus then shifts to testing migrants’ retention probability and examining policy instruments, such as support services, governments’ monitoring activities and the domestic promotion of the Australian and the Canadian provincial skilled programs. The role of external stakeholders in the policy implementation, especially in the Canadian provinces, is also examined and corresponding Australian developments are looked at. This chapter highlights recent policy developments and indicates what potential benefits they may bring. Innovative solutions that could be considered in the future development of the policies are also noted.

Analysis of the Australian and the Canadian provincial policies for skilled migrants is embedded in two contexts: population and socioeconomic trends (see Appendix I) and the administrative decisions as to what constitutes a ‘region’ that are made on their basis. These circumstances determine different emphases on eligibility factors in Australia and Canada. These eligibility factors and the policy management strategies are also influenced by divergent constitutional responsibilities in the matters of immigration in each country. One of the consequences is the policy application of the second key concept for the regional migration policies: ‘skills’. Cross-country comparison points to similarities and differences between the Australian and the Canadian provincial eligibility factors and policy instruments, leading to characterising of divergent policy management strategies.

This chapter analyses how suitable the eligibility factors and other policy instruments are in addressing the population and economic policy objectives in Australia and Canada, and what benefits policies might potentially bring. Two common approaches (common in concept, but not in detailed criteria) are compared: permanent migration options for offshore candidates and provisions for the onshore status conversion for temporary
workers and international students. The permanent offshore migration options in both countries include the family-linked migration, employer-linked migration and migration of independent individuals sponsored/nominated by the jurisdictions. Onshore status conversion of temporary workers is always employer-linked.

2.2 Migration streams and eligibility factors overview

This Section gives an overview of the Australian and the Canadian provincial migration streams and presents summaries of the Australian and the Canadian provincial eligibility factors for potential migrants.

2.2.1 Migration streams

Table 2.1 (see below) presents the Australian skilled migration streams and Table 2.2 details the Canadian provincial migration streams for skilled migrants. Visa type and the stakeholders involved are shown, and, in the case of Australia, the areas eligible for settlement are also shown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSRM category/scheme</th>
<th>Areas eligible</th>
<th>Status accorded</th>
<th>Points test</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled-Designated Area Sponsored category (SDAS)</td>
<td>All Australia is Designated except: Sydney, Newcastle, Wollongong, Brisbane and Perth metropolitan areas.</td>
<td>Permanent residence.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Family. No employment offer requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled-Designated Area Sponsored Overseas Student category</td>
<td>Regional or low population growth areas, which exclude: Sydney, Newcastle, Wollongong, Brisbane, Gold Coast, Perth and Melbourne.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>No. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td>Employer (business and position being filled must be in an eligible area, see column 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled-Offshore Designated Area Sponsored New Zealand Citizen category</td>
<td>In participating jurisdictions (at the time of writing in December 2004 South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania) where applicant's skills are in demand. Western Australia joined in May 2005.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>Yes. Pool mark must be met.</td>
<td>State/territory government, no employment guarantee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme (RSMS)</td>
<td>STNI-user states and RSMS-eligible employers.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>No. Some lower criteria must be met.</td>
<td>State/territory government or employer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled-Independent Regional (Provisional) (SIR)</td>
<td>Regional or low population growth metropolitan areas, which exclude: Sydney, Newcastle, Wollongong, NSW Central Coast, Brisbane, Gold Coast, Perth, Melbourne and ACT.</td>
<td>3-year temporary (provisional) visa. Fulfilling visa conditions enables applying for permanent residence through RSMS, STNI or State/Territory Sponsored Business Owner. Another temporary SIR visa conditional.</td>
<td>Yes. Full points test or if General Skilled Migration application pooled b), SIR pass mark applies (min. 110).</td>
<td>State/territory government, no employment guarantee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Stay temporary business (457) visa</td>
<td>Anywhere in Australia; lower criteria apply to migrants sponsored by employers from</td>
<td>Up to a 4-year temporary residence.</td>
<td>No. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td>Employer. Temporary sponsorship by regional employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSRM category/scheme</td>
<td>Areas eligible</td>
<td>Status accorded</td>
<td>Points test</td>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regional or low population growth areas. These are defined as for RSMS purposes (see above).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>discussed in Section 2.4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) SMD - Commonwealth-operated database with occupational and personal details of skilled applicants, who have applied for migration and are willing to settle in areas where their occupational skills are in demand. It is regularly updated and distributed to state/territory governments and RCBs (for definition see Table 2.3). Employers can access it too (DIMIA 2004n:39). It is available from DIMIA website (DIMIA 2005m).

b) General Skilled Migration application is pooled if the applicant does not score the pass mark but has enough points to be kept in the pool for up to two years after the application has been assessed, in case a newer, lower pass mark is set (DIMIA 2004j:3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Provinces and territories</th>
<th>Points test</th>
<th>Nomination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled supported by family member</td>
<td>Manitoba (Family Support-Priority Assessment Stream): for those with min. work experience and if occupation on the Occupational Requirements List must meet the requirements. Support from a close relative is required.</td>
<td>Manitoba - no. Other criteria (including close relative) apply.</td>
<td>Manitoba’s government; no job offer requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled recommended by community</td>
<td>Manitoba (Community Support-Priority Assessment Stream): for those with min. work experience and if occupation on the Occupational Requirements List must meet the requirements. Letter of Support from community who has signed a Community Support Agreement with Manitoba’s government is required. Nova Scotia (Community-Identified Stream): for those recommended by Regional Development Authorities (RDAs) and community partners to contribute social or economic value to the community.</td>
<td>Manitoba - no. Other criteria (including the community) must be met.</td>
<td>Manitoba - as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled recommended by employer</td>
<td>British Columbia (Strategic Occupations): for registered nurses, skilled workers, international students, and physicians. Nurses and physicians are not separately discussed. Skilled workers must have a guaranteed, permanent, full-time job offer. See also Skilled international student, Skilled temporary foreign worker. Alberta (Skilled Worker/Professional): for those with guaranteed, permanent, full-time job offer from approved employer. See also Skilled temporary foreign worker below. Saskatchewan (Skilled Workers/Professionals Sub-Category): for those with a confirmed, permanent, full-time job offer in a professional occupation or in apprentice-able trade. See also Skilled temporary foreign worker below. Saskatchewan (Health Professionals Category): for nurses and physicians who have worked on temporary permits in the province and who have permanent employment offer. Position offered to nurses must be full-time. Manitoba (Employer Direct-Priority Assessment Stream): for those with a pre-approved, permanent and full-time employment offer. See also Skilled temporary foreign worker below. Québec (Assured Job Program): for those with an official job offer. See also Skilled temporary foreign worker below. New Brunswick (Job Offer of Applicants): for those with a guaranteed, permanent, full-time job offer (Department Business New Brunswick. See also Skilled temporary foreign worker below.</td>
<td>British Columbia - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td>British Columbia’s government on employer’s recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alberta - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td>Alberta’s government on employer’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saskatchewan - yes. Provincial points system and criteria to be met by employer.</td>
<td>Saskatchewan’s government on employer’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saskatchewan - no. Other criteria must be met.</td>
<td>Saskatchewan’s government on employer’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manitoba - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td>Manitoba’s government on employer’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Québec - yes. Provincial points system and criteria to be met by employer.</td>
<td>Québec’s government on employer’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Brunswick - yes. Provincial points system and criteria to be met by employer.</td>
<td>New Brunswick’s government on employer’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Provinces and territories</td>
<td>Points test</td>
<td>Nomination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled independent selected by government</td>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong> (Strategic Recruitment Initiatives-Priority Assessment Stream) for those with Invitation to Apply from Manitoba.</td>
<td>Nova Scotia - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td>Nova Scotia’s government on employer’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong> (General Stream): for those with a close relative, OR 2 Affidavits of Support from close friends or distant relatives, OR previous work experience in Manitoba, OR completed education program in Manitoba.</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island - yes. Federal points system with fewer points to qualify.</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island’s government on employer’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong> (Occupations in Demand Program): for those who practice an occupation in demand and with relevant work experience.</td>
<td>Newfoundland and Labrador - yes. Federal points system with fewer points to qualify and criteria to be met by employer.</td>
<td>Newfoundland and Labrador’s government on employer’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong> (Employability and Occupational Mobility Program): for those with employability and occupational profile suitable for the Québec labour market and training in occupation from a Favouroured Training List.</td>
<td>Québec - yes. Provincial points system.</td>
<td>Québec’s government; no employment offer requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>British Columbia</strong> (Strategic Occupations-International Students Category): for foreign students and graduates with permanent, full-time job offer related to their studies. Outstanding foreign students without job offer may be recommended by post-secondary institution for provisional nomination. Job offer related to field of studies must be secured before provincial nomination.</td>
<td>British Columbia - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met. For provisional nomination other criteria (including post-secondary institution) must be met.</td>
<td>British Columbia’s government on employer’s request and on government on post-secondary institution’s recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Saskatchewan</strong> (Foreign Student Post Graduation Work Permit Category): for graduated foreign students who have worked on postgraduation permit and who have a permanent, full-time job offer.</td>
<td>Saskatchewan - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td>Saskatchewan’s government on employer’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong> (International Student-Priority Assessment Stream): for graduated foreign students, with a postgraduation work permit, currently employed and with full-time, long-term job offer related to their studies.</td>
<td>Manitoba - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td>Manitoba’s government on employer’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Provinces and territories</td>
<td>Points test</td>
<td>Nomination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled temporary foreign worker recommended by employer</td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong> (Foreign Students-Permanent Migration): for foreign students 1 year away from completing the studies.</td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong> - information could not be located.</td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong>'s government. Information on job offer requirement could not be located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia (Strategic Occupations): under the same criteria (see above) this category is open to temporary foreign workers in Canada with guaranteed, permanent, full-time job offers.</td>
<td><strong>British Columbia</strong> - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td><strong>British Columbia</strong>'s government on employer’s recommendation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta (Skilled Worker/Professional): under the same criteria (see above) this category is open to temporary foreign workers with guaranteed, permanent, full-time job offer.</td>
<td><strong>Alberta</strong> - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td><strong>Alberta</strong>’s government on employer’s request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan (Existing Work Permit Sub-Category): for those who have worked on a temporary permit and with a permanent, full time job offer in a professional occupation (NOC-II skill levels A,B) or apprentice-able trade.</td>
<td><strong>Saskatchewan</strong> - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td><strong>Saskatchewan</strong>’s government of employer’s request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba (Employer Direct-Priority Assessment Stream): under the same criteria (see above) this category is open to temporary foreign workers employed full-time in Manitoba and with a permanent job offer.</td>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong> - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong>’s government on employer’s request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec (Temporary Workers-Permanent Immigration): for temporary foreign workers with a job offer.</td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong> - information could not be located. Certain criteria must be met.</td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong>’s government on employer’s request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick (Job Offer Applicants): under same criteria (see above) this category is open to temporary foreign workers with a guaranteed job offer.</td>
<td><strong>New Brunswick</strong> - yes. Provincial points system and criteria to be met by employer.</td>
<td><strong>New Brunswick</strong>’s government on employer’s request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia (Temporary Foreign Workers): for temporary foreign workers in the province with a permanent job offer.</td>
<td><strong>Nova Scotia</strong> - no. Other criteria (including employer) must be met.</td>
<td><strong>Nova Scotia</strong>’s government on employer’s request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island (Skilled Workers): under the same criteria (see above) this category is open to temporary work permit holders in Canada.</td>
<td><strong>Prince Edward Island</strong> - yes. Federal points system with fewer points to qualify and criteria to be met by employer.</td>
<td><strong>Prince Edward Island</strong>’s government on employer’s request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland and Labrador (Occupational/Skilled Worker Category): under the same criteria (see above) this category is open to temporary foreign workers working in the province.</td>
<td><strong>Newfoundland and Labrador</strong> - federal points system with fewer points to qualify and criteria to be met by employer.</td>
<td><strong>Newfoundland and Labrador</strong>’s government on employer’s request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) See comment in Subsection 2.2.2.
b) Information regarding the points-test in Québec comes from a commercial website (Canadavisa.com 2005) because such information could not be located from the government website.

Sources: Canadavisa.com 2005; Department of Business New Brunswick (DB NB) n.d.f; Department of Development and Technology Prince Edward Island (DDT PE) n.d.a; DDT PE n.d.g; DDT PE n.d.j; Department of Government Relations Saskatchewan (DGR SK) 2004; DGR SK 2005c; DGR SK 2005d; DGR SK 2005e; DGR SK 2005f; Department of Innovation, Trade and Rural Development Newfoundland and Labrador (DITRD NL) 2005; DITRD NL n.d.c; DITRD NL n.d.e; DITRD NL n.d.h; Manitoba Labour and Immigration (MLI) 2005b; Province of Nova Scotia 2005; Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women’s Services British Columbia (MCAWS BC) 2004b; MCAWS BC n.d.f; MCAWS BC n.d.i; MCAWS BC n.d.n; MCAWS BC n.d.p; MCAWS BC n.d.r; Ministry of Economic Development Alberta (MED AB) n.d.a; MED AB n.d.b; Ministère de l’Immigration et des Communautés Culturelles Québec (MICC QC) 2004e; MICC QC 2004h; MICC QC 2004i; MICC QC 2004j; MICC QC n.d; Office of Economic Development Nova Scotia (OED NS) 2004; OED NS 2005b; OED NS 2005d.
Tables 2.1 and 2.2 show that both countries offer similar skilled migration streams to similar groups of people. Family-linked migration, employer-driven migration and the migration of independent skilled people sponsored by the state/territory governments in Australia and provincial governments in Canada are the common categories. Beyond them, foreign students may apply for state/territory and provincial migration under different arrangements in each country. These differences arise from the ultimately federal government responsibility for immigration in Australia, while in Canada each provincial government is responsible for its own entry streams and criteria applicable thereto. That sole provincial responsibility, as well as individual priorities, explains why not all provinces offer each of the streams as presented in Table 2.2. For clarity, it has to be noted that in Australia each skilled category is ‘sponsored’ (‘nominated’) by the named sponsor. In the Canadian provinces, migrants are recommended to the governments by their ‘sponsors’ (their family, for example), but formally the provinces nominate them. Québec ‘selects’ its skilled migrants.

In comparison to the migration streams in Australia, it is striking that family-linked migration is much less popular, currently only available in Manitoba.1 By contrast, the family-sponsored migration, managed by DIMIA in Australia, is available to three groups of skilled migrants, including international students. They are able to migrate to eligible areas (called ‘Designated Areas, see Table 2.1) chosen by governments and considered ‘regional’ in the context of population and socioeconomic trends. Employer-sponsored migration dominates the entry streams across all Canadian provinces, while in Australia it is available in the regional or low population growth areas (note the differences with Designated Areas for family migration in Table 2.1). The absence of geographical restrictions (Designated Areas) from the skilled streams in Canada (Table 2.2) reflects the migrants’ settlement trends, the consequent policy understanding of ‘region’ (see Appendix I and particularly Subsections I.3.1 and I.5.2) and permanent residents’ guaranteed mobility rights (see Section 1.6 in Chapter One). This approach applies to all skilled streams. The impact of the offshore employed-linked migration is strengthened by onshore applications that can be made by temporary foreign workers in Canada and Australia.2 Table 2.2

---

1 Saskatchewan is also considering introducing the family-linked migration (Rhodes 2005).
2 Country-specific terminology is used to refer to temporary workers in Canada and Australia. In Canada, they are referred to as temporary foreign workers. In Australia, temporary workers are those, who hold Long Stay temporary business (457) visas. Due to the long name of that visa, these individuals are either referred to as the 457 visa holders or as temporary workers.
demonstrates that these workers are welcome in all Canadian provinces. They can migrate either under the arrangements for the skilled nominees, or, if in Saskatchewan, Québec or Nova Scotia - under separate PNP entry streams maintained for them by these governments. In Australia, the 457 visa holders are eligible for the regional employer-sponsored migration in the same regional or low population growth areas as RSMS (see Table 2.1).

Contrasting approaches emerge in handling of the independent (without employment offer) migration. It is a less prominent entry option in Canada, where only Manitoba and Québec welcome such migrants. In Australia, the STNI category, where no employment offer is necessary, is currently actively used by four states. The SIR visa, also in that group, and being a 2004 addition to the suite of regional visas, has been welcomed by all governments (the Australian Capital Territory is ineligible).

Currently, four Canadian provinces with special student streams invite international students to become nominees. However, such limited entry options are set to change. Changes announced in April 2005 involve innovations that will allow students in other provinces to also apply for a permanent resident status, although indirectly. In Australia, students have a suite of opportunities to stay permanently under the regional migration categories (see Table 2.3 below).

What merits attention is the innovative community-linked stream (Table 2.2) in Manitoba and Nova Scotia. In that form it is formally absent from Australia but some changes in similar direction are currently taking place (see Subsection 2.6.1). Another feature of the Australian and the Canadian provincial schemes is the points-testing of potential migrants. In Australia, independent categories of STNI and SIR involve points-tests. Also, those who are nominated for RSMS through the SMD must have obtained a pool mark. The points system is used for testing employer-recommended applicants in Saskatchewan, one of the Manitoba’s independent streams, the Québec independent and employer-recommended streams and in the majority of the Atlantic provinces. Regardless of whether this approach or other assessment criteria are used, similar factors are considered. As a result of the sole responsibility of the Canadian provincial governments for their entry options, absent from the considerations that follow is the Yukon Territory where only business nominees are invited. By contrast, Alberta does not offer the business component and has only the skilled.
scheme. Customisation of entry criteria in Australia is possible under the state/territory sponsored migration options (STNI and SIR), where these governments may establish certain own requirements, in addition to the DIMIA federal requirements. Finally, the variety of migration streams suggests that the governments are serious about the dispersal. They also appear innovative in inviting, in addition to offshore skilled migrants, temporary workers and international students. As it is shown later, policies in both countries continue to be developed.

### 2.2.2 Eligibility factors overview

This Subsection presents the key eligibility factors that the Australian federal and state/territory governments, as well as the Canadian provincial governments, use in assessing a potential skilled migrant. The Australian eligibility factors - including for the SIR visa³ - are presented in Table 2.3. Discussion on that visa and other recent innovations announced in April 2005 in Australia and Canada in relation to their respective immigration programs follow. These announcements are important for the future of the regional migration policies. The Canadian key eligibility factors are presented in Table 2.4, which closes this Subsection. The next Section provides cross-country comparative analysis of these factors. The Australian eligibility factors contain some concessions in comparison to the independent skilled migration. To understand the former, it is necessary to present the standard eligibility factors first (Box 2.1 below).

---

**Box 2.1 Basic eligibility factors for skilled migrants applying under the General Skilled Migration to Australia.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The applicant or the spouse must be able to satisfy the following eligibility factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>AGE</strong> - under 45 when applying;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>ENGLISH LANGUAGE</strong> - vocational English level as tested by International English Language Testing System (IELTS);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>QUALIFICATIONS</strong> - post-secondary (such as university or trade) qualifications; skills must have been assessed by the relevant assessing authority as suitable for the nominated occupation before submitting the immigration application;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>NOMINATED OCCUPATION</strong> - an occupation nominated for skilled migration must be on SOL;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>RECENT WORK EXPERIENCE</strong> - depending on the number of points that a nominated SOL occupation is worth, there is a requirement to provide evidence of having been in paid employment in any of SOL occupations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Occupation worth 60 points - at least 12 months of the 18 months immediately before applying;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Occupation worth 50 or 40 points - at least 2 of the 3 years immediately before applying.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** DIMIA 2004j.

---

³ That visa was introduced after the interviews had been finished, in 2004, and comments are based on the electronic sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/scheme</th>
<th>Who can apply?</th>
<th>Concessions to basic eligibility factors (Box 2.1)</th>
<th>Additional eligibility factors</th>
<th>Sponsorship conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled-Designated Area Sponsored category (SDAS)</td>
<td>Offshore and onshore applicants meeting basic eligibility factors and having a relative in a Designated Area to sponsor them. Application may be made onshore, but for visa to be granted, applicants must be offshore.</td>
<td>Functional English - acceptable instead of vocational English but English language upgrade tuition fee must be paid before visa is issued. Only South Australia, Victoria, Northern Territory and Tasmania offer this option.</td>
<td>Sponsor (relative) must have lived for at least a year and continue to live in a Designated Area (proof of relationship required). To access the English language upgrade fee option the sponsor must live in participating jurisdiction (see left column) and in a Designated Area.</td>
<td>Applicant must have an assurer who gives the Assurance of Support for 2 years. Should applicant need the Centrelink support, the assurer must repay the amount or, the equivalent will be taken from a deposited bond if this applies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled-Designated Area Sponsored Overseas Student category</td>
<td>Only eligible overseas students in Australia meeting basic eligibility factors able to nominate a relative from a Designated Area willing to sponsor them. These are holders of substantive student visas or holders of Bridging A or B visas. Excluded are: ELICOS, AusAID, Government sponsored and Defence students and any student visa with condition 8535 attached.</td>
<td>Functional English - as in SDAS. Recent work experience requirement waived if a) the applicant has studied in Australia for at least 2 years (full-time), b) all tuition was conducted in English, c) has completed an Australian degree, diploma or trade qualification during the 6 months immediately before applying for migration (the 6-month period begins from the date of completion and not from the date the qualification was conferred), d) the qualification awarded is relevant to the nominated occupation and e) if this study was for less than 2 years, but applicant completed another degree, diploma or trade qualification, the total period of study for 2 or more degrees, diplomas, or trade qualifications must amount to min. 2 years of full-time study whilst the applicant was present in Australia. This exemption cannot be used to waive any specific work experience requirement imposed by an assessing body as part of a skills assessment.</td>
<td>As in SDAS.</td>
<td>As in SDAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled-Onshore Designated Area Sponsored New Zealand Citizen</td>
<td>Holders of subclass 444 (Special Category) visa meeting basic eligibility factors and having a</td>
<td>Functional English as in SDAS. Recent work experience as in SDAS.</td>
<td>As in SDAS.</td>
<td>As in SDAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/scheme</td>
<td>Who can apply?</td>
<td>Concessions to basic eligibility factors (Box 2.1)</td>
<td>Additional eligibility factors</td>
<td>Sponsorship conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme (RSMS)</td>
<td>Offshore and onshore applicants (temporary residents) meeting visa criteria and nominated by an eligible employer. Examples of eligible temporary residents (must be allowed to work and exclude diplomatic, domestic workers, expatriate or retirement visa holders): Working Holiday Makers (WHMs); students with visas granted for a course at minimum a diploma level and completed; Temporary Protection Visa (TPV) holders; Temporary Humanitarian Visa (THV) holders; and Long Stay temporary business visa holders (457).</td>
<td><strong>Recent work experience requirement waived</strong> for recent graduates from Australian educational institutions as above. <strong>Age</strong> - nominee may be 45+ and under 50 if position is essential to business operation and it is impossible to find a suitably qualified, younger person. Nominee may be 50+ but under 55 if occupation is on MODL/from ASCO-II Major Groups I-II and position is so unusual/highly specialised that it is impossible to find a suitably qualified, younger person. Nominee may be 55+ but under 60 if occupation is on MODL/from ASCO-II Major Groups I-II, position would normally require a person with skills and experience acquired over many years and position is so unusual/highly specialised that it is impossible to find a suitably qualified, younger person. Applicants 60, or 60+ are generally not considered. <strong>Functional English</strong> - benchmark for RSMS. Less than functional level may apply if proposed duties do not require functional level and a person may operate in Australian workforce (esp. issues of passing skills to Australian employees and complying with OH&amp;S requirements). Employer must demonstrate that applicant worked in nominated position in Australia on 457 visa for at least 12 months before applying and had undertaken some training in English during this time. <strong>Qualifications</strong> - exceptions to diploma level or higher considered if nominee has equivalent experience and training but no formal qualifications, or if position to be filled has skill requirements below diploma level (at least AQF Certificate II/ASCO-II Major Groups 5-7; Major Groups 8-9 are not considered) but the nominee has filled it in on</td>
<td><strong>3 stages to bring a RSMS nominee:</strong> 1. Certification of employer’s nomination by RCB. 2. Nomination by employer (send the RCB-certified nomination to DIMIA for assessment). 3. Nominee applies for visa after DIMIA had approved the position. If applicant nominated from SMD, he/she need not lodge another application. Applicant is deemed to have RSMS application and can be proceeded accordingly. <strong>Qualifications</strong> - if position is identified from SMD, the nominee’s qualifications have already been assessed by relevant assessing authority as meeting Australian standards for the position.</td>
<td>At stage 1, RCB to certify a position must be satisfied that the vacancy sought to be filled in is genuine and full-time, available for at least 2 years, requires equivalent of at least Australian diploma level (trade certificates considered to be at this level or higher), cannot be filled locally, employment and remuneration are in accordance with Australian industrial laws and that an employment contract/letter of appointment is/will be issued. At stage 2 DIMIA assesses the employer nomination: position must be full-time and for a 2-year period, it meets employment terms and conditions in accordance with Australian industrial laws, is skilled (min. equivalent of Australian diploma level; full apprenticeship accepted as equivalent to, or higher than diploma) and has been certified by RCB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/scheme</td>
<td>Who can apply?</td>
<td>Concessions to basic eligibility factors (Box 2.1)</td>
<td>Additional eligibility factors</td>
<td>Sponsorship conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled State/Territory Nominated Independent category (STNI) Migrants can approach states/territories directly but usually identified from SMD</td>
<td>Applicants meeting all basic eligibility factors nominated by state/territory. Applications may be made onshore but for visa to be granted applicants must be offshore.</td>
<td>Concessions to basic eligibility factors: 457 visa at least 2 years prior to application, RCB confirms its location in a regional area under its jurisdiction and position is genuine, full-time and necessary for operation of business. <strong>Qualifications</strong> - assessed by relevant assessing authority when registration or licensing is required, or it is a trade occupation. May need to be assessed if migrant has not worked in that occupation in Australia for 2 years prior to applying. Otherwise 3 stages as in last column.</td>
<td>In addition to occupation on SOL, it must be on state/territory skill shortage list and be assessed as suitable for nominated occupation by relevant assessing authority. Actively sponsoring states until 2004 included Tasmania, Victoria and South Australia. Western Australia joined in May 2005. Their occupational demands are below. <strong>Tasmania</strong>: some occupations from shortage list sought outside Hobart only and some narrowed to particular specialisations/experience. <strong>Victoria</strong>: some occupations from shortage list outside Melbourne only, some narrowed to particular specialisations/experience, some require a job offer (always for regional Victoria or a business plan accepted as equivalent to job offer) and trade certificates required for some occupations to consider nomination.</td>
<td>At stage 3, after approving the nomination, DIMIA assesses the nominee’s application that he/she has relevant qualifications, is able to satisfy mandatory licensing/registration or professional membership, position is for at least 2 years (contract/appointment letter required), nominee is under 45 years and has functional English (and together with family meets health and character requirements). Nominee must stay in the sponsoring state/territory for at least 2 years and meet its criteria. See also Subsections 2.5.1 and 2.5.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/scheme</td>
<td>Who can apply?</td>
<td>Concessions to basic eligibility factors (Box 2.1)</td>
<td>Additional eligibility factors</td>
<td>Sponsorship conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>South Australia</strong>: Occupations for State Nomination: South Australia July 2004-June 2005 in shortage in Adelaide and regional areas; some occupations narrowed to particular specialisations/experience.</td>
<td><strong>Residence requirement for RSMS</strong> for the 2-year contract duration as above. STNI, SM residence requirement for 2 years as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Matching scheme enabled through SMD</td>
<td>Offshore Skilled-Independent applicants who opt for being on SMD and offshore Skill Matching Visa applicants meeting basic eligibility factors (concessions in the third column). Applicants can be nominated from SMD by governments for Skill Matching Visa (links migrants with specific skilled vacancies through STNI and RSMS), or STNI. Employers may nominate for RSMS.</td>
<td>Skill Matching Visa applicants benefit from following concessions: No points test but age and skills criteria apply. If applicant from SMD is nominated by a government and has only functional English, a language upgrade tuition fee must be paid before a visa grant. Currently South Australia and Tasmania offer this option. <strong>Recent work experience requirement</strong>: applicant must have been employed in any skilled occupation from SOL for at least 6 months in the 12 months before applying. <strong>Recent work experience requirement waived</strong> for recent graduates from Australian educational institutions as above.</td>
<td>Applicants selected from SMD for RSMS must meet criteria as above. Applicants selected from SMD for STNI/SM must satisfy nominating governments’ criteria. <strong>Tasmania, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia</strong>: candidates skill-matched for STNI/SM must meet relevant visa criteria. Includes occupation from state list for STNI and SM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/scheme</td>
<td>Who can apply?</td>
<td>Concessions to basic eligibility factors (Box 2.1)</td>
<td>Additional eligibility factors</td>
<td>Sponsorship conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Independent Regional (Provisional) category (SIR)</td>
<td>Offshore applicants meeting basic eligibility factors and SIR passmark; offshore applicants with pooled application for General Skilled Migration meeting SIR passmark (see Table 2.1); or eligible onshore students meeting basic requirements.</td>
<td>Eligible onshore students can use the following concessions: Overseas students must have a positive skills assessment in a 60 point skill level occupation from SOL, unless the applicant has completed immediately before applying a degree, diploma or trade certificate after at least 2 years of living and full-time study at a regional or low population growth metropolitan area, or has completed an Australian doctorate. In both cases a satisfactory skills assessment in a 50 point occupation is sufficient but qualification awarded must correspond to nominated occupation.</td>
<td>Visa holders must live and work in regional or low population growth metropolitan areas (see Table 2.1). 2 years of residence and 1 year of employment in above areas enables applying for permanent residence (see options in Table 2.1).</td>
<td>Participating states/territories have individual criteria (see Recent innovations below).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

a) The 8535 condition means that students, except in limited circumstances, are not allowed to remain in Australia beyond the date appearing on their visa and that they can only apply for a limited number of other substantive student visas. See DIMIA 2004r:2.

b) MODL - Migration Occupations in Demand List.

c) OH&S - Occupational Health and Safety.

d) RCB(s) - Regional Certifying Bodies gazetted by the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs are appointed to confirm that positions nominated for RSMS meet the required criteria. RCBs can be for example regional development boards, branches of state/territory governments, chambers of commerce or units of city councils. See DIMIA 2005d:15,33–6.

e) ASCO-II Major Groups are: Major Group Five - Advanced Clerical and Service Workers; Major Group Six - Intermediate Clerical, Sales and Service Workers and Major Group Seven - Intermediate Production and Transport Workers. Ineligible ASCO-II Major Groups are: Major Groups Eight - Elementary Clerical, Sales and Service Workers and Major Group Nine - Labourers and Related Workers. See Appendix IV for further details.

Sources: Centrelink n.d; Department of Economic Development Tasmania (DED TAS) 2004f; DED TAS 2005b; DED TAS n.d.b; DIMIA 2004i; DIMIA 2004j; DIMIA 2004n; DIMIA 2005d; DIMIA 2005m; Department of Industry and Resources Western Australia (DIR WA) 2005a; DIR WA 2005d; DIR WA 2005e; Immigration SA 2004a; Immigration SA 2004b; Skilled Migration Program Victoria (SMP VIC) n.d.f; SMP VIC n.d.h.
Table 2.3 shows that the key eligibility factors for sponsored skilled migrants in Australia are age, English language ability, skill level (qualifications) and nominated occupation, as well as recent work experience. The order of these factors follows DIMIA in its guidelines for skilled migrants. Age and language ability are two pre-application assessment factors. Skills level (qualifications), nominated occupation and recent work experience have also been gained prior to migration but these are core factors indicating what benefits are targeted through the schemes. Therefore, they are considered separately. All these factors are held in common with those considered by the Canadian provinces (see Table 2.4 below). The comparative analysis of eligibility factors follows this order as closely as possible, but the analysis must also incorporate certain differences in the policies’ design, especially in terms of employment offers in Canada.

**Recent innovations.** One such innovation is the SIR visa in Australia. It is initially a temporary regional (geographically restricted) visa that is without an equivalent in Canadian provinces. On meeting the conditions shown in Table 2.3, notably the two-year residence requirement and a one-year employment criterion, migrants may apply for one of the available permanent visas (see Table 2.1). The residence requirement is an administrative retention measure, that is imposed by the federal government as a visa condition. Similarly to STNI, governments may develop their own immigration criteria in addition to the federally established ones. This brings them closer to the sort of authority that the Canadian provinces have over their entry streams. This is probably best demonstrated by the fact that all jurisdictions (except New South Wales) have their own application forms. Nominated occupation is the principal factor considered by the governments. The strictest approach has been taken by Western Australia, Queensland and New South Wales. All these states have developed regional skills shortages lists specifying occupations for nominations in each of their regions (DIR WA 2005c; 2005a; Department of State Development and Innovation Queensland (DSDI QLD) 2005c; Department of State and Regional Development New South Wales (DSRD NSW) n.d.e gateway site).

The remaining jurisdictions are more open. The most welcoming states are Tasmania and South Australia, where applications from outside their shortages lists are accepted (DED TAS 2004b; Immigration SA 2005). The Victorian government assesses the chances of finding employment in regions (SMP VIC n.d.e). Until early 2005, the Northern Territory
had been using the national shortages list but it has consequently developed its own territorial shortages list (Department of Employment, Education and Training Northern Territory (DEET NT) 2005). It serves for SIR purposes, as well as to certify nominations for RSMS and the 457 visas (Australia’s Northern Territory n.d.b:1). To be nominated for each jurisdiction, a DIMIA requirement of the assessment for a SOL occupation must be observed (DIMIA 2004j:11).

Since employment is not a SIR visa condition, all governments need to be convinced that applicants have investigated employment opportunities and settlement-related issues in view of ensuring their retention (DED TAS 2005a; n.d.a; SMP VIC n.d.e; n.d.g; Immigration SA n.d.i; DIR WA 2005a; 2005b; Australia’s Northern Territory n.d.a; DSDI QLD 2005c). The settlement-related research includes, among other things (with exception of Tasmania and South Australia), the cost of living in all these jurisdictions. Other factors typically include the integrity of social networks, previous/planned visits to the state/territory (or the selected regional areas) or Australia, and education and/or employment/business links (including in regional areas) (DED TAS 2004b; n.d.a; SMP VIC n.d.e; Immigration SA n.d.i; DIR WA 2005a; Australia’s Northern Territory n.d.a). Queensland enquires about career advancement and lifestyle reasons for selecting a particular region, previous or planned visits, settlement research, including costs involved, but does not specifically enquire about social, educational or employment links with the state (DSDI QLD 2005c). Tasmania and South Australia also consider the spouse’s occupation (DED TAS n.d.a:3; Immigration SA n.d.i:2).

All governments except Queensland enquire about funds available for establishment while the applicant will be seeking employment. It is worth highlighting that the Northern Territory and Tasmania - not traditionally the largest recipients of skilled and business migrants - credit community links of SIR applicants (Australia’s Northern Territory n.d.a:1; DED TAS n.d.a:6). Tasmania also credits community links for STNI applicants (DED TAS n.d.b:5). As will be discussed later, the Canadian provinces enquire about these links more often. South Australia and Queensland offer an important concession from the general conditions applying to new immigrants (see DIMIA 2004j:14). Both states have determined that the education of school-age children (except for private schools) will not attract
overseas student fees (Immigration SA 2005:3; DSDI QLD 2005b:3) as is normally the case.

The recent announcements (April 2005) indicate that Australia is quickly moving towards opening up regional migration to more potential candidates, initially on a temporary basis. In Canada, a similar opening up trend may be observed, but this is manifested by the character of the Canadian provincial eligibility factors (see Section 2.3) and to a lesser extent through introducing temporary options.

The Australian announcements contained a few progressive measures. First, from 1 July 2005, SIR applicants received an additional ten points, enlarging the pool of candidates available for sponsorship. Second, from 1 November 2005, WHMs and occupational trainees were eligible for the SIR visa onshore, meaning that regional employers are able to benefit from an enlarged work pool, and, in the case of WHMs, some with Australian work experience. Third, from mid-2006 the family-sponsored regional migrants will be initially granted temporary visas (rather than permanent residency as it is the case now) to ensure that they live and work in a regional area before qualifying for permanent residency (DIMIA 2005e:1).

Furthermore, a new trade skills training visa will be introduced for full fee-paying overseas apprentices to train in regional areas where tradespeople are in demand. This measure is expected to help address regional skills shortages and to make the regional educational institutions more attractive. On completion of the training, apprentices will be eligible to apply for permanent residency under the existing regional migration categories (DIMIA 2005f:1)\(^4\). Finally, ten DIMIA staff will be outposted to key industry bodies to provide expert advice on sponsoring overseas workers. These experts will also work with the industry to organise joint seminars for employers and recruitment events. These measures will be introduced to help regional employers in particular (DIMIA 2005f). These recent measures demonstrate that Australia is highly active in expanding the potential reach of its regional migration policy, and that there is an ongoing commitment to develop it.

\(^4\) For concerns regarding the training opportunities for young Australians see Morris and Moran 2005.
International graduate students in Canada may obtain a postgraduation work permit (CIC 2005c:41). Following the April 2005 announcements, instead of one-year permits, two-year permits are now available outside of Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver (CIC 2005e:1). This aligns with the Canadian policy understanding of ‘region’. Former students, on conversion of status, become temporary foreign workers, and they may then consider applying for permanent status under the PNP. This is an indirect route into the permanent status involving a period of temporary residency. These recent developments support and expand the existing solutions, demonstrating that Canada is also highly active in opening up the regional migration opportunities to a number of potential candidates. Yet, at the time of writing, the scope for providing a boost to provincial policies remains narrower than that provided by the new Australian regional initiatives.

Table 2.4 below presents the key eligibility factors for the Canadian provincial skilled nominees. Family-linked migration stream (Manitoba only), employer-driven migration streams, streams for independent migrants and for international students are featured. Three streams are not included: skilled temporary foreign workers, special streams for health professionals and the community-linked streams. Skilled temporary foreign workers may apply for nominee status under the same eligibility factors as offshore applicants (or under special streams in three provinces) and minor differences in requirements are too insignificant to present them. That group of applicants and international students are dealt with in Section 2.4. Eligibility factors for international students are contained in Table 2.4 for ease of comparison with Table 2.3, featuring the corresponding eligibility criteria in Australia.

Health professionals are targeted under special streams in British Columbia and Saskatchewan but are sought after by other provinces, too. Hence, they are not separately discussed. Since shortages of health professionals are common across Canada, these two provinces are included in discussion on targeted skilled shortages (see Subsection 2.3.4). The community-driven streams and solutions adopted in Canada go beyond the simple migration eligibility factors and cover more than the two provinces with these streams. This aspect of the Canadian policies deserves special attention as it potentially characterises a new direction in the policies’ development (see Section 2.6).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/province</th>
<th>Eligibility factors for skilled migrants</th>
<th>Requirements for supporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled supported by family member</td>
<td><strong>Manitoba:</strong> Age - 21-49. Language ability (in first official language: English or French) - sufficient instruction and/or demonstrated ability to be employable based on supporting education, employment documents (such as internationally recognised test results, certificates from language classes, educational transcripts/employment references indicating English or French as principal language of instruction/communication), and/or employer interview. Relevant supporting documents must be submitted. Education/training - completed min.1 year of post-secondary education/training and received a diploma, certificate or degree. Work experience - min. 2 years of experience in last 5 years. If occupation is from the Occupational Requirements List applicant meets the applicable criteria, which may include (a) licence, (b) provisional certification or proof of eligibility for certification, (c) full-time, long-term job offer meeting the requirements of the Employer Direct Stream, (d) combination of points a) and c).</td>
<td>Manitoba - Affidavit of Support signed by a close relative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba - Family Support-Priority Assessment Stream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled recommended by employer</td>
<td><strong>British Columbia:</strong> Language ability - appropriate language skills for the job, which the employer must confirm. Education/training and work experience - not only suitable for employment but considerable education and experience; migrants expected to develop/use new knowledge, skills, or technologies. If applicable, interim assessment or permit enabling to commence working is required.</td>
<td>British Columbia - employer must demonstrate a skill shortage and provide company training plan. Position must meet provincial and Canadian employment and wage standards. Applications for positions from beyond the BC High Priority Sectors considered too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia - Strategic Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta - Skilled Worker/Professional</td>
<td><strong>Alberta:</strong> Language ability - applicant must provide certificates/documentation proving language ability as specified by employer for the position to be filled in. Education/training and work experience - applicant must provide education certificates and employment evidence to meet position requirements specified by employer and industry standards, if applicable.</td>
<td>Alberta - employer develops a business case with MED AB and relevant industry sector specialist and justifies the need to fill in a critical position in short supply (includes explanation how credentials will be recognised; how Alberta will benefit, how Albertans will be trained, what relocation and other assistance will be available). Offered position must meet provincial employment and wage standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/province</td>
<td>Eligibility factors for skilled migrants</td>
<td>Requirements for supporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan - Skilled Workers/Professionals Sub-Category</td>
<td>Saskatchewan: Points-tested are: <strong>Age</strong> - 18-55. If 56+ no points awarded. Language ability - assessed on the basis of documented proof of applicant's training and ability in one or both official languages. Documents confirming language capability identical to Manitoba Family Support-Priority Assessment Stream. Education and training - assessed on the basis of documented education and training programs. Applicant's occupation must fall within NOC-II skill levels A or B, or be apprentice-able trade in the province. Applicant must meet any applicable provincial, national and/or industry regulatory requirements prior to consideration. Department contacts relevant regulatory body to ensure no objections are raised in relation to nomination. <strong>Work experience</strong> - at least 1-year full-time or equivalent experience in intended occupation in the last 10 years. Additional points may be awarded for second skilled (diploma or trade) occupation, different from the nominated one.</td>
<td>Saskatchewan - if applicant's first language is not English/French, employer must interview him/her, certify that his/her language skills suffice for nominated occupation and specify how applicant will be helped to improve language skills. If applicant possesses skills and experience but no formal accreditation, employer must certify that these are suitable for the nominated occupation and specify how they were assessed. Wages and benefits must equal those employer pays or would pay to Canadian citizen/permanent resident with similar skills and experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba - Employer Direct-Priority Assessment Stream</td>
<td>Manitoba: Applicant must possess language ability, training, work experience and licensing or certification suitable for the offered position.</td>
<td>Manitoba - for applicants not employed in Manitoba employer must first have the employment offer pre-approved, (except offers made to temporary foreign workers employed full-time in Manitoba). Employer determines language(s) level required for position. Wage and benefit package should be compatible with labour market standards and sufficient to retain the worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec - Assured Job Program</td>
<td>Québec: Points-tested are: <strong>Age</strong> - 23-39. No points for less than 23 and 40+. French and English language ability - more points granted for French than English language ability; secondary/postsecondary studies in French also credited. Education and training - completed high school gives the least points and MA/PhD degrees give max. points. Applicant indicates highest diploma or title of document indicating the highest school grade completed. Applicant must satisfy requirements of the offered position and conditions governing access</td>
<td>Québec - employer must prove that despite reasonable efforts position cannot be filled locally. The scarcity of local manpower does not have to be demonstrated if occupation on the List of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/province</td>
<td>Eligibility factors for skilled migrants</td>
<td>Requirements for supporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick - Job Offer Applicants</td>
<td>to the occupation as specified in NOC-II, and if required, have certification of eligibility or a work permit from a professional body or association. To obtain work permit, applicant must meet educational (and if applicable, training/work experience/examination) requirements, and have sufficient knowledge of French (proven either by 3 years of secondary or post-secondary education, or by obtaining a certificate from the Office Québécois de la langue française). Temporary permits are issued for otherwise recognised professionals but language exam must be passed to qualify for a permanent permit. <strong>Work experience</strong> - applicant obtains points for the number of years in employment in last 10 years. Min. 6 months of work experience required. Points also awarded separately for work experience and assured employment. ( \text{New Brunswick: Points-tested are: Age} \ - 20-50. Points decrease if 44+. ) ( \text{Language ability} \ - \text{points awarded for abilities in any of official languages. Bonus points for skills in the other language. Test results from approved language-testing organisation should be submitted if claiming proficiency in non-native language. Alternatively, written submission detailing training in, and use of the language(s), official documentation of education in English/French, or work experience, or other applicable documentation should be submitted (these are CIC requirements).} ) ( \text{Education and training} \ - \text{a secondary school program not qualifying for university entrance or trade or occupational certification gives the least points. Post-graduate university studies (degrees) or a post-degree professional designation give max. points. Relevant documents must be attached. If licensing or accreditation required, applicant must prove his/her eligibility to work. Education, training and experience must be consistent with the intended occupation (from the Skill Shortages/High Demand Occupations List).} ) ( \text{Work experience} \ - \text{applicant obtains points for the number of years of experience in intended occupation during last 5 years.} )</td>
<td>Exemptions from Proof of Workforce Scarcity. Position must comply with legal and regulatory obligations. ( \text{New Brunswick} \ - \text{position must meet provincial employment standards and comparable industry pay rates. Employer determines language(s) level required for position. Employer has a greater chance of having the worker nominated if his/her employment will fill in a skill shortage in the province.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia - Skilled Worker Stream</td>
<td>( \text{Nova Scotia: Age} \ - 25-60. ) ( \text{Language ability} \ - \text{basic literacy skills in one or both official languages suitable for employment.} ) ( \text{Education and training} \ - \text{min. education of grade 12 in the province or equivalent. Examples of industry skill shortages are provided to help applicants assess their chances of nomination.} ) ( \text{Work experience} \ - \text{no information could be located.} )</td>
<td>( \text{Nova Scotia} \ - \text{employer may offer a position for an identified critical skill shortage, where position cannot be filled locally. Individuals in most skilled occupations can qualify if employer offers standard wages and working conditions for that field.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island - Skilled Workers</td>
<td>( \text{Prince Edward Island: Points-tested are: Age} \ - 21-49. Points decrease if 49+. ) ( \text{Language ability} \ - \text{assessed on the basis of ability to communicate and work in one or both of official languages. Moderate ability required and can be proved by submitting language test results from an approved organisation, or by filling in a form explaining how applicant meets these requirements (these are CIC requirements).} )</td>
<td>( \text{Prince Edward Island} \ - \text{employment may only be offered for a skill shortage and position cannot be filled locally. It must meet provincial employment} \text{requirements.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/province</td>
<td>Eligibility factors for skilled migrants</td>
<td>Requirements for supporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland and Labrador - Occupational/ Skilled Worker Category.</td>
<td><strong>Education</strong> - completed high school gives the least points. MA/PhD degrees give max. points. If provincial licensing or accreditation required, applicant must prove eligibility to work in that position. Education, training and work experience must be consistent with the intended occupation. Occupation must be from the Skilled Shortage List. <strong>Work experience</strong> - applicant obtains points for the number of years of experience in intended occupation during last 10 years.</td>
<td>Standards and comparable industry pay rates. Employer determines language(s) fluency required for the position - CIC scale used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Newfoundland and Labrador</strong>: Points-tested are: <strong>Age</strong> - 21-65. No points for 56-65. <strong>Language ability</strong> - applicant assessed on the basis of ability to communicate and work in one of the official languages. Language ability in the second language may be noted, but the highest scoring language ability is considered in total assessment score. Applicant may be requested to submit assessment documentation respecting language. <strong>Education</strong> - completed high school gives the least points. MA/PhD degrees give max. points. If provincial, national and/or industry association regulatory and licensing requirements apply to intended occupation, applicant required to meet these requirements prior to consideration, or have his/her educational, training or occupational credentials reviewed by a qualification assessment agency or an occupational accreditation organisation in the province. Education, training and experience must be consistent with intended occupation, which must be on the Strategic Sector List. <strong>Work experience</strong> - applicant obtains points for the number of years of experience in intended occupation during last 5 years. <strong>Arranged employment</strong> - applicant obtains points for a confirmed employment offer in the Strategic Sector, or applicant’s skills are critical to the operation of the company or organisation (occupation from beyond the Strategic Sector List).</td>
<td><strong>Newfoundland and Labrador</strong> - position falling beyond the Strategic Sector list may be eligible if employer justifies that it is critical to the operation of business. Position must meet provincial employment standards and the comparable industry pay rates. Employer determines language(s) fluency requirements for the position (CIC scale used), required education and other qualifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled independent selected by government</td>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong>: Initiatives are undertaken by Manitoba government and/or involve considering applications from qualified applicants. Initiatives are undertaken in accordance with provincial immigration needs and available resources. Individuals with a Letter of Invitation are eligible, or adult dependants of approved nominees who can prove that they will assist their family in successful settlement. <strong>Age</strong> - 21-49 or as specified under the terms of specific initiative. <strong>Language ability</strong> (in first official language: English or French) - criteria and documentation as in Family Support - Priority Assessment Stream. Additionally, language ability may be tested in interview with Manitoba PNP. <strong>Education</strong> - min. education/training as per terms of specific initiative but must include completion of secondary education. <strong>Work experience</strong> - demonstrated employability in Manitoba or as per terms of specific initiative. If applicant's only work experience in last 5 years is from the Occupational Requirements List, applicant must meet the same criteria as in Family Support - Priority Assessment Stream.</td>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong> - government nominates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/province</td>
<td>Eligibility factors for skilled migrants</td>
<td>Requirements for supporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manitoba - General Stream</strong></td>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong>: Points-tested are: Age 17-53. Points decrease if 50+, if 53+ no points awarded.</td>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong> - as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Language ability</strong> - assessed on the basis of years of using English/French as 1st language at work; at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school and on the basis of studying English/French as a foreign or 2nd language. A range of options earns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>points, incl. some instruction and demonstrated language ability combined with employer’s interview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted documentation as in Family Support - Priority Assessment Stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Education and training</strong> - completed secondary school gives the least points. MA or PhD degrees give</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max. points. Transcripts and diplomas/certificates/degrees must be submitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work experience</strong> - applicant obtains points for the number of years of employment in last 10 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min. 6 months of work experience required. If applicant’s only work experience in last 5 years is from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Occupational Requirements List, applicant must meet the same criteria as in Family Support -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority Assessment Stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Québec - Occupations in Demand Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong>: Points-tested are: Age - as in Assured Job Program.</td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong> - government nominates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>French and English language ability</strong> - as in Assured Job Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Education and training</strong> - points as in Assured Job Program. Only applicants with occupation from List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Occupations in Demand may apply. Professional high school diploma or post-secondary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diploma are lowest qualification levels on the list.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work experience</strong> - applicant obtains points for the number of years in employment in last 10 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min. 6 months of work experience in the nominated occupation required. Points also awarded separately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for work experience and occupation in demand. Work experience in a NOC-II level D is not acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If occupation in demand governed by a professional order (regulated), applicant may only be accepted if</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in a subsequent process his/her training (formation) is recognised. Note that 'training' used in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English version of this document is translated from formation used in its French version, which refers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to education. The English meaning of 'training' equals stage in French (compare MICC QC 2005d and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICC QC 2005h). 'Training' (stage) such as apprenticeships, training courses or specialised internships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>must be recognised by a diploma and must have been obtained within 10 years preceding the application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(MICC QC 2005d). If in regulated profession, procedure to obtain a work permit as in Assured Job Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Québec - Employability and Occupational Mobility Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong>: Points-tested are: Age - as in Assured Job Program.</td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong> - as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>French and English language ability</strong> - as in Assured Job Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Education and training</strong> - points as in Assured Job Program. Education must be from field on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favoured Training List. Lowest qualifications on that list are from post-secondary level requiring 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>years of studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work experience</strong> - applicant obtains points for the number of years in employment in last 10 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min. 6 months of work experience required. Points also awarded separately for work experience and for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>having scored points for Employability and Occupational Mobility Assessment. If in regulated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>profession, procedure to obtain work permit as in Assured Job Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/province</td>
<td>Eligibility factors for skilled migrants</td>
<td>Requirements for supporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled international student</td>
<td><strong>British Columbia: Language ability</strong> - employer must confirm that candidate has appropriate language skills for the job. <strong>Education</strong> - students/graduates from selected disciplines may apply (high priority areas). Min. period of studies (1 or 2 years) depends on discipline and study level (undergraduate or higher; masters; doctorate). Applications from beyond these disciplines considered from academically strong students who will fill future skills needs. Required job offer must be full-time, permanent and in area related to student’s field of study. If mandatory regulatory/licensing requirements apply, applicant must prove that these requirements have been met (permit, registration card or approval letter from the regulatory body). All supporting documents must be submitted. <strong>Work experience</strong> - not required.</td>
<td><strong>British Columbia</strong> - employer must offer position matching Canadian standards of wages and working conditions for new graduates and demonstrate how candidate will fill in a current shortage or future skilled work needs. Training plans and future business development plans support application. If available, evidence of skill shortages (industry reports) should be also attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia - Strategic Occupations-International Students Category</td>
<td><strong>British Columbia</strong>: applicants must meet all requirements and submit relevant recommendations. Guaranteed job offer must be secured prior to nomination.</td>
<td><strong>British Columbia</strong> - post secondary institution must recommend student by providing min. 2 recommendation letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan - Foreign Student Post Graduation Work Permit Category</td>
<td><strong>Saskatchewan: Education</strong> - applicant must have graduated from program of min. 1-year duration in Saskatchewan and has obtained a degree, diploma or certificate from recognised Saskatchewan post-secondary institution. Permanent, full-time job offer required. If intended occupation is licensed, or other credentials are required, license or other form of approval from regulatory association must be submitted. <strong>Work experience</strong> - applicant must have worked for a Saskatchewan employer for min. 6 months on a post graduation permit. All supporting documents must be submitted.</td>
<td><strong>Saskatchewan</strong> - employer must offer position matching Canadian wages and working conditions for new graduates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba - International Student-Priority Assessment Stream</td>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong>: Applicant assessed on the basis of education, work experience, offer of full-time, long-term employment (must be related to the field of studies), any required licensing or certification and potential for retention in Manitoba. <strong>Language ability</strong> - considered in assessment but documents not required. <strong>Education</strong> - postgraduation work permit necessary to apply under this stream requires completing all degree or program requirements in an eligible Manitoba program. <strong>Work experience</strong> - applicant must be working when applying.</td>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong> - government nominates upon assessment of applicant’s suitability and assessment of employment offer that must include details of position and salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/province</td>
<td>Eligibility factors for skilled migrants</td>
<td>Requirements for supporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec - Foreign Students-Permanent Migration</td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong>: French and English language ability - if assumed that students are points-tested, then language criteria as in Assured Job Program. <strong>Education</strong> - applicant must submit recent transcripts and letter from educational institution stating date of graduation (or expected date), number of credits obtained (or to be obtained) and whether studies are full or part-time. No information on employment offer could be located. No information on processing applicants in regulated professions could be located either but it may be expected that certification of eligibility or work permit apply. Criteria for obtaining that work permit would be the same as under Assured Job Program. <strong>Work experience</strong> - no information could be located but if assumed that the points-test applies, then the min. of 6-month work experience would apply.</td>
<td><strong>Québec</strong> - government nominates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
2.3 Comparative analysis of the offshore eligibility factors

Tables 2.3 and 2.4 allow for comparative analysis of the key eligibility factors of the Australian and Canadian provincial streams. Comments regard the permanent offshore migration streams: the family-supported migration, employer-driven migration and migration of the independent people selected by the state/territory and the provincial governments. In the former case, the state/territory sponsored SIR visa is also included. Two pre-application assessment factors (age and language ability), core factors of skill levels (qualifications), nominated occupation and recent work experience are covered. Another core factor from the Canadian provinces discussed here is the pre-arranged employment offer. Examination of the skilled shortages from Australia and the Canadian provinces closes this Section.

Examination of these factors shows what benefits these migrants might bring to their jurisdictions and reveals how well the adopted measures address the population and economic policies’ objectives. The excerpts from the Australian state/territory and the Canadian provincial immigration and/or population strategies (see Section 1.7 in Chapter One) point to three similar objectives: address the uneven population distribution, including of migrants (improve dispersal of migrants); support the population growth; and respond to skills shortages (the background for these objectives in appears in Appendix I). Building on the Australian and Canadian policy-specific application of the key concepts of ‘skills’ and ‘region’ and the divergent constitutional responsibilities in the matter of immigration in both countries introduced in Chapter One, this Section highlights differences in responses to these similar policy objectives.

2.3.1 Age and language ability

Tables 2.3 and 2.4 show that, in general, the age factor is more liberally applied by the Canadian provinces, compared to Australia, and that not all provinces set the age limits. Québec constitutes an exception. This more open approach reflects the shared constitutional responsibility for migration matters in Canada, which enables the provincial governments to control the key eligibility factors. In Australia, immigration is a federal responsibility, which results in some federal benchmarks being provided under the regional and state/territory skilled migration streams.
Accordingly, the age limit for regional and state/territory sponsored skilled migrants in Australia is the same as under the Australian federal, independent skilled migration. The only concession made available to individuals older than 45 years exists under the RSMS. That standard age limit suggests that Australia is interested in migrants with long working-life span. This is intended to address the economic policy objective of filling skills shortages.

By contrast, in the Canadian provinces with age limits, one can observe that skilled people above the age of 45 may qualify under all streams: the family-linked migration, employer-linked migration and the independent stream (Table 2.4). Age limits for the employer-linked migrants differ, illustrating the implementation of shared responsibility for immigration matters. Such limits as 50 (New Brunswick), 60 (Nova Scotia) or 65 (Newfoundland and Labrador) may be attractive to older applicants that would not qualify in Australia. Also, the family-linked stream and the independent streams in Manitoba are more open to older applicants than the corresponding Australian schemes (49/53 versus 45 years of age, respectively). Since all these provinces have recently experienced either minimal population growth/stagnation, or decline (see Subsection I.3.2 in Appendix I), this may suggest that the latter trends are of primary concern to the governments. On the other hand, such an approach may be ineffective in addressing demographic concerns. These provinces are among the oldest in Canada (Manitoba excepted; see Subsection I.3.3 in Appendix I). Only Québec seems to have adopted an uncompromising line of not awarding points for applicants aged 40 years and older.

Language skills constitute an important work ‘tool’ for skilled migrants. This is where the Australian and the Canadian provincial criteria appear to converge, although in some provinces the ways of proving one’s linguistic ability are more liberal than in Australia. Principally, it is required that migrants document their sufficient language skills, which is crucial for the non-native English (and French in Canada) speakers. For that purpose, results from an internationally recognised language test are required. IELTS is the only common test used in both countries, and hence its application is compared.

In Australia, the vocational English level is a standard requirement (minimum 5.0 on each of the IELTS components) for the (federal) independent skilled migrants, but some
concessions are available for the region-bound migrants. As Table 2.3 shows, all three
groups of family-sponsored migrants may migrate with a functional English level
(minimum 4.5 on each of the IELTS components). That level is also acceptable for the
skill-matched migrants selected from the SMD by state/territory governments or by
employers.

RSMS candidates are accepted with a functional English level and further concession
requires special circumstances. Their functional English level may be proved by IELTS
results, evidence of qualifications for which the instruction language was English (for
example a degree, a diploma or a trade certificate), or by a successful interview with a
DIMIA officer (DIMIA 2005d:18). State/territory sponsored independent migrants must
meet the standard vocational English level, which can be proved either by an IELTS score
or by post-secondary studies in English. Potentially, such requirements are appropriate to
address the economic policy objective of filling skills shortages (note arrangements for
language skills upgrade in Table 2.3).

Table 2.4 shows contrasting requirements for the family-linked migrants in Manitoba. They
may provide IELTS results or other educational or employment-related documents
indicating English/French as the principal language of instruction or communication (this is
also the CIC approach). They may also be interviewed by an employer (although an
employment offer is not mandatory under this stream). Under the dominating employer-
linked migration streams, and in the majority of Canadian provinces, it is the employer that
determines the language(s) ability(-ies) that the candidates must have for their positions. In
the context of the economic policy objective, this may ostensibly seem to offer less
guarantee of the language ability standards than in Australia. On the other hand, the
employer’s role in the process is understandable. These streams do not have similar federal
guaranteed standards, as in Australia, and therefore the level formally determined by
employer could impact on the quality of economic benefits.

Some provinces are more specific. For example, Prince Edward Island, which uses the
Canadian federal points system, has adopted its language ability benchmarks for assessment
purposes. That province also uses the same terminology as CIC. According to Table 2.4, its
candidates should have moderate language ability. That, using the CIC benchmarks (CIC
corresponds to a minimum of 5.0 on each of the IELTS components, which, in turn, corresponds to the vocational English level in Australia (DIMIA 2004j:36). In Nova Scotia, candidates should have basic literacy skills, which in CIC terminology would correspond to a minimum of 4.0 on each of the IELTS components. This is close to the functional English level in Australia a minimum of 4.5 on each of the IELTS components (DIMIA 2004j:29).

Therefore, the brackets of functional and vocational English levels may apply as they do in Australia. In Prince Edward Island and in such provinces as Saskatchewan or New Brunswick, similar to Manitoba family-linked migration alternative documents are accepted, too. Table 2.4 also indicates that independent skilled migrants (both streams) nominated by Manitoba are subject to similar requirements as family and employer-linked nominees.

2.3.2 Job offer status and the skill levels (qualifications)

Employment offers and skill levels are essential eligibility factors in the context of the economic policies' objectives in Australia and Canada. As noted, Australia offers a wider range of migration options to skilled migrants than the corresponding Canadian provincial schemes, where the employer-recommended migration dominates. This difference is embedded the policy application of 'skills' in each country as well in the dispersal measures.

Skill levels (qualifications). Whether an employment offer is a visa condition or not, in Australia the federal requirements regarding the regional and state/territory sponsored migrants' skill levels are fairly uniform and strict. The policy limits the skill levels to ASCO-II Major Groups One to Four, just like in the case of independent (federal) skilled migrants. This means that only candidates with qualifications at any of these levels (from university to trades) can be considered for skilled regional and state/territory sponsored migration. Level III trade certificates (Major Group Four covers trade occupations) are the lowest suitable for migration under the family-linked and independent state/territory sponsored migration (DIMIA 2004j:6; Appendix IV). RSMS candidates should preferably fall within the brackets of the same levels. Although the lowest qualifications accepted are

---

5 These groups are: Major Group One - Managers and Administrators; Major Group Two - Professionals; Major Group Three - Associate Professionals; and Major Group Four - Tradespersons and Related Workers. See Appendix IV for further details.
at diploma level, trade certificates are considered to be at this level or higher (DIMIA 2005d:15). Table 2.3 shows how exceptional nominations for RSMS may be made if the position requires less than a diploma level.

Application of the strict skill levels enables regions, states and territories to welcome migrants with high skills, at levels consistent across Australia. Importantly, they are identical to those applicable to federal skilled migrants, thus ensuring that targeted areas receive migrants who are not less skilled. This simple, yet innovative, policy solution is aimed at addressing the trend of the in-migration of people without any qualifications into non-metropolitan areas, as well as balancing the net losses of professionals and tradespeople (ASCO-II Major Groups Two and Four) suffered by these areas through internal migration (see Subsection I.4.2 in Appendix I). Setting the minimal skill levels at the diploma level and higher may also potentially help improve the proportion of people with post-school qualifications in rural areas (see Subsection I.4.1 in Appendix I). These benchmarks apply to family-linked and independent program migrants, where no employment offers are required. Some exceptional grounds may be considered in the case of RSMS.

Another criterion narrowing the skill levels’ application is the SOL. It is a list of skilled occupations used by DIMIA for federal, independent permanent migration to Australia, covering selected occupations from ASCO-II eligible skill levels (DIMIA 2004j:6; 2005n). SOL is periodically reviewed to reflect labour market needs. Occupations for nomination under the regional family-linked and state/territory sponsored independent streams are limited to SOL. This is intended to ensure that migrants without pre-arranged employment offers are able to find employment quickly. Only RSMS candidates do not need to have occupations from SOL. However, they do have occupations from SOL if they are nominated from the SMD. If the employer nominates them through other means, certification of their position by a RCB is required (see details in Table 2.3).

Furthermore, where states and territories customise entry criteria to their particular needs (state/territory sponsored migration), state/territory and/or regional shortages lists apply, and they conform to the SOL skill levels, too. This highlights two issues. First, it strengthens the observation that in comparison to the federal permanent skilled migration,
the state/territory and regional schemes allow entry of people who are not less skilled, and exceptions are limited. Second, the Australian jurisdictions may compete for migrants in terms of occupations in demand, but not by differentiated skill levels. These lists are innovative solutions, ensuring that those who arrive have skills that are in demand in a particular geographic area that is eligible for their settlement.

Finally, all candidates for regional family-linked and state/territory sponsored skilled migration are subject to a skills assessment. This is a requirement for federal independent skilled migrants, too. The relevant assessment authority certifies candidates’ qualifications and skills as suitable for their nominated occupation from SOL (DIMIA 2004j:6). Such assessment is an integral and a mandatory element of the application procedure, and its results advise DIMIA that an individual is job-ready in Australia. Hence, it serves both migration and professional purposes. Procedures for the RSMS candidates, with regard to the skills assessment, depend on their circumstances (see Table 2.3).

Settlement of selected skilled migrants is also assisted by a combination of federal and state/territory criteria. The family-linked regional migrants and the RSMS migrants may only settle in the Designated Areas determined by the governments (family-linked) and in the regional or low population growth (RSMS) areas. On the other hand, these visas are federally managed. For example, an employer interested in sponsoring an individual under RSMS deals directly with DIMIA, while the local input is provided by a RCB. RCB’s advice is then taken by DIMIA in processing the application (see Table 2.3). The state/territory sponsored schemes provided to the governments enable them to establish their own criteria in addition to those that are federally guaranteed. Unlike the visas for the Designated Areas, STNI has no geographically specific focus and entire jurisdictions are eligible for settlement. On the other hand, to best use migrants’ skills, the governments use skills audits to limit the settlement of migrants to areas where their skills are in demand, for example to areas outside the largest cities, such as Melbourne. Such guarantees of skill levels and migrants’ dispersal enable offering a suite of migration options beyond the employer-linked regional migration.

6 Recent survey of SDAS migrants (DIMIA 2005b) indicates that issues related to post-arrival non-recognition of qualifications and experience results in some migrants not working in their preferred occupations. See Chapter Four, Subsection 4.2.1. A national approach to licensing in trades is being drafted (Council of Australian Governments (COAG) 2005:2).
Strict policy application of skill levels, nominated occupations from SOL and state/territory and regional lists, and employment offers if relevant, in combination with Designated Areas and other dispersal measures, suggest that these policy measures are potentially suitable to address the policy population objectives of growth and dispersal as well as economic objectives. The deliverable benefits include new residents settling in eligible areas and also possessing skills relevant to the labour market that may be either immediately employed or in demand. These measures seem also potentially able to impact positively on the trends of the internal migration of occupational groups referred to above, and presented in Appendix I (Subsection I.4.2). The joint management of the policy by the federal and state/territory governments makes the responsibility for their outcomes joint, too. The policy in Australia operates under the ‘umbrella’ of the federal government.

Under the Canadian provincial programs, the governments determine, independently of the federal government, the skilled occupations in demand. This allows for the abandoning (lowering) of the federal requirement of the skill levels and the skill type. As a result, the policy application of the concept of ‘skills’ by the provincial policies is less strict than in Australia. At the federal Canadian level, all NOC-II skill levels A, B and the skill type 0 are eligible for skilled independent migration (CIC 2002d:1). These generally correspond to the Australian ASCO-II Major Groups One to Four. Yet, Canada, does not use its equivalent of SOL, which would limit the number of eligible occupations for migration, in line with labour market needs.

This effective lack of a SOL-like measure explains the strong preference of the Canadian provincial governments for a pre-arranged employment offer. Since no such offer is necessary under the federal skilled migration program, the provincial approach is innovative because it ensures nominees’ immediate participation in the labour market, where the shortage has been identified. This delivers better economic outcomes than the CIC program and remains in line with the provincial policies’ objectives. Under such circumstances, the lower skill levels that are permitted become less important, although they constitute a different feature in comparison to Australia.

7 These skill levels are: A - occupations usually require university education; B - occupations usually require college education or apprenticeship training and skill type 0 are management occupations. See Appendix V for further details.
An examination of the approaches used to determine skill levels across the Canadian provinces reveals a generally open attitude, as well as a reliance on employers to signal areas of skills shortages, which they are unable to fill from the local/Canadian labour market. Four provinces have practically no specific shortages’ lists that employers should observe. Alberta entirely relies on employers demonstrating the shortage. Saskatchewan allows all occupations falling into NOC-II skill levels A and B, as well as apprentice-able trades (Such an open approach is a result of a major change the program underwent in January 2005, moving away from targeting merely 12 occupations; DGR SK 2005g:3). This province, and Australia where a similar scheme was introduced in November 2005, may be interested in comparing their respective schemes’ outcomes once their schemes have matured in a couple of years’ time. Their initiatives show that innovative policies are being developed, which will ultimately serve to expand the programs.

Until late May 2005, Manitoba required employment offers from NOC-II skill level C and all skill level D occupations that were placed on its Restricted Occupations List (MLI 2004d:23). Now it operates on a basis of revisited Occupational Requirements List, which covers licensed and other restricted occupations, and where an employment offer may be required. In comparison to the previous list, the majority of level D occupations and some level C occupations have been removed, eliminating, too, the previous need for a job offer, thus making Manitoba more accessible (MLI 2005b:24). This province appears the most open at Canada’s scale, allowing for the migration of people with skills levels A–D.

---

\(^8\) This visa was introduced as a pilot program (DIMIA 2005g:5). It is anticipated that until Australia brings in a regional trade skills training visa for apprentices, Saskatchewan, with its permanent residency offer for apprentices, may be the more attractive option. The implementation of this training visa in Australia may have three-fold consequences. First, it may soften the generally strict rules regarding eligible skill levels, which so far have constituted a significant difference between Australia and Canada. Second, states and territories may favour, as in case of SIR, having their own state/territory lists of trades in demand rather than a national list (if found necessary), effectively increasing their role in influencing the skilled migrants they would like to retain. If this occurred, Australian regional migration policy would involve a higher degree of individual states’ and territories’ decisions, yet not quite resembling the Canadian style. Third, if Saskatchewan remained the only province welcoming apprentices, as opposed to apprentice regional migration in Australia, the latter could become more attractive to potential applicants than Saskatchewan most likely thanks to offering settlement options across regional areas in the whole country as opposed to one jurisdiction.

\(^7\) NOC-II skill level C are occupations usually requiring secondary school and/or occupation-specific training. NOC-II skill level D covers occupations where on-the-job training is usually provided. See Appendix V for further details. In Manitoba, skill level C eligible occupations included some ‘Clerical Occupations’; ‘Assisting Occupations in Support of Health Services’; some ‘Intermediate Sales and Service Occupations’; ‘Truck Drivers’ and some occupations from ‘Processing and Manufacturing, Machine Operators and Assemblers’. Level D occupations were ‘Elemental Sales and Service Occupations’; ‘Trade Helpers, Construction Labourers and Related Occupations’; ‘Labourers in Primary Industry’ and ‘Labourers in Processing, Manufacturing and Utilities’ (MLI 2004d:23).
(unskilled). In Québec, candidates recommended by employers must meet the conditions governing access to the occupation as per NOC-II (see Table 2.4).

Table 2.4 shows that British Columbia and Newfoundland and Labrador use industry (sectoral) lists while New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island rely on lists of specific occupations. The latter two have single lower-skilled (skill level C) occupations on their lists (DB NB n.d.a:1; DDT PE n.d.f:1). The Strategic Sector List in Newfoundland and Labrador is too general to determine whether such occupations are sought, but considering that manufacturing, natural resources and tourism are all listed (DITRD NL n.d.i:1), it may be the case. In all these provinces (except Prince Edward Island), nomination is possible for a position falling outside the list, if sufficiently justified.

The open Manitoba approach means that the family-linked and the two independent Manitoba streams nominees may use occupations from any skill levels for nomination. Yet, as Table 2.4 shows, if they nominate an occupation from the Occupations Requirements List, they may sometimes need an employment offer. In Québec, the independent-skilled migrants must have an occupation from one of the two lists currently in force (MICC QC 2004h:2; 2004f; 2004g)\(^6\). Such an approach resembles that of SOL and state/territory shortages lists, and ensures the employability of migrants after arrival.

Such an open attitude to determining the skill levels and occupations for provincial migration is reflected in the range of considered formal qualifications. In many cases lower qualifications are considered on a regular basis. It may be observed that family-linked nominees in Manitoba may be accepted with a minimum of one-year of post-secondary education/training (Table 2.4).\(^11\) Independent Manitoba nominees (both streams) must have as a minimum requirement completed secondary school education. That is also the lowest level for some occupations listed on the Occupations in Demand Program in Québec.

---
\(^6\) MICC QC and MRCI QC, also referred to in this thesis, are the same Ministry. Since the precise date of the name change of the Ministry could not be located, but some Québec documents from 2004 bear a different name to www.mrci.gouv.qc.ca, all these documents and documents from 2005 (some under the www.micc.gouv.qc.ca domain), regardless of the name, are classified as MICC QC, and other documents, clearly under the www.mrci.gouv.qc.ca, as MRCI QC.

\(^11\) In Australia, if a one year of experience relevant to a nominated position (one year of experience corresponds to level II certificate) the lowest acceptable under "exceptional" grounds in RSMS) were to be considered, it could only be for a person that has previously worked in that position and on "exceptional" grounds (DIMIA 2005d:16). There is no other regional or state/territory stream where such lower skills could be considered.
Similarly, secondary school education (grade 12 or equivalent in Nova Scotia) for employer-recommended nominees in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador is acceptable. Note that in Québec and in the Atlantic provinces (Nova Scotia excepted), candidates are points-tested and such low qualifications would need to be compensated for by other factors. In general, the Canadian provincial approaches under all three entry streams seem more open towards lower skilled migrants than it is the case under the Australian schemes.

The above examples demonstrate that when decisions regarding the eligible skill levels and occupations are taken individually by each government, and independently from the federal government, this results in some provinces providing an option for, and constituting an attractive destination for, those potential lower-skilled migrants that would not qualify under the strict Australian rules, or could only be considered on ‘exceptional’ grounds under RSMS. Under such arrangements, it is possible that the Canadian provincial policies may deliver slightly different outcomes in comparison to the Australian schemes. This difference however does not completely offset the focus on higher skilled nominees. Canada and Australia have similar motivations in attracting these higher skilled individuals.

Considering that a pre-arranged employment offer is, in the majority of cases, an important difference among the Canadian federal and provincial programs, and an innovative solution in the latter case, nominees must be ready for the job market and able to commence working immediately after landing. In Australia, this is handled through applying the federal skills assessment requirement to all migration streams (exception may apply for RSMS). The Canadian provinces have adopted an approach that is closer to the Australian model than to the Canadian federal solution.

In Canada, assessment for federal skilled migration and for professional purposes under the (federal) independent migration stream are separate. Assessment for migration purposes is performed by a Canadian immigration officer and a regulatory body then assesses skills for professional purposes after landing. Prospective skilled migrants may obtain credentials assessment prior to migration, yet this does not guarantee that they will be recognised by a regulatory body (and thus a license will be issued) or by an employer (CIC 2005a:1).

12 On the other hand, Prince Edward Island requires all its nominees to have a baccalaureate degree, or college/trade school equivalent and minimum 14 years of education (DDT PE n.d.g:1).
Interviews with two senior officers of assessment bodies that the CIC website (2005a:2) provides links to, confirmed this. There is a missing link between the assessment and the requirements of the labour market.

Most regulatory bodies are not set up to assess foreign credentials prior to migration (Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials (CICIC) 2002:8). This means that it is generally not possible to gain licensure, certification or registration before landing. Only in some regulated professions can a pre-landing initial assessment be obtained (2002:8). Rules governing regulated occupations are complex, too. Professions are regulated by provincial regulatory bodies, and trades are regulated directly by the provinces (Brouwer 1999:9). The same professions are not regulated in all provinces and territories (1999:10,11). The interprovincial portability of qualifications is limited to a group of trades.). Going through such a maze of rules after landing is slowing labour market integration of new Canadian permanent residents.

Under these circumstances, to make the employer-linked streams work, the Canadian provinces are more demanding than the Canadian federal government in requiring that nominees recommended by employers meet the registration and licensing criteria prior to migration. Since in the majority of cases it is not possible to become fully licensed prior to migration, most provinces accept nominees if they meet the minimum criteria.

This is illustrated by Table 2.4: the employer-recommended nominees in British Columbia, Québec and Newfoundland and Labrador must obtain a temporary license or another confirmation from the relevant regulatory body (or assessment agency) confirming that they can practice in the nominated occupation. A number of temporary solutions are also acceptable by Manitoba, if the applicant’s work experience is from an occupation on the

---

13 Interviews took place on 17 March 2003 and 22 March 2003.
14 Considerable efforts are now being directed towards improving access to regulated and non-regulated occupations, facilitating the integration of newcomers. There has been a whole of government commitment to this process (see for example Government of Canada 2001:4; 2002:5; 2004:9). The April 2005 announcements are part of these efforts. They contain measures to improve professional recognition, market-oriented language training and bridging initiatives (HRSDC 2005c:1–3). Funding is also provided for the improvement of the ‘Going to Canada’ portal (2005b:2). By comparison, a comprehensive, up-to-date web portal containing information relating to recognition and licensing in Australia will also be made available, as revealed in the April 2005 Australian announcements (DIMIA 2005e).
Occupational Requirements List (see Table 2.4).\textsuperscript{15} The Table also shows that in Alberta candidates must meet the employer and industry standards and employer explains how credentials will be recognised. Considering that 80 per cent of the candidates presented to the PNP in this province, as revealed by a senior Albertan government official,\textsuperscript{16} are temporary foreign workers, the steps to full recognition are likely to be underway already. In New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, meeting the minimum criteria is less straightforward. Yet, obtaining full license may take several months and documents from New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island refer to the need to prove eligibility in order to work in an occupation. Hence, it may be assumed that meeting the minimum criteria suffices to commence working.

It can be concluded that demanding that Canadian provincial nominees be eligible to work in their nominated occupations is another innovative solution (in comparison to the Canadian federal program for skilled independent migrants), complementing the innovative pre-arrival employment requirement, and ensuring that nominees under these and other provincial streams are immediately employable. This enables better policy outcomes than under the Canadian federal program for skilled migrants. Furthermore, this is an aspect where the Australian and the Canadian provincial policy instruments converge.

Considering the open attitude towards the skill levels and eligible occupations, domination of the employer-recommended provincial migration linked with the skills assessment is understandable for two reasons. First, in the light of the policy understanding of ‘regions’, where entire jurisdictions are eligible, the local knowledge that employers possess is indispensable. Contrary to Australia, no RCBs equivalents are involved in the certification of employers’ nominations and so the provincial governments would need to have comprehensive, up-to-date knowledge on shortages across their entire jurisdictions. Hence, employers are the best conduits of information, and engaging them directly in the policy implementation is an innovative and reasonable solution.

\textsuperscript{15} Note that where an employment offer is a prerequisite for an application (in employer-linked and international student streams) criteria regarding eligibility to work communicated by Manitoba and presented in Table 2.4 are concise in comparison to other streams. It may be understood that if a license or another form of confirmation were necessary, the employer would need to ensure that in the first place. By contrast, where an employment offer is typically unnecessary, in other streams, employability of nominees in regulated occupations must be proven prior to consideration of application by Manitoba PNP and hence the list of possible ways to do so is provided (see options in Family Support-Priority Assessment Stream).

\textsuperscript{16} Interview took place on 22 March 2003.
Second, under the liberal policy application of the skill levels and occupations in shortage, where there is no specific shortages list, a significant part of NOC-II occupations is eligible, or the shortage occurs in an occupation that is not typically in shortage, a genuine employment offer provides a balance. For that offer to be taken up immediately, a nominee must be deemed eligible via a skills assessment. Under such an approach, it would be risky to allow in individuals with just any skills, which explains incidence of the non-employer linked streams.

It can be concluded that the employment offer approach has a triple function. First, it offers the benefit of immediately employing suitably skilled individuals in positions that have been identified as experiencing shortages (the lower skill effect is then diminished). Second, such provincial migrants typically bring family members with them, thus increasing population levels. This aspect of the policies is essential for some Canadian provinces, such as the Atlantic region, Manitoba or Saskatchewan. As shown in Appendix I (Subsection I.3.2), their population trends have been rather unfavourable, with net population losses suffered through internal migration (Prince Edward Island excepted), and low, or in some cases, negative population growth rates in recent years. The importance of these population-related concerns is confirmed by Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia in their intention/policy documents (see Section 1.7 in Chapter One). Third, the employment offer is linked to a particular location, and under the Canadian policy understanding of ‘region’ taking it up corresponds to the benefit of having a “balanced geographic distribution of immigrants” (see Section 1.7 in Chapter One). The Canadian provincial governments have not adopted a strict approach, as shown in Australia, to determining particular areas eligible for settlement, but the ‘soft measures’, mentioned in Chapter One, assist in dispersal away from Vancouver and Montréal.

All in all, these benefits suggest that the employment offer approach is potentially able to address the economic, population growth and dispersal policies’ objectives. It should also be observed that its functions correspond to those of the policy instruments applied in the Australian schemes. In combination with the skills assessment, both Canadian and Australian measures appear to constitute a set of policy instruments potentially capable of meeting their respective policies’ objectives. They also demonstrate that divergent policy measures are adopted to address them.
2.3.3 Work experience

Work experience is another core eligibility factor. In Australia, the regional family-linked and Skill Matching Visa applicants may qualify with concessional (shorter than standard) periods of recent work experience (see Box 2.1 and Table 2.3). As under the remaining categories of the General Migration Stream, this work experience may be from any SOL occupation.\(^1\) By comparison, the family-linked migration stream in Manitoba requires longer work experience than the federal skilled workers in Canada must possess.

In the case of RSMS, the work experience is not specified by DIMIA but skilled-independent candidates on SMD, who can be nominated for RSMS, need to meet the standard recent work experience requirements (see Box 2.1 and Table 2.3). The Canadian provinces are typically liberal. For example, Table 2.4 shows that British Columbia does not determine the minimum work experience period at all. The Eastern provinces show the greatest flexibility by considering work experience in the intended occupation that has taken place over the last five or ten years. In some provinces, this experience must be in the nominated occupation.

Table 2.4 shows that General Stream applicants in Manitoba and candidates for the Employability and Occupational Mobility Program in Québec must have a minimum six months of work experience in the past ten years, while candidates for the other independent Québec stream must demonstrate a minimum six months of work experience in their nominated occupation. These periods are shorter than under the Canadian federal economic stream criteria. On the whole, it may be concluded that Canadian provinces have generally adopted a more open approach than Australia to determining the minimum work experience. This is possible thanks to the pre-arranged employment offers made by employers convinced of the suitability of the skilled migrants for the nominated positions. Despite these differences, that eligibility factor seems also potentially able to ensure that the Australian and the Canadian jurisdictions obtain the targeted economic benefits of filling in their shortages with suitably skilled individuals.

\(^1\) Depending on the number of points that an occupation is valid, different periods of required work experience apply (DIMIA 2004j:6; 2005n).
Further to that, the skills and work experience requirements adopted under the Australian and Canadian regional migration policies illustrate how regions are helped to participate in the knowledge-based economy by being facilitated access to learning and innovation. These are proposed as means of regional development by the ‘learning region’ concept noted in the literature review. How migrants’ skills are defined for the purposes of these policies and what benefits may their employment potentially bring is central in explaining their relevance to this theoretical proposition. The ‘skills’ and work experience requirements are principal practical means intended to help regions to boost their human capital. The age and language ability eligibility factors are important yet operational means (conducts) in that process. Defining skills acceptable for regional migration in Australia as per highest skill levels and further limiting them to occupations in demand, as well as allowing regional employers to nominate migrants for genuine vacancies that cannot be locally filled (see Table 2.3), illustrate how the policies assist in building up that capital in regions with an intention to enable businesses to continue and/or enhance their operations, and to become more competitive. This may involve knowledge acquisition: transfer of overseas-gained skills and expertise to local employees.

Despite a more open approach to defining skill levels and occupations for provincial migration in Canada, the dominant employer-driven streams similarly assist in building and enhancing the human capital to enable businesses to continue and/or expand their operations and to become more competitive. For example, the very name of the ‘Strategic Occupations’ stream in British Columbia (Table 2.4) implies that these nominees are expected to fill critical gaps holding the company’s operations back. Indeed, as Table 2.4 shows, those migrants are expected to develop/use new knowledge, skills or technologies and must possess considerable education and experience. To recruit international students, British Columbia employers must demonstrate that the individual will fill a current shortage or meet future skilled work needs and future business development plans must be attached.

In Alberta, nominees may only fill critical positions and employers must specify how Alberta will benefit from that and how employers will be trained (Table 2.4). British Columbia and Saskatchewan offer streams for key managers and administrators (classified in this thesis along with business migration streams, see Table 3.6 in Chapter Three) - Saskatchewan terms its stream ‘Critical Occupations’. The Eastern provinces emphasise that nominees should fill a critical skill shortage, where a position cannot be locally filled.
Such requirements (see Table 2.4) illustrate that the Canadian provincial eligibility factors may also result in skills and expertise transfer from overseas, whilst responding to critical shortages. In evolving global economic environment, that connection to international knowledge and practices that migrants may offer, may help integrate Australian and Canadian regional firms into the global economy. Thus, these eligibility factors are practical applications of deliberate support to regions, to help them participate in the knowledge-based economy, as per the principles of learning and innovation proposed by the ‘learning region’ concept.

2.3.4 Comparison of skills shortages

The Australian and the Canadian provincial governments have converging interests in seeking migrants in some highly skilled occupations, which corresponds to the identified employment patterns and the demand for specialists in different industries (Appendix I). To identify the areas of direct competition, contents of the shortages lists from Australia (state/territory and regional lists) and Canada were compared. In the latter case, the industry (sectoral) lists were also used, along with other indications of shortages.

This comparison reveals that the health care, engineering and agricultural professions are the most competitive. The health care sector appears to be short of almost any specialisation across the Australian states and territories (DED TAS 2005b; SMP VIC n.d.h; Immigration SA 2004a; DIR WA 2005e; DEET NT 2005; DSDI QLD 2005g gateway site; DSRD NSW n.d.e gateway site). British Columbia and Saskatchewan have special PNP streams for health care professionals (MCAWS BC n.d.r; n.d.n.;18 DGR SK 2005c; 2005d). Other Canadian provinces have them on the occupational shortages lists (MICC QC 2004f; DB NB n.d.a; OED NS 2004; DDT PE n.d.f), or welcome them otherwise (MED AB 2004a; MLI 2005b; DITRD NL n.d.i).

These shortages, current at 2005, also correspond to the observations made by the interviewees in both countries in 2003.19 In fact, with a few exceptions, health care was the

---

18 Initial review of BC PNP categories performed at the beginning of 2005 was updated in May 2005 when British Columbia added a new stream for midwives (MCAWS BC n.d.m). This confirms that policies continue to be developed and innovative strategies are being used to meet the labour market needs.

19 A number of interviewees mentioned shortages of various health professionals. In Australia, this trend was observed by one senior Tasmanian government official on 4 November 2003; one Victorian senior government official on 28 October 2003; two RCBs from regional Victoria on 28 October 2003, and on 30
first sector to rate a mention. These shortages correspond to the needs of the changing demographic profile of Australian and Canadian populations. In the light of the targeting of health professionals by all jurisdictions in Australia, and the reported net migration losses from the non-metropolitan areas in some Australian states (1991–96), as well as growth in employment in non-metropolitan regions of Australia in 1986–96 (see Subsection I.4.2 in Appendix I), it can be understood that, regardless of the trends, there are needs that have yet to be met. This is why governments are seeking specialists abroad. Similarly, despite absolute employment growth in this sector in Rural and Small Town areas in Canada (RSTs), there still seem to be needs that have not been met, prompting the Canadian provincial governments (employers) to seek specialists abroad. Indeed, some Canadian provinces, such as the Prairie ones, rely heavily on foreign-trained (especially South African) doctor-nominees in their regional areas. Once fully accredited, they are free to move anywhere and the widely held perception is that a large percentage of the South African doctors recruited to the Prairies ends up in Vancouver or Toronto (Grant 2004:11). Moreover, the demand for health professionals outside of the largest cities in both Australia and Canada may be partially driven by the internal migration of retirees, which is a manifestation of the lifestyle-driven migration (see Subsections I.3.1 and I.4.2 in Appendix I).

Engineers and some engineering associate professionals (technicians) are in high demand in almost every jurisdiction, although different specialisations are targeted. The mainstream ones include civil, electronics and mechanical engineers. There is also a shortage of aeronautical engineers in Victoria (SMP VIC n.d.h), aircraft maintenance engineers in

October 2003, respectively; an officer from one of the regional development boards in South Australia on 10 November 2003; a regionally-based Western Australia government official on 17 November 2003; RCB from regional Western Australia at 17 November; g) RCB from regional Queensland on 24 November 2003; and one senior New South Wales government official on 11 August 2003. In Canada, shortages of health professionals were mentioned for example by one senior British Columbia government official on 17 March 2003; one senior Albertan government official on 22 March 2003; and one Québec academic on 31 March 2003.

31 Definition of Rural and Small Town areas (RSTs) can be found in Box I.4 in Appendix I.

21 The description of employment trends in different industries referred to here can be found in Subsection 1.4.2 in Appendix I.

22 Further documentation of the reliance on South African doctors in the Prairies is provided. A comparison of numbers of practising South African-trained physicians in Saskatchewan and South Africa’s Northern Cape, which have roughly the same population of one million, has shown that, in 2000, there were 263 practising physicians in Saskatchewan and 332 in the Northern Cape. Alternatively, if the Prairie provinces are considered jointly and have population of 5.4m, roughly equal to that of South Africa’s Northern Province, there were more South African-trained physicians practising in the Prairies (582) than in the Northern Province (545). In Manitoba alone, for every three new South African registrants, two are deleted (Grant 2004:10–1).
Victoria and the Northern Territory (SMP VIC n.d.h; DEET NT 2005), qualified aerospace technicians in British Columbia (MCAWS BC n.d.p), and aircraft maintenance and construction occupations in two Eastern provinces (MICC QC 2004g; 2004f; DDT PE n.d.f). Aerospace is also a priority sector in Newfoundland and Labrador (DITRD NL n.d.i). Therefore, some Canadian jurisdictions may be competing with Victoria and the Northern Territory for specialists.

There may be even more competition for mining engineers that may choose to settle in any of the three Australian states targeting them (Immigration SA 2004a; DIR WA 2005e; DSDI QLD 2005g gateway site); although, Canadian provinces have similar shortages (OED NS 2004; DITRD NL n.d.i). Shortages of these professionals were similarly observed during interviews in British Columbia and in Queensland. This is no surprise since both countries are resource-rich. Furthermore, mining is a targeted sector for the business component of some PNPs (see Table 3.7 in Chapter Three).

Further, agricultural and related occupations are targeted by Australian and Canadian jurisdictions and often through the business component of the Canadian PNPs. In Australia, Victoria is short of horticulturalists (SMP VIC n.d.h) and Western Australia seeks mixed crop and livestock farmers, stock and station agents, as well as agricultural scientists and technical officers (DIR WA 2005e). Queensland is short of nurserypersons (DSDI QLD 2005g gateway site). Furthermore, two Australian business community leaders saw good prospects for value-added horticulture production. Agricultural occupations are also on SOL and may be used to migrate to states considering applications for the SIR visa on the basis of SOL (Tasmania, Victoria, South Australia). Strengthening the agricultural sector in Australia may be assisted by sponsored business migration, as states and territories may nominate farmers. A special welcome for farmers interested in becoming business migrants is extended by Tasmania (DED TAS 2004e).

In Alberta, its Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development participates in developing business cases for the nomination of skilled workers (MED AB 2004a). Further east, Québec seeks agriculture, forestry and fishing specialists through its ‘List of Favoured

23 In British Columbia this was mentioned by a senior government official on 17 March 2003 and in Australia by a Queensland government official on 20 November 2003.
24 They were interviewed on 5 November 2003 and on 18 August 2003, respectively.
Training" (MICC QC 2004f). Farm entrepreneurs are targeted through the shortage list in Prince Edward Island (DDT PE n.d.f). In Newfoundland and Labrador, agricultural and agrifoods, as well as fisheries, are strategic sectors (DITRD NL n.d.i). In fact, in this province, the Strategic Sector List is used for the purposes of skilled and business nominations (DITRD NL n.d.e; n.d.a). Furthermore, PNP business streams targeting farmers are operated by Saskatchewan and Manitoba (see Subsection 3.3.4 in Chapter Three). Despite the reported declining employment in non-metropolitan regions in Australia (1986–96) and in RSTs in Canada, there appears to be a need for some specialist skills in both countries.

The demand for teachers observed more often by the regionally based Australian interviewees than in Canadian provinces, appears to continue to be more acute in the former.25 According to the lists, secondary school teachers are needed in particular (DED TAS 2005b; SMP VIC n.d.h; Immigration SA 2004a; DEET NT 2005; DSRD NSW n.d.e gateway site). Western Australia targets vocational education (trades) teachers for nominations to regions (DIR WA 2005e). In Canada only two provinces target educational professionals: British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. Converse to Australia, there is a need for post-secondary (MCAWS BC n.d.o) and university teachers (DDT PE n.d.f), but the open approach enables all teachers to become nominees. Despite the noted general growth in employment in the education industry in the non-metropolitan regions of Australia (1986–96), the shortages present on the Australian lists indicate that the education sector continues to offer employment opportunities and that migrants are seen as a group potentially able to alleviate these pressures.

The situation with the education sector in Canada requires an explanation. Considering that shortages exist - according to two lists - at the post-secondary and university level, and that RST areas that have experienced fluctuating employment rates in the education sector comprise only areas with populations between 1,000–9,999, migrants in this sector may rather be nominated for positions in larger centres. Nationally, the proportion of older university and college professors was higher in 2001 than in 1991; this may eventually lead

25 Shortages of teaching professionals were mentioned in Australia by a senior Tasmanian government official on 4 November 2003; two RCBs from regional Victoria on 28 and 30 October 2003, respectively; and an officer from one of the regional development boards in South Australia on 10 November 2003. In Canada, shortages of teachers were mentioned by a senior British Columbia government official on 17 March 2003.
to shortages (Statistics Canada 2003b:10–11). The fact that two provinces already recognise higher education as an area that is experiencing shortages suggests that the shortages occurring at a provincial level are being evened nationally.

In regards to specialists in the financial services industry, two interviewees from regional Australia observed shortages of accountants. Accountants are in demand in the majority of Australian jurisdictions (DED TAS 2005b; DIR WA 2005e; DEET NT 2005; DSDI QLD 2005g gateway site; DSRD NSW n.d.e gateway site) but less so in Canada (MCAWS BC 2004b; DB NB n.d.a). The noted net losses of finance and insurance specialists through internal migration from non-metropolitan Australia (1991–96) and the decline in employment in inland and remote regions (1986–96) suggest that such a shortage may have been the case earlier, although it seems that it is selective in terms of location in non-metropolitan Australia.

In Australia, there is also strong demand for community workers and related occupations (for example, social workers, drug and alcohol counsellors and youth workers) (SMP VIC n.d.h; Immigration SA 2004a; DIR WA 2005e; DEET NT 2005; DSDI QLD 2005g gateway site; DSRD NSW n.d.e gateway site). In Canada, social workers are only targeted by Prince Edward Island (DDT PEI n.d.f). Despite the overall employment growth trend in that sector reported in Australia for the decade of 1986–96, it is interesting to observe that from these six Australian jurisdictions that currently have shortages of community workers, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia have already experienced net migration losses in that sector in their non-metropolitan areas between 1991–96 (health and community services were considered jointly).

Finally, shortages in trades were more often mentioned by Australian interviewees, as opposed to only one such comment from Canada. Shortages lists from the Australian and

---

26 These shortages were noted by an officer from one of the regional development boards in South Australia on 10 November 2003; and a RCB from regional Queensland on 24 November 2003.

27 Recently published research by Birrell and Rapson (2005) discusses the labour market consequences of international students trained locally in accounting and becoming permanent residents under the onshore status conversion provisions.

28 In Australia, shortages in various trades occupations were observed by a senior Tasmanian government official on 4 November 2003; a Victorian senior government official on 28 October 2003; a regionally based Western Australia government official on 17 November 2003; a Queensland government official on 20 November 2003; an officer from one of the regional development boards in South Australia on 10 November
Canadian jurisdictions reinforce this view, although nominations in Canada may be made for occupations from beyond the lists, too. Targeted shortages across Australia commonly include pastry cooks, electricians, hairdressers, motor mechanics, panel beaters, plumbers, metal fabricators, bricklayers, carpenters and joiners as well as chefs (associate professionals) (DED TAS 2005b; Immigration SA 2004a; SMP VIC n.d.h; DIR WA 2005e; DEET NT 2005; DSDI QLD 2005g gateway site; DSRD NSW n.d.e gateway site). In comparison, specific trades shortages in Canadian provinces, if listed, include mechanics and machinists (MICC QC 2004g; DB NB n.d.a; DDT PE n.d.f) and in the case of the first two provinces, tool and die makers.

Shortages in trade occupations recorded on the Australian lists and mentioned by the interviewees correspond to the reported widespread net migration losses of tradespersons from non-metropolitan Australia between 1991 and 1996. Although the Canadian lists suggest that shortages in trades occupations are less pressing, the observed increase in the absolute employment for example in construction in RSTs, may suggest that some opportunities for migrants exist, too. According to the 2001 Census (Statistics Canada 2003b:11), some occupations in the construction sector, as well as electricians, had large shares of older workers, which could eventually lead to shortages.

All in all, the Australian and the Canadian jurisdictions directly compete for a number of the same professions, particularly for health care professionals, engineers and various agricultural occupations. Tradespeople, especially, seem to be in shortage across Australia. Despite less evidence emanating from Canada, it can be surmised that shortages in some trade occupations may soon occur.

2.4 Onshore status conversion: temporary workers and international students

This Section compares approaches to the onshore status conversion provisions for temporary workers and international students in Australia and in the Canadian provinces. It examines what policy objectives these provisions can address and what benefits the

2003; and a senior New South Wales government official on 11 August 2003. In Canada, shortages in trades occupations were mentioned by a senior Albertan government official on 22 March 2003.
governments can obtain as a result of the permanent settlement of these migrants. It also highlights some innovative solutions. The evidence presented in this Section leads to a better characterisation of the proposed policy management strategies adopted in Australia and by the Canadian provinces.

2.4.1 Temporary workers
This Subsection focuses on the 457 visa holders who may apply for a permanent status onshore under the RSMS. This is followed by an examination of the corresponding Canadian provincial solutions for temporary foreign workers.

**Australia.** The onshore status conversion for 457 visa holders into RSMS is only possible in geographically restricted areas - the same as those eligible under the RSMS - facilitating a direct path to permanent residency. Therefore, this conversion supports the policy objectives of population growth and dispersal, as well as addresses the objective of responding to skills shortages.

Requirements for the 457 visa are established at the federal level and are identical across all eligible areas. Regional employers, as in RSMS, deal directly with DIMIA. There is an important provision that they can take advantage of when nominating a person for a 457 visa, in comparison to employers located elsewhere in Australia. The standard requirement of nominating an individual for a position within the first four ASCO-II Major Groups may be waived (DIMIA 2004p:3). To secure that waiver, employers must obtain (like those applying to have a worker nominated under the RSMS) a certification from a RCB for their nomination. A RCB certifies that the nominated activity corresponds to the tasks of the gazetted occupation, that the position is genuine, full-time, necessary for the operation of the sponsor’s business, and cannot be filled locally, and that the position will be remunerated at a level not lower than the level of remuneration provided for under relevant Australian legislation and awards (DIMIA 2004p:16). The 457 visa applicants undergo a skills assessment when there are doubts about their skills and/or experience, or when registration or licensing is required. In the latter case, they may be asked to prove that they are eligible for the registration of license (2004p:18).
Since occupations from the ASCO-II Major Groups Eight to Nine are ineligible (DIMIA 2004p:16; Appendix IV), regional employers may nominate only temporary workers for positions falling within ASCO-II Major Groups Five to Seven, remaining in line with 'exceptional' grounds for RSMS nominations. In fact, as observed in Table 2.3, this waiver is carried into 'exceptional' nominations under RSMS. There, lower skilled migrants may be nominated if they have acted in such a position for at least two years on a 457 visa. It is observed that the RSMS status conversion is managed by DIMIA with local input (certification of the position by an RCB – see Table 2.3) confirming the joint policy management strategy mentioned in the preceding Section.

That compatibility between the 457 visa and RSMS allows for seamless status change, providing uninterrupted economic benefits from employing an overseas worker, and responds to the tendency of permanent migration often involving an initial period of temporary residence. This is supported by recent statistics. In 2003–04, 9,788 individuals holding the 457 visas applied for permanent status. Almost 70 per cent were processed under the employer-linked visa classes, including RSMS, although numbers processed under that scheme were not published (DIMIA 2005l:67). Nonetheless, DIMIA observed that migrants nominated from onshore were often already employed in regions on a temporary basis (2005l:41). Such a trend had been observed previously in a RSMS survey (Cully and Goodes 2000:31). Clearly, this provision recognises the new character of global mobility, which entails an initial period of legal temporary stay, followed by permanent residence.

Observe in Table 2.3 that international students, WHM, TPV and THV visa holders (the latter two from August 2004) may apply for permanent residency onshore under the RSMS. Tapping these previously available (but not considered in the context of the regional policy) groups such as WHMs (tourists) and refugees (TPVs and THVs) should be applauded as an innovative solution. This measure expands the pool of potential regional settlers, corresponding at the same time to the policy objectives of the population growth and dispersal. It also enhances the policy potential of addressing the skilled shortages in the targeted areas. WHMs are also eligible for the SIR visa onshore (as a result of the April 2005 announcements), which further attests to the innovative character of the new policy measures. If, under that new arrangement, some of the 109,485 WHMs who arrived in
Australia in 2003–04 (DIMIA 2005f:60) applied for SIR, the overall numbers of regional settlers could be positively impacted.

The mechanisms for onshore status conversion for all these aforementioned visa holders and the 457 visa holders seem potentially able to respond to the policy objectives, as does the combination of the policy instruments used for the offshore visas (see Subsection 2.3.2). As a result of this status change, the state/territory governments may potentially obtain benefits identical to those created by the settlement of offshore permanent visa holders. Therefore, the examined onshore arrangements expand the overall efforts of the governments and it can be assumed that they will improve delivery of the targeted benefits.

Canada. Table 2.2 shows that temporary foreign workers may apply for permanent residency under PNP's across all participating provinces. Only Saskatchewan, Québec and Nova Scotia have separate streams for these candidates. Elsewhere, provisions for these workers are an integral part of the employer-driven provincial migration, and candidates must satisfy the same eligibility factors as the offshore candidates. For the purposes of the onshore status conversion, the Canadian provinces continue to use their sole powers to decide on entry requirements. Across all jurisdictions, a guaranteed employment offer requirement continues to be applied.

In the provinces, where separate streams for temporary foreign workers are maintained, the schemes do not have features that would render their outcomes dissimilar to those of the remaining jurisdictions. Note, though, that Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Newfoundland and Labrador have determined that applicants must have at least six months of work experience prior to applying (DGR SK 2005f:9; MLI 2005b:9; DITRD NL n.d.e:1).29 Such information could not be located for Québec, but if it were assumed that applicants are subject to a points-test, as the offshore applicants are, the minimum period of six months of work experience would apply.

29 British Columbia requires its prospective nominee-physicians to have worked on a temporary permit in the province for a minimum of nine months (MCAWS BC n.d.n:1). Saskatchewan determines that its potential nominate-nurses and physicians must have worked on temporary permits in the province for a minimum of six months (DGR SK 2005c:1; 2005d:1).
Temporary foreign workers have been previously tested for suitability for employment. An employment offer must have been assessed as meeting the acceptable criteria. HRSDC assesses, among other things, whether the offer is genuine and is filling a labour shortage, whether wages and working conditions are comparable to those offered to Canadians working in the same occupations, and whether reasonable efforts have been made to hire or train Canadians (2003:1-2). According to CIC (2005c:40), workers must be doing work falling within NOC-II skill levels A, B or the skill type 0. Hence, the skill levels of those who change their status onshore under the PNPss are comparable to ASCO-II Major Groups One to Four in Australia acceptable under RSMS and SIR.

Where a temporary foreign worker must have certification, licensing or registration (HRSDC 2004:2), it may be understood that provisional eligibility to work in their nominated occupation is acceptable. Likewise, in the case of the offshore skilled nominees, employers hiring temporary foreign workers determine their language skills and education in relation to the proposed employment (2004:2). This may partially explain why the provincial governments have adopted an open approach discussed earlier: some of the nominees would have initially been tested for eligibility for certification, licensing or registration before being granted a temporary status.

As in Australia, provisions for onshore status conversion across the Canadian provinces confirm that they recognise that the trend of permanent migration nowadays often involves an initial period of temporary residence. For example, it was noted earlier that 80 per cent of the candidates presented to the program were temporary foreign workers in Alberta (see Subsection 2.3.2). According to more recent estimates, the numbers of temporary foreign workers becoming Alberta nominees were, in fact, higher - 95 per cent (Huynh 2004:14). In British Columbia, nominees were former temporary foreign workers in 74 per cent of cases. These examples indicate the scale and usefulness of the onshore status conversion provision. Also, Nova Scotia reported that many of its nominees have been living and working in the province as temporary foreign workers (Province of Nova Scotia 2005:13). Overall, in 2004 there were 129,013 temporary foreign workers in Canada (CIC 2005b:69), constituting a considerable group of potential nominees.
Despite the status conversion under the PNPs being available to temporary foreign workers, as opposed to a larger group of potential migrants under the Australian schemes, that provision seems potentially capable of addressing the policies' objectives. First, a permanent employment offer delivers the benefit of continued filling of an area of skill shortage with a suitably qualified individual. Second, the continued presence of these individuals and their families maintains the population level, and, if located in 'regions' in the Canadian policy understanding, they also deliver the benefit of a "balanced geographic distribution of immigrants" (see Section 1.7 in Chapter One). This means that Canadian provinces may potentially obtain the same types of benefits as elicited from the settlement of their offshore migrants. Hence, the economic and the population policy objectives, including dispersal, may potentially be addressed, too. This indicates that, as in Australia, the onshore status conversion provisions under the PNPs expand the governments' efforts overall and assist in achieving the targeted benefits.

There are two additional benefits obtainable by Canadian provincial governments and the Australian state/territory under the onshore status conversion provisions. They may be called 'uniquely onshore'. First, the temporary residents, unlike offshore migrants have local work experience with their employer, which may increase the economic benefits to the latter. Second, they have also been living in an area for some time, reducing the need for settlement assistance. Therefore, there may be fewer adjustment issues than in the case of offshore migrants. The onshore provisions in both countries not only support the governments' efforts in addressing their policies' objectives. A recognition of the benefits brought through the onshore status conversion from temporary to permanent supports one of the proposed hypotheses that regional migration policies respond to new global population movements, often involving a period of temporary residency.

The Canadian provinces administer the criteria for the onshore status conversion independently of the Canadian federal government. This contrasts the procedure adopted in Australia, where these criteria are established at the federal level and apply to all eligible areas. This Canadian strategy is a continuation of the management approach to offshore nominations. Despite managing the onshore status conversion independently from each other, these Canadian provincial provisions are almost identical, with the employment offer constituting the only permanent migration option.
With many avenues for an onshore status conversion now open in Australia and Canada under the regional migration schemes, and both countries actively encouraging the temporary residents to settle, the future research, hopefully benefiting from more detailed data, may investigate the relations between the two stages in more depth.

2.4.2 International students

Movement of international students has become a large-scale phenomenon. As of 30 June 2003, there were 172,973 international students in Australia and 179,119 in the corresponding time in 2004. Over 2002–03, 162,575 visas were granted to international students, which, over 2003–04, increased to 171,616 (DIMIA 2004n:59; 2005i:62). By comparison in Canada, on 1 December 2003 there were 144,245 international students and at the same time in 2004 153,638 of them were present. The annual flows of students amounted to 56,536 in 2004, a decline in comparison to 60,201 in 2003 (CIC 2005b:81,78). These are large numbers and the onshore conversion provisions are a timely recognition of the potential benefit that the Australian states and territories, as well as the Canadian provinces, may obtain if even a portion of these individuals chooses to remain permanently.

Australia. Table 2.3 shows that recent international students may apply for a permanent status under two family-linked schemes, RSMS, STNI, the Skill Matching Visa and SIR across all eligible areas in the country. It also shows that such graduates may benefit from a recent work experience waiver. To qualify, they must satisfy the two years study in Australia requirement within six months prior to applying. The recent work experience period is not specified under the RSMS, but, as with other applicants, students must have an employment offer. In all these categories, applicants must satisfy all relevant federally established eligibility factors including age, English language level, skill levels (qualifications) and nominated occupation from SOL assessed by the relevant assessment body (and where applicable, also from state/territory or regional skilled shortages lists). State/territory customised criteria, if applicable, must be satisfied as well.

As for the unsponsored students, students undergoing a points-test under a state/territory sponsored category (STNI, SIR) may receive additional points for having studied and resided in a regional or low population growth metropolitan area (DIMIA 2004j:33,41). DIMIA introduced this innovation in mid-2003 (DIMIA 2004n:38) to support the
regionalisation efforts. This measure promotes educational institutions in those areas and rewards students who have decided to study there when they apply for a permanent status. It is hoped that having resided in a regional area, they would develop attachment to the place and would remain there. This would assist in retaining locally grown skills.

Eligibility of the recent graduates for the same visas as the offshore candidates provides them with a considerable choice. On the other hand, their eligibility for the aforementioned options supports and strengthens the earlier observation regarding the joint federal and state/territory governments’ management strategy of the regional and state/territory sponsored migration.

As in the case of the offshore applicants and the temporary workers, this onshore status conversion provision for students corresponds to the policy objectives. The same requirements of a nominated occupation from a shortage list (SOL and if applicable, a state/territory, or a regional list), or an employment offer requirement (RSMS) match the objective of addressing skilled shortages. Continued presence of former students supports the population increase and dispersal objectives. As a result of their settlement, the governments may get similar types of contributions as from these other groups. Like temporary workers, students are more adaptive, which means less pressure on services such as government-funded employment search assistance. Hence, this provision supports the overall governments’ efforts in meeting their policy objectives and suggests that the combination of the adopted policy instruments will be potentially able to deliver the expected benefits.

The onshore status conversion provision has been popular but students have mostly applied as independent skilled migrants rather than as regional skilled migrants. For example, SDAS migrants who are former students constitute a low proportion of the annual visa grants in that category. Only 653 (figure includes dependants) students were granted these visas in 2003–04. By comparison, 11,541 (including dependants) individuals obtained permanent residency under the skilled independent option (DIMIA 2005i:66). Similar proportions were recorded in the preceding year 2002–03 (303 visas versus 7,916 visas, respectively, see DIMIA 2004n:62). Nevertheless, the rapid uptake of onshore permanent visas provides strong evidence that Australia has flexibly responded to a trend of new,
global population movement, involving initially a temporary stay, while also promoting the dispersal.31

**Canada.** Table 2.4 shows that former international students may apply for a nominee status under special PNP student streams in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Québec. Although this suggests fewer opportunities for students than in Australia, the announcements made in April 2005 contained innovations that will make it easier for them to remain permanently.

As offshore candidates and temporary foreign workers, students are subject to provincial rules individually established by each of these governments. Table 2.4 shows the central role of two core eligibility factors: qualifications (education) and a pre-arranged employment offer. As in other streams, and unlike in Australia, the employment offer is a dominating feature of students’ migration. Québec is the only province where information regarding the employment offer could not be located. If it were not required, and if students underwent the points-test, it might be assumed that they would be collecting points under criteria applicable to one of the independent streams.

Age and language ability factors are given less weight as students are typically young and communicate well in one of the official languages. Further, Table 2.4 shows that the employer’s role in testing the candidate’s language skills is clearly stated by British Columbia. International students in Manitoba do not need to submit evidence of language ability in English and/or French that normally apply. The approach to testing language skills by Québec is not clearly stated but it may be assumed that students communicate well in French. If it is assumed that they are subject to the points-test, as other applicants, then the criteria as under the Assured Job Program would apply (see Table 2.4).

The minimum period of study under the Canadian provincial programs is also more flexible than the one required in Australia. Table 2.4 shows that it may involve a one-year program in British Columbia and Saskatchewan, while Manitoba does not determine the minimum

31 In response to rapidly growing numbers of students, DIMIA has recently tightened the rules twice. First, it increased the number of points necessary to qualify each time. Another adjustment, aimed at improving the quality of credentials, raised the period of study from one to two years (Birrell and Ranson 2005:9–10).
study period. British Columbia and Québec also welcome students nearing completion of their programs.

The recent work experience eligibility factor is not unanimously applied. In British Columbia, as in Australia, it is not required. Six months of work experience on a post-graduation work permit applies in Saskatchewan, while candidates in Manitoba program must be working when they apply (Table 2.4). No comparable information could be located from Québec, but, if the points-system applies, then students would need to have at least six months of work experience. The Table also shows that, as in the case of the offshore applicants, the skills assessment requirement brings the Canadian arrangements closer to the Australian ones. If regulatory/licensing requirements apply, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Manitoba accept a provisional eligibility to work, issued by the relevant authority. It may be expected that Québec would apply a similar approach, although precise information in relation to students could not be located.

Although the sole provincial responsibility for the policies results in minor differences in the eligibility factors, the overarching characteristic of the pre-arranged employment offer holds for international students. It replicates the approach to the offshore skilled nominees and the temporary foreign workers. Hence, its essential role in operation of the PNP s for skilled migrants is further strengthened and confirmed. The pre-arranged employment offer also strengthens the previously noted contrast that Australia and the Canadian provinces do not use identical policy instruments to secure similar policy outcomes.

As with the arrangements for the offshore applicants and the temporary foreign workers onshore, the provisions for international students' status change onshore seem to generally have the potential to address the population and economic policies' objectives. Unavailability of relevant information does not allow for support of these provisions' correspondence to targeted economic benefits only in the case of Québec. These provisions may potentially deliver all the same benefits as from the settlement of the two other groups including the need for less assistance in adjustment than nominees from offshore. Therefore, it may be therefore concluded that, as in Australia, this provision supports the overall governments' efforts of meeting their policies' objectives and suggests that it is capable of delivering targeted benefits.
As noted earlier, the recent announcements made in April 2005 involved a solution
enabling students to obtain two-year post-graduation work permits in Canada except
Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver. This regionalisation measure is driven by the expected
benefits from their work and settlement in these areas. It enables students to apply for a
temporary foreign worker status onshore, which makes them eligible to apply later for
permanent residency under the PNPs. Considering that only in four provinces permanent
residency may be immediately sought under the PNPs, in the remaining provinces (for
example, the Atlantic ones), this may become an attractive path to permanent residency.
The Atlantic provinces in fact consider education and work experience obtained in their
provinces (New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador) and in Canada (Prince Edward
Island) as retention factors when assessing the candidates (see Subsection 2.5.1). Being able
to use both when applying, former students enhance their chances of selection.

To qualify for these geographically restricted permits, students must have studied for two
years full-time at, and have graduated from, a post-secondary institution located outside
Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver. Their employment offer must be consistent with the
completed studies and be from an area outside Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver. The
HRSDC confirmation is not necessary. The application for the permit must be submitted
within 90 days of being notified that they had met the study program requirement. All other
students may be issued a permit valid for up to one year (CIC 2005c:41–2).

These new arrangements demonstrate that Canada is active in introducing solutions that a)
promote the educational institutions outside three largest cities; b) enable students to
experience the Canadian labour market for a longer period initially in a temporary capacity;
c) make the locally obtained skills available to employers (with a potential of a longer-term
retention); and d) increase the overall pool of potential workers. Like the additional points
given to students who have studied in regional Australia, the introduction of these
arrangements indicates that the Canadian federal government is active and innovative in
supporting regionalisation efforts. As a result of implementation of this new strategy, not
only economic but also population benefits could potentially be obtained. For example, in
Saskatchewan, where the population increase is essential, international students, especially
over a period of time, could contribute. Announcement of the opening of the program to
students was made in the context of 1,700 of them studying in Saskatchewan (DGR SK
2005g:6). Even a portion of the 1,700 new permanent and employed residents would be beneficial. That stream has only been recently introduced in Saskatchewan in 2004 (2005g:6) and in British Columbia in 2002 (expanded in 2004 to the currently binding eligible areas of study; MCAWS BC 2004b:1). That also attests to the innovative character of the new policy initiatives aimed at expanding the existing programs.

In the light of the aforementioned regionalisation measures, it may be now stated that the provincial and federal governments in Canada recognise and want to benefit from the increasing population mobility trend involving initially a temporary residency. As in Australia, where the onshore conversion for students has been possible since mid-2001 (DIMIA 2004n:61), policies in Canada are becoming more flexible and responsive than ever before. This confirms one of the hypotheses proposing that the Australian and the Canadian policy initiatives are responding to new global population movements.

A few closing remarks may now be made about the Australian and the Canadian visa options for the offshore and the onshore regional skilled migrants. First, the evidence presented above demonstrates that the onshore status conversion provisions for temporary workers and international students in both countries serve to address similar policy objectives to those established in the preceding Section regarding offshore options. This shows that parallel operation of onshore and offshore streams means that the governments have undertaken wide-ranging regionalisation efforts. The onshore provisions may provide additional channels of obtaining the targeted benefits of continued alleviation of skills shortages with suitably qualified individuals, their (and their families) continued presence maintains the population level and the employment and settlement arrangements ensure that they live in areas where their skills and presence are preferred. In addition, some ‘uniquely onshore’ benefits may be delivered. Therefore, all three population objectives: economic, population growth and dispersal - are able to be met. Second, the design and application of the eligibility factors for the onshore applicants provides further evidence that the Australian and the Canadian policies are implemented through distinctive management strategies.

Third, the recent regionalisation initiative for international students, the recent history of the student streams in British Columbia and Saskatchewan, the system of awarding additional
points for former regionally based students and recent eligibility of WHMs for the SIR visa in Australia, support the proposition of high activity of the governments, creating innovative regional migration policies. These measures strengthen and augment the innovative solutions adopted for the purposes of managing the offshore skilled applicants highlighted in the preceding Section. These involved application of skill levels identical to the independent (federal) migrants in Australia; state/territory and regional shortages lists facilitating a match between the local labour market and the individual’s skills; employment offer and skills assessment in the Canadian provinces ensuring a better labour market outcome than the federal Canadian program and introduction (Saskatchewan) and the of new regional trade skills visas for apprentices (Australia). All these solutions, both the existing and the newly introduced, yield broad support for one of the hypotheses that Australia and Canada are highly active in regional migration policies.

Furthermore, the recent policy developments highlighted above, as well as introduction of the SIR visa and the additional points allocated to SIR candidates to increase its accessibility in Australia (see Subsection 2.2.2), allow us to conclude that these developments may potentially bring two benefits. First, in both countries the governments may gain access to a larger pool of potential candidates, which may assist in increasing the number of skilled regional migrants filling the shortages. Second, particularly the measures with an explicit regional focus in Australia and Canada, but potentially also other measures, support the dispersal policy objective and have the potential to enhance the outcomes. These solutions boost the scale of the governments’ operations and demonstrate that the governments are committed to developing their regional migration policies.

Fourth, it should be reiterated that this Section has established that the governments in Australia and Canada recognise and want to benefit from the increasing mobility trend initially involving temporary residency. In both countries, the numbers of potential candidates were considerable and were indicators of the considerable popularity of that status conversion. The onshore status conversion provisions were observed to characterise the flexibility and responsiveness of the governments to these emerging trends. These characteristics lend support to the hypothesis that Australia and Canada are responding to new global population movements.
Finally, it may be observed that the settlement of offshore and onshore applicants brings to the interested jurisdictions such additional benefits as spending on housing and related payments, consumer needs and the like, thus providing increased consumer demand and spending. Settlement of a considerable number of migrants in a small community may also support the continued delivery of services (for example, financial services). Data to assess precisely the impact of these benefits would be difficult to obtain but nevertheless should be noted.

2.5 Retention factors, support services and monitoring activity

So far the eligibility factors for the offshore and onshore applicants have been discussed. This Section deals with three issues. First, it compares the Australian and the Canadian provincial retention factors. They require special attention due to their role in providing an enduring solution to uneven population distribution. Next, two assisting policy instruments are discussed: the governmental support services to the program migrants in Australia and Canada, supporting the economic and population policies’ objectives as well as functions and outcomes of the monitoring measures.

2.5.1 Retention factors

Ensuring that regional and state/territory sponsored skilled migrants in Australia and the skilled nominees in the Canadian provinces adapt to local conditions and stay is essential. Assessing the retention probability is especially important in the case of offshore applicants, because those converting to a permanent status onshore are already familiar with the local conditions. Regardless of where the application for a permanent residency is made from, the applicants fill in identical or similar application forms enquiring about local connections. For that reason, the retention factors are discussed here, following the examination of the offshore and onshore migration options. This Subsection looks at the retention factors specified by the Australian federal government for the family-linked regional migrants, the RSMS, the state/territory considerations for the STNI candidates (considerations for the SIR candidates were discussed earlier) and at corresponding Canadian provincial retention factors.
Australia. Besides the key eligibility factors, the regional family-linked candidates are assessed against two specific DIMIA requirements. Table 2.3 shows that they must possess a sponsor to whom they are related and who has lived for minimum of one year (and continues to live) in a Designated Area, as well as an assurer. Hence, the retention is linked to the presence of a family member. The applicant or the applicant’s spouse must be related to the sponsor as: a) a non-dependent child (natural, adoptive, or step-child); b) a parent; c) a brother or sister (including adoptive or step-siblings); d) a niece or nephew (including adoptive or a step-niece or nephew); e) a first cousin; or f) a grandchild. The assurer guarantees that any payments made by Centrelink to the assuree during the two-year period are recoverable (DIMIA 2004j:9,30). Centrelink decides who can be an assurer and determines the financial capacity to provide the required support (Centrelink n.d.:1).

No specific questions regarding the ease of adaptation to the local conditions are asked under the RSMS, except the value of money, goods and assets that will be brought into Australia and the spouse’s English language ability (DIMIA 2005c:7,9). Note, however, that the employer must offer at least a two-year mandatory contract (Table 2.3), an administrative measure that temporarily guarantees retention in a regional or low population growth area. Similarly, the Table shows that STNI migrants are required to remain in their sponsoring jurisdiction for at least two years, which is also a temporary retention measure.

Where the state/territory governments influence the selection criteria under STNI, the retention related issues are covered in their application forms. This is in addition to the requirement of having an occupation from a state/territory shortages list (see Table 2.3). Commonly, governments enquire about the integrity of social networks (relatives, friends) in the states (Tasmania, Victoria) or in Australia (Tasmania, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia); previous visits to the state (Tasmania, Victoria), or to Australia (South Australia and Western Australia); educational experience in the state (Tasmania and Victoria) or in Australia (Western Australia); whether the employment opportunities in the state have been investigated (Tasmania and South Australia); and whether the applicant’s skills set have a reasonable employment prospects (Victoria and Western Australia). A confirmed employment offer satisfies the last requirement in these two states. In Victoria, this is a mandatory requirement if the applicant’s skills are only in demand in a regional
area; alternatively, evidence that one will establish a business is acceptable. An employment offer is also valued by Tasmania. That state favours also strong, pre-existing business or other connections, and Victoria values previous employment experience in the state (DED TAS 2004f:1; n.d.b:5; SMP VIC n.d.f:2; 2004:3; Immigration SA n.d.k:2; DIR WA 2005d:2,4; 2005c:5–6). In addition, Tasmania enquires about any contacts with community groups (DED TAS n.d.b:5).

Other questions regard the spouse’s employability (DED TAS n.d.b:3) and the spouse’s occupation and intention to work (SMP VIC 2004:3; DIR WA 2005c:5). The STNI participating governments also take financial resources into consideration and some recommend specific sums (DED TAS 2004b:2; SMP VIC 2004:2; DIR WA 2005c:3). South Australia enquires about, but does not formally recommend, any minimum amount of money/assets to be transferred to that state (Immigration SA n.d.k:1). That concern is understandable, because unlike the assurance required for the regional-family linked migrants, or the RSMS candidates who will work, the STNI applicants are not required to have an employment offer (although this is regarded favourably) that would immediately provide an income stream. DIMIA also enquires about the total value of money, goods and assets that the offshore regional-family sponsored candidates (SDAS) and offshore STNI, SIR and SMV candidates intend to bring into the country (DIMIA 2004e:6). The retention factors that the STNI-user states consider resemble those applicable to the SIR visa applicants (see Subsection 2.2.2).

These considerations demonstrate that the governments may customise entry criteria to receive migrants best adaptable to the local conditions, and likely to stay, in line with the retention principle. Despite that certain degree of autonomy, the other eligibility factors remain established at the federal level and the Australian federal government enables operation of the state/territory nominated schemes.31 This is also the case of the family-linked regional migration and the RSMS. The latter is entirely managed by the federal government, and retention is guaranteed administratively for two years under DIMIA criteria. Therefore, the retention factors as under STNI do not apply. The Designated Areas,

---
31 The Australian federal government also decides (important for the points-tested candidates under STNI and SIR), where additional points can be collected. They involve points for specific work experience, for a nominated occupation in demand (must be on MODL), spouse’s skills and bonus points (capital investment in Australia, Australian work experience or fluency in one of community languages) (DIMIA 2004j:37–9, 41–3). Some of them may assist in adaptation and, in turn, enhance the chance of retention.
the administrative retention measures in RSMS and STNI, as well as the STNI and SIR-user states own retention factors further support the statement that the combination of federal and state/territory governments’ policy instruments constitutes a distinctive Australian policy management strategy.

**Canada.** The provinces, which entirely control their entry criteria, continue that approach in relation to the retention-related issues. This regards all four groups of provincial migrants: the family-sponsored migrants in Manitoba, the employer-recommended ones, international students and the independent migrants.

In family-linked provincial migration in Manitoba, as in Australia, family support is essential. The list of eligible family members is similar, too. Apart from parents, children, siblings, nieces/nephews and first cousins, it includes aunts/uncles, and, instead of grandchildren as in Australia, grandparents (MLI 2005b:12). As with other Manitoba nominees, the family-linked ones fill in the same application form, with the retention-related questions (see next paragraph). The family-linked nominees are subject to the PNP financial requirements that nominees under all streams must meet. Settlement funds (a recommendation is made as to the minimum amount) to pay immigration fees and relocation costs, funds to support oneself while looking for employment and to ensure successful settlement are required. An employment offer may prove one’s financial ability. If these criteria are not met, the supporting family member must sign a Declaration of Financial Support (2005b:3). This has a similar function to the Assurance of Support required in Australia.

Unlike in Australia, the Canadian provinces consider a range of retention factors in assessing their employer-linked migrants. Despite minor differences between the Canadian provincial requirements in general, here they display a high degree of similarity. Typically, similar questions are asked to those that the STNI and SIR-user states and territories ask now in Australia. Nominees are asked about family relationships in the province (British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Québec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Labrador) and/or Canada (British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba); previous education and employment in the province (British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Québec, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador), or in Canada (Prince Edward Island); and
other previous visits in the province, such as for tourist or business reasons (British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Québec, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador) or
Canada (Alberta, Manitoba) (MCAWS BC n.d.h:1-2; MED AB 2004b:3; DGR SK n.d.e:4-5; MLI 2005b:n.p.; MICC QC 2004a:5; DB NB n.d.f:4; DDT PE n.d.j:4; DITRD NL n.d.h:4). This indicates the importance that provinces attach to the successful settlement and retention of employer-recommended migrants, despite the fact that the employment offer is already perceived as a guarantee for retention. Where applicable, points-tests are used.

Guaranteed employment for a spouse is favourably perceived (MCAWS BC n.d.h:2). New Brunswick awards points for a spouse’s confirmed employment in an occupation identified as in shortage, or if spouse’s education and experience is from such field but he/she does not have a guaranteed employment offer (DB NB n.d.f:4). Newfoundland and Labrador awards points when spouse has post-secondary education; has a confirmed employment offer in an occupation from the Strategic Sector List; or in another occupation (DITRD NL n.d.h:4). Alberta is interested in the spouse’s occupation and education and Prince Edward Island in spouse’s/partner’s education (MED AB 2004b:3; DDT PE n.d.j:4). Québec awards points for the spouse’s characteristics (Canadavisa.com 2005:1).

Interestingly, in the Eastern provinces not only spouses help collect sufficient points. Principal applicants may be awarded additional points for their employment-related abilities. For example, they may be able to provide evidence of employment in more than one occupation, as in New Brunswick (DB NB n.d.f:4), or in an occupation other than the one nominated, as in Newfoundland and Labrador (DITRD NL n.d.h:4). In Québec, points for work experience are the basis for awarding further employment-related points (see Table 2.4). In the light of the generally unfavourable population trends in these provinces (see Subsection 1.3.2 in Appendix I), it can be understood that these points are aimed at helping the candidates to score the necessary number of points, which, in turn, enlarges the potential pool of the candidates available for nomination.

32 Nova Scotia makes an exploratory visit mandatory and it involves an interview. Prince Edward Island may require skilled workers to make such visit, also including an interview. The reason for this visit is also to enable candidates to familiarise themselves with the local culture, quality of life and employment opportunities. Newfoundland and Labrador may similarly require a candidate to make a visit to meet with the employer and the Department. See OED NS 2005a:1; DDT PE n.d.c:4; DITRD NL n.d.e:1.
In addition to testing employer-recommended applicants for retention, the locally available support that will help migrants adapt receives considerable attention. British Columbia and Manitoba employers (those who need to have their employment offer pre-approved; others who make offers to people already working in Manitoba are not subject to these requirements) are expected to assist with relocation costs, paying immigration fees, initial accommodation/finding housing and must specify any other assistance offered (MCAWS BC n.d.d:1; MLI 2005b:9; 2004c:3). Albertan employers are expected to help with relocation expenses and offer other assistance (MED AB n.d.b:3–4). Any Albertan employer must also supply an employee benefit plan and a retention program (MED AB 2004a:3). Also, Manitoban employers are expected to provide a retention plan specifying benefits, advancement opportunities for the employee and other features aimed at encouraging the nominee to stay with the company (MLI 2004c:3). In regions where there is a significant need for settlement services for newcomers, the level of settlement support from employer and/or community is also considered (MLI 2005b:8). By comparison, in Australia the RSMS employers are not formally obliged to provide assistance, although the newest RSMS survey (DIMIA 2005a:8) indicates that they do offer it. This, however, is not mandatory. The newest RSMS survey is referred to in Chapter Four.

In addition to the factors mentioned earlier, Saskatchewan points-test its candidates, appraising employer and community support (each separately). An employer may help with finding English classes, help the spouse find employment, or meet immediate settlement needs. The employer must formally state what support will be provided. Also, an official letter from a community organisation detailing the support and who will provide it gets nominee points (DGR SK n.d.e:5). Newfoundland and Labrador similarly awards points if the applicant has been recruited/supported by a community, cultural or regional development authority (DITRD NL n.d.h:4).

Financial resources are important, and recommendations by the governments, as in Australia, are made (MLI 2005b:5; DGR SK n.d.e:6; DB NB n.d.f:10; DDT PE n.d.c:2; DITRD NL n.d.h:6). Where candidates are points-tested, points for finances increase relatively to the amount of money (DGR SK n.d.e:6; DITRD NL n.d.h:6). As DIMIA has done in Australia, CIC has a recommended sum for skilled migrants (2004i:1). The
provincial sums may be seen as guidance as they are close to the amount recommended by CIC.

The above evidence shows that employer-recommended migrants not only are assessed in the light of their previous links to the province (which are not considered under the Australian RSMS), and their entry is well facilitated, especially in Eastern Canada. Their employers are formally responsible for offering them support and the community support is favoured, too. Furthermore, some employers must submit retention plans to demonstrate how will ensure their nominees’ retention. Such formal engagement of employers and community stakeholders in policy implementation, and even points-testing it in two cases, is a different approach to that of Australia. This suggests that the Canadian provinces attach considerable weight to the cooperation with these local actors. Such a situation results from a non-restrictive approach to settlement, where provincial governments must look for assisting measures in enhancing retention outcomes. By comparison, in Australia this is guaranteed by temporary administrative measures, such as a residency requirement under the STNI visa, or a temporary employment contract under RSMS, on top of the geographically restricted settlement.

Independent migrants selected by Manitoba and Québec are similarly tested for connections to the province in order to establish their likelihood of retention. The Strategic Recruitment Initiative candidates in Manitoba are assessed for the retention factors mentioned in the employer-linked streams (see above). They must also meet the same financial requirements as the family-linked and the employer-recommended nominees (MLI 2005b:5). General Stream applicants in Manitoba obtain points for having a strong connection to Manitoba by having one of the following: a) close relative support; b) family-like support (distant relatives or friends); c) work experience; or d) completed education in Manitoba (points depend on the level of education). Points are also awarded for a regional destination (based on employment, education, family or community support documents) (2005b:18,21). Financial requirements apply, too. The two Québec independent streams’ migrants fill in the same application form and therefore are subject to the same retention checks as the employer-recommended ones. Their financial resources are required for the first three months (MICC QC 2004h:2–3). Québec has the most developed regional dispersal strategy.
in place of all Canadian provinces and this involves extensive cooperation with regional and community stakeholders to facilitate adaptation and retention (see Section 2.6).

What is striking about the retention factors examined so far is the promotion of the community engagement within the provincial programs. Next to the employment offer itself this is another 'soft measure', as anticipated in Chapter One, promoting the intraprovincial dispersal and retention of the nominees under the non-restrictive settlement arrangements. Such an approach to retention also aligns with the current concept of regional development through involvement of the local community stakeholders.

International students in British Columbia and Manitoba are checked for similar retention factors to the employer-recommended provincial migrants. In Saskatchewan, applicants are questioned about relatives in Canada (DGR SK n.d.b:2). Since the employment offer ensures a source of income, and students are assumed to have resided in the province for a while, employers in Manitoba are not asked about the kind of support required in the case of other employer-recommended nominees. By contrast, British Columbia employers need to specify what support they plan to provide (MCAWS BC n.d.d:1). In Québec, if it is assumed that international students are subject to the points-test, then the retention factors would be those for the remaining groups of applicants.

The above comparisons show that Australia and the Canadian provinces use different approaches to ensure retention. Two major differences need to be highlighted. First, in Canada, the sole provincial responsibility for the policies’ outcomes results in all potential nominees being subject to the provincial retention checks drawn individually by each provincial government. This approach is applied regardless of an employment offer. By contrast, similarly extensive (and similar in character) retention factors in Australia are only considered under STNI (and SIR). This illustrates the governments’ role in modifying the otherwise federal criteria (except their own shortages’ lists). An employment offer from a regional or a low population growth area in RSMS or from a Designated Area in the regional family-linked migration are deemed sufficient retention measures. Retention of the RSMS and STNI (and SIR) migrants is further enhanced by an administrative temporary retention measure.
Second, as a consequence of entire provinces being eligible for settlement, but under the non-restrictive settlement arrangements, the Canadian provincial retention strategies are based on cooperation with employers and communities under the employer-recommended and independent migration streams. In that context, this cooperation constitutes an innovative solution. Furthermore, these stakeholders’ participation represents a supplementary ‘soft measure’ (employment offer was one), promoting the intraprovincial dispersal and retention. Where the formal assessment of the support provided by these stakeholders is points-tested (Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Newfoundland and Labrador), that enhances their importance in the policies’ implementation. Engaging these stakeholders also illustrates how the policies implement the concept of the community-driven regional development. Despite the different approaches in Australia and Canada, these measures seem potentially able to address the lasting dispersal of migrants, as intended by the policies.

By comparison, the community links under the state/territory schemes in Australia are not prominently exposed as retention factors, yet their presence under STNI in Tasmania and SIR in Tasmania and the Northern Territory are worth highlighting. These differences in adopted policy instruments to ensure retention further illustrate how the Australian and Canadian provincial policies operate on a basis of two distinctive management strategies.

2.5.2 Support services

Australia. The southeastern states specify what help is available to their sponsored skilled migrants. In Tasmania, there is one list of support services for skilled and business people and it appears geared towards the latter (see Table 3.9 in Chapter Three). However, the sponsored skilled migrants may benefit from the ‘meet and greet service’ and accommodation, and rental car hire at government rates (DED TAS 2004d:1). In Victoria, migrants may be referred to specific job vacancies registered by employers with the state government. The government provides information about living and working in the state, including employment opportunities in regional areas, as well as refers migrants to the qualifications assessment service after arrival (SMP VIC n.d.c:1). The Tasmanian services especially seem potentially able to ease the initial settlement stage, allowing migrants to concentrate on employment search, while the Victorian measures target quick labour market participation, in line with the economic policy objective. Since employment
opportunity is one of the reasons for migration in the first place, success of migrants translates into economic and populational benefits, including retention.

According to a senior South Australian government official, this state offers a number of services to its STNI and other skilled independent categories, as well as to the RSMS migrants. The offshore SIR visa holders are eligible to access them, too (Immigration SA 2005:4). There is a ‘meet and greet service’ as in Tasmania; pre-arranged (on request) temporary, short-term accommodation in Adelaide; settlement orientation service (for example, individual referrals to relevant agencies; links to individual job search sessions, career counselling, information on community organisations, legal and health services and alike) and Home Ownership Information Package. Moreover, a Migrant Employment Consultancy Service (MECS) provides job search advice and support (for example, short-term individual consultancies and industry networking) (2003b). MECS is also available to SIR visa holders relocating from within Australia (2005:3). As in Victoria, the overseas qualifications assessment service is offered (2003b). Support offered by South Australia is impressive, and by far the greatest assistance available to sponsored skilled migrants in Australia.

As observed by the above mentioned state government official, the majority of the sponsored skilled migrants settle in Adelaide, which makes service delivery easy. According to an officer from one of the South Australian regional development boards, at the time of the interview there was a recognised shortage of accommodation in regions outside Adelaide. Under such circumstances, employer-sponsored migrants would receive assistance from the employer working with a Regional Project Officer (RPO). As the senior South Australian government official explained, RPOs were responsible for raising awareness of the skilled schemes and the SMD to regional employers. RPOs assisted in cases of actual sponsorship, and, as commented by that regionally based officer, employers were happy about this assistance. Furthermore, that regionally based officer explained that the RPO’s role was to make the initial contact with a candidate located through the SMD. Such a candidate would receive a letter indicating that an employer was interested in sponsorship, along with information about the area and electronic links to explore. This would enable the person to be better informed about the region and assess the attractiveness

---

33 This interview took place on 12 November 2003.
34 Interview took place on 10 November 2003.
of the offer. Such contact was also used as a promotional method. All in all, the South Australia services facilitate the initial settlement and assist in employment search, which, as noted in the preceding cases, enhances the state’s chances of obtaining the targeted longer-term economic and populational benefits.

In Queensland, assistance to SIR visa applicants (the only category that this government sponsors) in performing necessary settlement-related research is provided by designated local governments’ officers in regional areas (DSDI QLD 2005c:1). Other jurisdictions have no or limited information on support services. For example, Western Australia, at the time of the final review of the information for this chapter (May 2005), was a newcomer to the STNI and SIR schemes and no integrated electronic information was available. The Australian Capital Territory seemingly focuses on the employers’ needs in the context of RSMS (Business ACT 2005b:7; 2005c:8).35

In sum, the governments provide referrals, Tasmania and South Australia offer a ‘meet and greet service’, and the support services seem the most extensive in South Australia. For non-employer linked skilled migrants, the accommodation arrangements seem particularly valuable and could be considered elsewhere, including Canada. Also the ‘meet and greet service’ and personalised literature used to promote regions could be introduced in other jurisdictions in both countries. Considering the trend of onshore status conversion, providing a welcome service would not cause the budgets to blow out (in South Australia it is done by volunteers). Arranging car rental at lower rates, as in Tasmania, would also be welcomed by migrants in other jurisdictions. It should be stressed that even where the governments do not particularly mention assistance in employment search/job matching, new settlers may use the mainstream job matching services maintained by the federal government (DIMIA 2004j:50). The character of all these measures may assist in meeting the economic and population policy objectives.

35 Details of visas sponsored by the Territory only became available after the major review of updates in the Australian and Canadian visas availability and requirements had been completed in May 2005. In July 2005, the Territory launched its new website (Business ACT 2005a gateway site) containing its migration strategy and related documents. For that reason, the Territory’s requirements are not discussed at length in this and the following chapter. On the other hand, this initiative supports and expands the observation made earlier regarding the developmental and progressive character of the governments’ initiatives.
The Australian federal government’s support for employers extends beyond the provision of SMD, which one interviewee noted as a useful tool for identifying migrants.\textsuperscript{36} First, the outposting of ten DIMIA experts in industries to assist regional employers in addressing their shortages was announced in April 2005. Second, DIMIA assistance was also going to extend into joint information sessions and recruitment events with the industry (see Subsection 2.2.2). Information sessions on sponsorship options to employers are also held by the state/territory governments but there was an indication that interest in such sessions was low until the employer actually experienced a shortage that could not be quickly filled.\textsuperscript{37} The above measures involving the support activities of federal and state/territory governments confirm the observation that the regional dispersal policy in Australia in jointly managed by these authorities.

One innovative solution merits attention. Victoria now maintains its own registry (database) of job vacancies reported by employers and put online for prospective migrants to explore (see link from SMP VIC n.d.c). It lists occupation, required qualifications, information about employers (including an indication that it will sponsor the applicant), salary range and location in Victoria. This is an electronic promotion of employment vacancies in Victoria and is intended to attract enquiries. In that sense, it is a dedicated approach facilitating and accelerating the employment match and supporting the economic policy objective. Such solution could benefit other jurisdictions in Australia and Canada (compare Québec below).

As illustrated, at the time of the interviews, the usefulness of support services could only be assessed from the employers’ perspective.\textsuperscript{38} The introduction of SIR visa, where migrants may be eligible for some support is too recent to evaluate and this visa was not available at the time of the interviews. A survey of that group is currently underway but results will only be available in late 2006 (DIMIA 2004h). A review of departmental annual reports from jurisdictions offering support services to skilled migrants did not reveal any evaluation

\textsuperscript{36} Noted by a senior Tasmanian government official on 4 November 2003.
\textsuperscript{37} That was observed by the RCB from regional Queensland and by a regionally based senior Queensland government official on 24 November 2003.
\textsuperscript{38} The newest RSMS survey outcomes discuss also the employers’ satisfaction with the scheme (DIMIA 2005a:10-1). The SDAS survey outcomes show that as result of participating in English classes the migrants’ English ability has improved (DIMIA 2005b:30). This in itself is a positive outcome of the government-funded services but this is an isolated example, insufficient to offer any further assessment.
details. This indicates that this is in-house knowledge and remains unpublished. Under such circumstances it may be assumed that the internal governments’ assessments support their continuous delivery because the targeted group of migrants benefits. This, in turn, helps address the economic and population policy objectives as well as retention.

Canada. The provincial governments determine the support they offer independently of each other and of the federal government. To facilitate securing employment, they provide links from their websites to employment search engines. One such facility maintained by HRSDC (2005a), serves as an employment search engine and a posting space for employers. Yet, unlike SMD in Australia, it does not have an immigrant focus. Once employment is guaranteed, the employer and the community provide the initial settlement assistance.

In comparison to the Australian governments’ initiatives, a level of similarly personalised settlement support is offered by Québec. This may be explained by the fact that it selects independent migrants as it occurs in Australia. First, there is a ‘meet and greet service’ at the airport. If it is missed, migrants make an appointment with an integration officer in the area they intend to live (MICC QC 2004d:1). That meeting serves to provide orientation in such matters as education, housing options, health insurance; to register the individual for a French language class and to provide other referrals, for example to community services (MICC QC 2004c:2). Other services include counselling and references related to employment searches, education and occupational training; information sessions on the socioeconomic situation and the job market for the French speakers; French courses across the province; information sessions on regulated professions and occupations and settlement options in regions (2004c:1–2). All these services, as in Australia, aim at facilitating the transition with a view to increasing and retaining the economic and populational benefits.

As revealed by a senior regionally based Québec government official, regional employers participate in the welcome service at the airport. There are also regular information sessions in Montréal, where regional employment opportunities are presented to immigrants and where they have a chance to meet regional employers and discuss other aspects of life in the regions. Participants for these sessions are sourced from an internal government’s database

---

9 Interview took place on 2 April 2003.
of immigrants who register their interest on a voluntary basis. Their professional profiles are matched with the regional skills shortages (Gagné 2003:11). What may indicate the success of these sessions is that the interviewed regionally based government official quoted above noted that employers would often take curriculum vitae on the spot. Information about these sessions may be found on the government’s website.

Regions are also promoted in another way. Selected candidates may receive a personalised letter, while still abroad, informing them about employment prospects in regions and encouraging them to contact a designated person in that region. Such an initiative was undertaken in 2001–02 and raised considerable interest among targeted individuals (Gagné 2003:3–4). The senior regionally based government official confirmed that such was the role of her office. This initiative could be seen as a promotional method, similar to that undertaken by RPOs in South Australia who were contacting skilled migrants found through the SMD. Its effectiveness could be investigated by other jurisdictions.

Individuals who agreed to settle in regions benefit from personalised support to facilitate their integration. They may also receive a mentor (for example, a member of a relevant regulatory body) and benefit from training to upgrade their skills so that they can become members of a regulated profession. On the other hand, regional employers (and other stakeholders, too) are offered consulting services in diversity management (Gagné 2003:10). The above examples of support to migrants and employers indicate a commitment to the dispersal of the former, in line with the economic and population policy objectives.

Although no information on similar support could be located in other Canadian provinces, all permanent residents are eligible to use the mainstream services. That means that the nominees in other provinces may use various counselling services, find out about community and/or ethnic organisations, enrol in English/French classes and alike. Provinces also facilitate full recognition of internationally trained professionals. Details of these measures, however, go beyond the focus of this thesis.

Having proposed that a Victoria-style, online and searchable database of employment opportunities should be considered by other Australian and Canadian jurisdictions, it worth
looking at the situation in Canada. In Saskatchewan, the government may assist employers in finding skilled nominees (DGR SK 2005e:1). In Québec, according to the earlier quoted senior regionally based government official, regional offices of Emploi Québec88 were assisting employers to find workers, including immigrants. In the latter case, matching was possible thanks to the aforementioned internal government database of Montréal-based migrants. Putting up regional employment opportunities online, as in Victoria, could reduce the workload of providing the matching service to processing the application. At the moment, the job search engines linked to the Canadian provincial governmental websites give a number of results that require time to be filtered through and enquired about. Hence, facilitating the match between a company and a nominee could simplify and accelerate the process. Joint management and maintenance could be considered by neighbouring jurisdictions to lower the operational costs. Such idea might perhaps be considered by the Atlantic provinces.

The limited information on the governmental support services to the provincial skilled migrants compromises any serious assessment of their usefulness. Information from one province only disables any generalisations, and, due to its distinctiveness, Québec is deemed to be not fully representative of the rest of Canada. Also, the departmental annual reports from the provinces do not evaluate the support provided by employers and communities. This indicates that it is the internal knowledge of the governments and thus remains unpublished. Therefore, it may be assumed that, as in Australia, support is considered worthwhile in terms of benefiting the target group and addressing the economic and population policies’ objectives, as well as retention.

There is a host of electronic information on the governments’ websites that sponsored/nominated skilled migrants may access in Australia and in the Canadian provinces prior or after migrating. It covers a range of socioeconomic themes relating to the sponsoring jurisdictions, their regions and regional communities. Links to regional and local (including ethnic) organisations are provided. Appendices VI and VII contain addresses of the principal programs’ websites, from which that information can be accessed. In closing, it may be concluded that the range and character of the services

---

88 Emploi Québec (Employment Québec) is part of the Ministère de l’Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale (Ministry for Employment and Social Solidarity).
discussed above support the hypothesis that Australia and Canada are highly active in creating innovative regional migration policies.

2.5.3 Monitoring activity

Monitoring of the state/territory sponsored and regional migrants in Australia and of the Canadian provincial skilled migrants reflects the conditions of their initial entry and the responsibilities of the governments for managing their respective programs. Differences in functions and outcomes of this monitoring are highlighted.

Australia. Monitoring in Australia takes place for visa compliance and evaluation purposes. Visa compliance activities are performed by DIMIA, and evaluation may be pursued by DIMIA and by the sponsoring governments. Evaluation may also occur through regular or occasional surveys. According to the announcements made in April 2005, the regional family sponsored migrants from mid-2006 will be initially entering on temporary visas (rather than receiving permanent residency, as it is the case now). They will be eligible to apply for permanent residency on satisfying residency and employment conditions. This suggests that some visa compliance procedures will be introduced. Currently these migrants’ visas do not contain any settlement conditions that would need to be monitored. The SDAS visa holders were subject to an occasional DIMIA survey (DIMIA 2005b). Its findings are discussed in Chapter Four but it is worth mentioning that these migrants were found to have failed to address the dispersal principle and the skills shortages in regional areas.

Visas of RSMS migrants may be cancelled. DIMIA may do so in the following cases: a) employment with the sponsoring employer has not been commenced within six months since arrival in Australia, or since the visa has been granted, in the case of an onshore applicant, or b) the sponsored employee has left the employer before completing the two-year contract. The latter has been mentioned as a temporary retention guarantee. If a migrant has made a genuine effort to complete the two-year employment with the sponsoring employer the visa will not be cancelled (DIMIA 2004n:40).

RSMS visa holders were subject to two occasional evaluation surveys (Cully and Goode 2000; DIMIA 2005a). The first one was performed prior to the enforcement of the
cancellations provisions (2001), and its findings were that a high degree of separation within the two-year contract with the sponsoring employer exists (Cully and Goodes 2000:33–4). On the other hand, multiple use of the scheme by employers was an indication that RSMS was meeting their needs; the most satisfied were those who had made multiple use of it and where migrants were still employed (2000:15–8,20). The second survey provides recent information and is discussed at length in Chapter Four. It is important to report though that while the retention rates have improved in comparison to the first survey, there was a slight drift away from the Designated Areas for longer-term migrants, such as those who had completed their two-year contracts (DIMIA 2005a:12,14).

The STNI visa holders are monitored by the sponsoring governments (DIMIA 2004j:15). According to their requirements, the STNI applicants (and Skill Matching applicants, who may be sponsored by state/territory governments under the STNI process) agree to complete four surveys over the period of initial two years after arrival (upon arrival and then six, 12 and 24 months afterwards) and that they will keep the governments informed of their address for that purpose (SMP VIC n.d.f:3; DIR WA 2005d:2). Such surveys serve to evaluate the scheme’s performance and the regular frequency at which they are conducted seems able to deliver reliable results. Note that this two-year period corresponds to the two-year minimum residency requirement in the sponsoring state, as per the administrative temporary retention measure (see Table 2.3). Although information on visa cancellation in the case of a STNI migrant not seeing out the entire two-year period in the sponsoring jurisdiction could not be immediately located, the approach to other visas suggests that it may also be cancelled on the basis of non-compliance.

The SIR migrants sign a declaration on the DIMIA application form acknowledging that they will abide by the conditions of their temporary visa (see conditions in Table 2.3). They must also acknowledge that they understand that their visa may be cancelled if they do not comply with these conditions (DIMIA 2004e:28). This group of migrants must conform to their visa conditions if they wish to apply for a permanent visa. The SIR migrants are currently being surveyed. Respondents will be surveyed at intervals of six months, 18 months and two years after arrival to assess their settlement success including the labour market participation (DIMIA 2004h:1).
In sum, the outcomes of monitored performance may potentially lead to visa cancellations for the RSMS and SIR visa holders; similar rules will apply to the regional family-sponsored migrants from mid-2006. It is likely that non-compliance may also result in a visa cancellation for the STNI migrants. Hence, entry and retention of these groups is possible under certain attached conditions. All applicants, regardless of the sponsor, declare on a DIMIA application form that if they give false/misleading information, their application may be refused or any visa granted may be cancelled (DIMIA 2004e:27; 2005c:22). This means that there are two grounds for visa cancellations: a) non-compliance with the visa conditions (for example, not completing the two-year contract under RSMS or not maintaining the residence in the sponsoring state/territory under SIR/STNI), and b) supplying false information. Observe that in the first case non-compliance with the visa conditions may potentially lead to its cancellation regardless whether either permanent or temporary status has been initially granted. For the family-linked regional migrants, until the new temporary visa comes into force, supplying false information constitutes the only ground for visa cancellations since they are not subject to other performance conditions. Monitoring shared by the governments for the evaluation purposes, and performed by DIMIA in the context of visa compliance, reflects the governments' cooperation in the policy management and DIMIA's sole constitutional responsibility for the immigration policy. At the time of writing, no data on rates of visa cancellation of regional visas could be located (compare Subsection 3.4.2 in Chapter Three).

**Canada.** All provincial skilled (and business migrants) land as permanent residents, regardless of whether they have been recommended by an employer or otherwise. Under their guaranteed mobility rights (see Section 1.6 in Chapter One), no similar visa compliance rules (and possible outcomes), like for RSMS, SIR or STNI visa holders in Australia, may be applied. This means that all provincial skilled (and business) migrants are not obliged to stay in the nominating province. Despite their permanent or long-term employment, they have only a moral obligation to stay with the employer who recommended them. British Columbia, for example, informs international students that they do not have a formal obligation to stay with their employer but are expected to do so for a reasonable period of time to meet the program’s objective of addressing the critical skill shortages (MCAWS BC n.d.f:5). Non-employer recommended migrants should loyally stay in their nominating province, yet they are not obliged to do so.
In consequence, and contrary to Australia, it is not possible to cancel a nominee’s or a Québec-selected migrant’s permanent visa on the grounds of changing employer or moving to another jurisdiction, but there is a CIC provision that may result in an individual’s removal. All prospective permanent residents, including skilled and business provincial nominees and Québec-selected skilled and business migrants sign a CIC declaration stating that they understand that making any false statements or concealing material in their permanent residence application may result in their exclusion from Canada and may be grounds for their prosecution or removal (CIC 2004j:4).

Saskatchewan repeats this formula on its application form and all other governments (except Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island) require that applicants sign a declaration stating that they understand that any false statements or concealment of information may result in the province refusing the application, or, if applicable, the nomination. Ultimately, as in Australia, monitoring for the visa compliance purposes is a federal responsibility. However, in comparison to RSMS, SIR or STNI visa holders in Australia, the grounds for removal are limited to detection of false information or concealing it at the application stage.

In the light of the above, monitoring in the Canadian provinces is principally undertaken for evaluation purposes, which constitutes a difference with Australia. It reflects the provincial government’s responsibilities for their own programs. Each agreement between a provincial/territory government and the federal government contains evaluation measures. Agreements with British Columbia, Manitoba and three Atlantic provinces (all except New Brunswick where text of the renewed agreement is unavailable online) speak of tracking of nominees for various periods of time since their date of landing: two years in British Columbia, three years in Manitoba and five years in each of the Atlantic provinces (CIC 2004b:7; 2003c:6; 2002a:8; 2001b:6; 2003d:7\textsuperscript{41}). Aims of this tracking include “(...) assessing the effectiveness of the Provincial Nominee Program” in British Columbia (CIC 2004b:7-8), retention outcomes in Manitoba (CIC 2003c:6), and “(...) effectiveness of targeted recruitment and integration and retention activities” in three Atlantic provinces (CIC 2002a:8; 2001b:6; 2003d:7).

\textsuperscript{41} The Newfoundland and Labrador document refers to the agreement that expired in 2004 but is quoted here for comparative purposes. It was extended until December 2005 (DHRLE NL 2005:24) but no original document was made available online.
The Saskatchewan agreement\(^2\) recognises that evaluation of the program is important in determining its impact and outcomes for the province. Information sharing with Canada includes information on retention within the province and the original destination community (CIC 2002b:6). Under a renewed agreement with New Brunswick (2005), according to a news release (no original text has been made available online), the evaluation will involve analysis of the extent of the nominees' contribution to the province's industrial and economic development and evaluation of their settlement success (CIC 2005d:3). The 1991 Canada-Québec Accord makes promotion of joint research on migration flows, and their evaluation, the responsibility of the Joint Committee [with Canada] (MRCI QC 2000:A-2). Finally, evaluation of the Yukon PNP (the Territory has only a business component) is also provided for in the agreement (CIC 2001e:4).

Despite differences in details, monitoring for evaluation purposes is a universal feature of all agreements, reflecting the individual character of each provincial/territorial program. Not all governments mention on their websites that they survey their skilled nominees and not all report the outcomes of these surveys. Results of the annual surveys of employers and their skilled nominees are reported by British Columbia, and they indicate that both are satisfied with the program. Likely based on internal counts, dispersal outcomes and labour market effects are also reported (MCAWS BC 2005a:61–2). In Manitoba, an evaluation survey carried out in 2001 revealed favourable retention, employment and regional dispersal rates (ProLogica Research Inc. 2001:14,28,39).

In Québec, one of the senior government officials mentioned the use of administrative data sources other than the survey approach.\(^3\) These were the Longitudinal Immigration Database, maintained by the federal government, and another method consisting in matching data on permanent entry of Québec-selected immigrants and from the Québec health insurance card. The database links administrative information from immigration files with information from tax file returns. This enables all entrants, including nominees and Québec-selected migrants, to be tracked across the country. The second method allows the Québec government to check whether the migrants it selected are still provincial residents.

---

\(^2\) This agreement, signed in 2002, is now incorporated into a new Immigration Agreement with Canada signed in June 2005. Only a news release was made available electronically following this new agreement, but not the original text of the agreement. See news release CIC 2005f:2.

\(^3\) Interview took place on 1 April 2003.
The MICC publications are based on internal counts of the Ministry. Other agencies, such as Emploi Québec, dealing with immigration issues, may use the survey approach (see, for example, Blais 2001). In Saskatchewan and in the Maritime provinces, no surveys were reported in the annual reports, and statistics are provided on the basis of internal counts.

Other governments communicate that nominees and employers participate in program evaluation, as it is the case for example in British Columbia and Alberta (MCAWS BC n.d.p.:6, MED AB n.d.a:2). In Manitoba, the applicant consents to be contacted about the program evaluation and in Nova Scotia nominees are informed that they will participate in the program evaluation (MLI 2005b:n.p.; OED NS 2005a:1). In Québec, information collected on the application form may be used for the purpose of studies, statistics or program evaluation (MICC QC 2004a:6).

All in all, monitoring is being pursued for visa compliance and evaluation purposes in Australia, and chiefly for the latter reason in the Canadian provinces. The visa compliance monitoring reflects the restrictions attached to visas in Australia for the RSMS, SIR and STNI migrants, as opposed to guaranteed mobility rights to permanent residents, including the provincial migrants, in Canada. Therefore, moving from one jurisdiction to another or changing employers have different consequences. In Australia, this means that the visa conditions have been breached, potentially carrying a penalty of visa cancellation, and, in consequence, a loss of a temporary (permanent) resident status. By contrast, in the Canadian provinces such activities do not carry the consequence of the permanent resident status loss. On the other hand, providing false/misleading information to DIMIA may result in the application refusal or a cancellation of the visa grant. Similarly, detecting that such information was provided to CIC at the application stage may lead to prosecution or removal from Canada.

The shared monitoring management approach, where DIMIA is responsible for the compliance issues, and all governments participate in the evaluation of different visa subclasses, further supports the distinctive character of the Australian policy management strategy. By contrast, the distinctive character of the Canadian provincial policies’ management cannot be fully confirmed. While the individual provincial monitoring
practices do support that statement, the ultimate right of the federal government to decide on the removal of an individual prevents us from fully confirming this.

2.6 External stakeholder engagement and promotion

This Section examines two policy instruments. First, it expands on the innovative Canadian provincial policy instrument of integrating employers and community stakeholders into the policy implementation process. Having concluded that they support the governments’ retention and intraprovincial dispersal efforts, this Section looks at the formal Canadian provincial cooperation frameworks involving them. Under the Canadian understanding of ‘region’, it is this formal cooperation, and not merely the ‘soft measures’, such as employment offers and community support, that constitute measures of intraprovincial dispersal. Examination of the Canadian practices is then followed by a presentation of the Australian developments in that area.

Second, domestic promotion of the regional skilled schemes in Australia and employer-linked streams in the Canadian provinces is discussed. Since it emerged from the interviews that international promotion resulted in business migration more often than skilled migration, the role of international promotion is accordingly discussed in Chapter Three, but, where relevant, comments regarding the skilled migrants are offered (see Section 3.5). Since business and skilled opportunities are internationally promoted in similar ways, it would be impractical to separate them.

2.6.1 External stakeholder engagement

Canada. The majority of the Canadian provincial governments have regional cooperation frameworks. They are typically operated with skilled nominees in mind, however, where other migrants’ groups may benefit, this is noted, too. They are typically of recent history, which shows that governments and stakeholders are active and innovative in their endeavours to attract migrants to settle outside the largest Canadian cities.

In British Columbia, the regional migration initiative commenced in October 2004 and ran until June 2005 (Zehr 2004:n.p.). It involved joint federal and provincial funding for projects where communities led initiatives to support the attraction and retention of
immigrants and temporary residents outside Greater Vancouver (CIC 2004f:2). Eight areas participated in the strategy as of May 2005 (Revelstoke, Powell River, Greater Vernon, Prince George, Okanagan, Nanaimo, Abbotsford and Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District). The initiatives consisted in each community inventing its own immigration strategy to enhance awareness of immigration opportunities and to develop resources to attract skilled and business migrants, foreign students and investment. It was intended that immigration strategy should be integrated into a community development plan (MCAWS BC 2005b:3). These strategies were going to be made available to other communities to share the experiences and increase community involvement (WED CA 2005:2).

A number of community stakeholders may be involved, such as economic development associations, employers, ethnocultural organisations, chambers of commerce, educational institutions, community leaders, settlement agencies, as well as other non-government and private organisations identified by the communities (MCAWS BC 2005b:2). These bodies may use the existing mechanisms to attract migrants such as for example the PNP (including its regional business component), enhance local capacity to accept privately sponsored refugees or make use of facilitated entry of foreign students (2005b:3–4). This demonstrates that under the non-restrictive approach to settlement of nominees, the incentive approach is promoted. Regional immigration strategies may embrace many possible ways of increasing local populations, in line with their identified population and economic needs. The concept of engagement of these stakeholders is driven by expected retention outcomes and resultant population boost as well as by the skills shortages. This is a proactive approach potentially able to address the policies’ objectives.

In Saskatchewan, nominees under the Skilled Workers/Professionals and Critical Occupations Sub-Categories may obtain extra points by benefiting from a Community Support Plan (CSP) submitted with other immigration documentation to the provincial government. The CSP may be initiated by an employer recruiting several nominees, or by a community agency (DGR SK n.d.e:6). A CSP must address basic settlement needs, such as housing, transportation, language training, child care, spousal employment, immediate settlement needs (for example, opening bank accounts, shopping, driver’s licenses and family doctors) and longer-term settlement needs. It should be developed through a community-based process, involving appropriate community groups, service organisations
and the Department (DGR SK n.d.e:6). This illustrates another proactive, innovative approach to increasing the attraction of regional areas by combining the employment offer with the community stakeholders’ support, in the non-restrictive settlement setting. As in British Columbia, this is potentially able to bring population benefits in the form of retention and resultant population increase in regional areas, as well as address skilled shortages, as intended by the policy.

Manitoba has turned community support into a formal provincial migration stream for skilled people. Individuals may be recommended for nomination by community organisations under the Community Support-Priority Assessment Stream. This requires the organisation to sign a so-called Community Support Agreement (CSA) with the government. These agreements are partnerships with specific objectives and requirements, arranged in accordance with program’s needs and available resources (MLI 2005b:14). Candidates must satisfy identical eligibility factors as the family-linked stream: age, language ability, qualifications and work experience (see Table 2.4). Since all nominees use the same application form, the community-linked nominees are considered in the light of the same retention factors as other Manitoba nominees (see Subsection 2.5.1). Importantly, they must also possess a letter of support from their recommending organisation (2005b:14).

Examples of two regional communities that have entered into CSAs are Winkler and Steinbach (Huynh 2004:13). They were also mentioned during an interview with a Manitoba government official as examples of towns actively attracting migrants, and it was estimated by that official to have excellent (around 90 per cent) retention rates.44 Furthermore, the City of Winnipeg is a partner (with CIC and MLI) in the Winnipeg Private Refugee Sponsorship Assistance Program, which, apart from the humanitarian aspect, serves to increase the city population and aims at retaining it (CIC 2002f:1,3). This initiative in Winnipeg is consistent with the Canadian understanding of ‘region’.

Manitoba initiatives provide further evidence of the active role of the local stakeholders in the policy implementation. Their participation guarantees the delivery of necessary assistance, which, in turn, promotes retention and associated benefits. Under the non-

44 Interview took place on 25 March 2003,
restrictive settlement arrangements, enabling local stakeholders to join the provincial government’s efforts in addressing policy objectives, such as boosting and retaining population across the province, especially in the face of the trend of net interprovincial migration losses of the local residents (see Subsection I.3.2 in Appendix I), demonstrates the innovation of the adopted approach.

Québec represents the most structured example of the regionalisation of immigration and the current policy goes back to early 1990s. From early on, cooperation with local actors, establishment of immigrant serving agencies and promotion of regions were seen as important factors to the policy success. Family and ethnic links and support lent by the local populations were other key factors in permanent settlement. To ensure that the regionalisation strategy fitted the regional development policy, local socioeconomic bodies were consulted and the ‘Action Plan’ followed in 1993 (Simard 1996:444–46). Initiatives to increase the settlement of migrants in the regions by targeting those who settled in Montréal were also proposed (1996:446).

The current regionalisation policy is based on a few pillars. Two regional governments’ outposts are the Ministry’s regional offices and integration centres (carrefours d’intégration). The latter offer reception services, including settlement assistance, language training, credentials assessment services, employment assistance and facilitate sociocultural integration (Gagné 2003:2). The policy supports locally driven initiatives to attract and retain immigrants. As one of the senior Québec government officials dealing with regional matters explained, a pivotal role is played by the regional development councils (Conseils Régionaux de Développement). They organise the consultative process of local stakeholders with regard to the regional development policies. If it is decided at this local level that regional immigration strategy is a means to enhance the development of the region, and specific objectives are established, the council may enter into a special agreement with the Ministry. It provides financial support to meet the objectives of the agreement.

45 Background for the current policy and earlier experiences with regionalisation in Québec can be found in Simard 1996:442–44.
46 Interview took place on 1 April 2003.
Such agreements may include other ministries and local institutions engaged in providing assistance to immigrants, such as settlement agencies, local universities or colleges. Employers also participate. The money does not come exclusively from MRCI QC/MICC QC but from other ministries, too. At the time of the interviews (2003), many regions were using immigration to support their development objectives: South Québec (Sud du Québec), National Capital Region (Capitale Nationale et sa région), Central Québec (Centre du Québec), Mauricie, Outaouais and more remote regions of Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean and Abitimi-Témiscamingue. Similar agreements existed also with some city councils, where the Ministry was supporting the local immigration plans. In 2003, participating councils included Québec City, Sherbrooke, Gatineau and Montréal.\(^7\)

If Québec City is taken as an example, among the reasons for introducing the city immigration action plan to execute the agreement were the slowing population growth and low migration rates (Ville de Québec n.d.:n.p.). The focus of the plan included promotion of the city as a settlement choice, integration of new arrivals and improvement of the intercultural relations (n.d.:n.p.). A Québec City city council officer\(^8\) reported that the city was targeting skilled workers in particular.

As one of the quoted senior Québec government officials explained, there is also a ‘Fund for Regional Initiatives in Immigration’ (Fonds d’initiatives régionales en immigration), used to fund specific projects carried out by non-profit organisations, municipalities, local chambers of commerce and other local stakeholders. An example of such a project financed was an attraction strategy (aimed at Montréal-based migrants) implemented by a vocational training centre and a settlement agency, both from Sherbrooke. These two institutions, in cooperation with other regional stakeholders, were offering job placement services in areas experiencing skills shortages in the region, complete with settlement assistance (Gagné 2003:3).

The engagement of a number of local stakeholders that consult with each other and agree to integrate the immigration strategies into broader regional development strategies is reflected in the official policy documents such as ‘Québec Immigration Plans’ and

\(^7\) These regions and city councils were mentioned by the senior Québec government official as in note above and by another senior Québec government official responsible for integration matters at 1 April 2003.

\(^8\) Interview took place on 21 March 2003.
‘Strategic Plans’ (see for example MRCI QC 2002a; MICC QC 2005i). Until recently, the ‘Strategic Plans’ (see for example plan for 2001–04 in MRCI QC 2001a) comprised numerical targets for regional settlement. The new “Action Plan 2004–2007” (MRCI QC 2004b) builds on the notion of responsibility of the regions themselves for their development, which the provincial government supports. Instead of numerical targets, the new strategy is based on regional action plans. These cover cooperation of, and initiatives undertaken by, the local and regional actors, such as local and regional offices of the provincial ministries, municipalities, regional authorities, business associations, employers, educational institutions, non-profit organisations and other local and regional institutions. Three principles guide the plans: attraction, reception and integration of the new arrivals (2004b:102). Such locally driven plans have so far been launched by, and for Québec City and its region (MRCI QC 2004a), by the region of Estrie (MICC QC 2005e) and by the region of Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean (MICC QC 2005f). All in all, engaging these stakeholders to create and implement strategies to attract, settle and integrate skilled and business immigrants potentially addresses the policy objectives of the government. Under the guaranteed freedom of settlement in Canada such arrangements are innovative.

Community sponsorships were mentioned as new initiatives in New Brunswick but no specific information was yet available from the program’s website in May 2005. Furthermore, activity of ethnic communities (for example, the Jewish community in Fredericton) in supporting the increase in nominees’ numbers in that province was noted (Lampart 2004:n.p.). Nova Scotia is another province that has turned this support into a formal provincial migration stream. Its immigration strategy (Province of Nova Scotia 2005) mentions the Community-Identified Stream, which is offered through the Regional Development Authorities (RDAs) and community partners. All RDAs can recommend migrants on the basis of their social and economic contribution to the community. It appears that it may take a form of a specific business plan developed by the RDAs and interested community partners (2005:13). This would bring the Nova Scotia’s approach in line with those of British Columbia and Québec. In May 2005, information about the development of this plan was available from the Greater Halifax Partnership (Greater Halifax Partnership n.d:1). A similar Immigration Partnership also exists in Colchester (Colchester Regional Development Agency (CORDA) n.d:1). Local stakeholders attest to
the activity of the government in mobilising the regional and community stakeholders and to the innovative character of such initiatives, as discussed above.

Newfoundland and Labrador’s recognition of community links remains one of the points-tested retention factors for skilled nominees and was discussed earlier. Programs in Saskatchewan and Manitoba do not have regional immigration frameworks but operate on the basis of agreements reached each time a community-driven immigration is to take place. All in all, a feature of this community engagement in the policy implementation is some sort of an official agreement between the provincial governments and the community/regional stakeholders.

These initiatives demonstrate an unprecedented rise in popularity of the community-driven immigration initiatives, where the migration streams are those available, and they may be used in a targeted way to meet specific immigration and community development objectives. While the support offered to a nominee by the recommending employer, sometimes accompanied by community support was deemed an essential and innovative policy instrument of dispersal and retention (see Subsection 2.5.1), one can now see that these are one-off initiatives. These formal partnerships with community and regional stakeholders go a step further. In the majority of such partnerships, a number of stakeholders are involved, allowing the support to be more wide-ranging. Furthermore, rather than assisting an individual nominee with a family, similar support may be offered to a greater number of people. Even in cases where one recommending organisation is involved (Manitoba), it is likely that assisting stakeholders are recruited to help in the settlement of a number of people. In sum, the partnerships seem equipped to handle groups of people, which may potentially be more beneficial in terms of population targets. For the above reasons, it is recommended that such initiatives should be implemented more widely.

Considering the scale of adoption of these initiatives, if this course of action continues, matures and spills over to areas that have not yet adopted them, they may soon denominate a new dimension of the immigration policy development. In the light of the non-restrictive

\[9\] Newfoundland and Labrador’s future immigration strategy will support regional economic development strategies (DHRI.E NL 2005:13). It remains to be seen whether the community links already integrated into skilled nominees’ formal assessment will be upgraded to community-linked migration streams, or perhaps the regions will integrate them into their economic strategies, as in Québec.
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approach to settlement, addressing the policy objectives by means of such regional immigration initiatives will continue to be incentive-based. Such an approach is widely promoted by the federal and provincial governments in Canada and it was clearly the spirit of the federal-provincial-territorial meeting of ministers responsible for immigration in Gatineau, Québec in 2004. The ministers agreed to work on an Immigration Framework to attract, settle and retain newcomers in all regions of Canada. The Framework is to lay the foundation for a more responsive immigration program based on stronger partnerships between federal and provincial/territorial governments, and to create opportunities for increased participation from cities and communities, large and small, from employers and others (Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat (CICS) 2004:1). This indicates that continued use of these initiatives will be, as it has been in the past, based on the established earlier distinctive Canadian provincial policy management strategy, where governments cooperate with these stakeholders individually and independently of each other and of the federal government.

In Australia, similar strategies are currently being developed, however, with one exception, these have not yet taken the form of regional immigration strategies. Currently, state funding in Victoria, as in Québec, enables the implementation of the regional migration strategies. This is a continuation and development of partnerships with local and regional authorities formed earlier (Parliament of Australia 2003c:2). There is a ‘Regional Migration Incentive Fund’, which involves “(...) support to regional communities to develop, and implement local strategies to attract, receive and retain skilled and business migrants (...).” This is a component of the migration strategy aimed at increasing Victoria’s share of skilled and business migrants, contribute to overall population growth targets and address skill shortages (from Summary of Actions, Victorian Government 2004).

As in Canada, partners may involve local governments, employers, chambers of commerce and regional development bodies. Furthermore, relevant state and federal governments’ departments will participate (Department for Victorian Communities (DVC) 2004:4–5). The participating areas include (in each case with adjacent region): Ballarat, Geelong, Shepparton, Warrnambool, Bendigo, Horsham, Mildura, Swan Hill, Wodonga and the Gippsland region (2004:3). Of the local initiatives that may be supported, the most important seem to be the language training for new arrivals and children, temporary
housing assistance for migrants, job matching and work experience for Melbourne based migrants in regional Victoria (2004:5–6). The auxiliary funding for ‘Targeted Programs’ is intended to help local communities (not limited to those mentioned above) to attract and settle skilled and business migrants (Victorian Government 2004:n.p.).

Empowering local and regional stakeholders to create their immigration strategies (and financially supporting them), while at the same time cooperating with committed supporters of dispersal, retention and alleviation of skills shortages and boosting the business development, attests to the active role of the government and an innovative character of the adopted regionalisation approach. This brings Victoria in line with the Canadian provincial initiatives and such initiatives would likely benefit also other communities across Australia. As in Canada, they should be more widely used.

Other Australian states have not yet created similar funds but the direction of developments in some jurisdictions suggests that communities may soon play a greater role. First, community-sponsored migration was foreshadowed in South Australia’s population policy (Government of South Australia 2004:12). Its policy is aimed at increasing population levels and meeting the skills shortages across the whole state (2004:8,10). Second, the Northern Territory in its ‘Business and Skilled Migration Strategy 2005–2010’ recognises that migrants and ethnic communities have established networks that could lead to more migration from their home countries, thus contributing to retention (DBIRD NT n.d.a:8).

Given that the communities’ role in immigration and retention has been recognised and documented, and that states and territories observe what others are doing, it is possible that in the following months there will be more initiatives similar to those being pursued by Victoria. Should they bring tangible results and demonstrate that with targeted funding and committed regional and local stakeholders the integrated policy may yield better results than isolated support by regional employers, other jurisdictions may follow. It will be important though to develop strategies customised to the local conditions, as there is no universal solution.

50 Publication year of this document is reported in DPC VIC 2004:21.
Formal recognition of the community links only by Tasmania and the Northern Territory as retention factors indicates a minimal scale of tapping into the community potential in comparison to the Canadian provinces, but the above evidence illustrates that this is now changing. The Victorian initiative and the Tasmanian and the Northern Territory's interests demonstrate that such direction is possible. In comparison to Canada, where these stakeholders' engagement was a natural solution to dispersal and retention under the sole responsibility of the provincial governments and the non-restrictive settlement arrangements, the later catch-up in Australia may result from the sole DIMIA responsibility for some regional visas and delineation of the regional or low population growth areas that guarantee dispersal. The introduction of the regional SIR visa, where Tasmania and Northern Territory credit the community links, but one of the permanent visa options is RSMS managed by DIMIA suggests, that this cooperation of state/territory and federal government in Australia will continue. Nonetheless, the community and regionally driven immigration initiatives in both countries enable confirming one of the proposed hypotheses that Australia and Canada are highly active in innovative regional migration policies.

Under such circumstances, the regional immigration initiatives in the Australian states and territories will likely develop on the basis of existing visa options rather than involve introducing community-linked streams, as in some Canadian provinces. They are worth monitoring as they may similarly come to represent a new dimension of the immigration policy development. At the same time, the practice of these initiatives in both countries, involving the role of each one Canadian provincial government in cooperating with the said stakeholders and the use of available DIMIA-only and other visas in Australia, confirm the distinctive character of the policy management strategies identified earlier.

The initial interest in whether the policies have incorporated new models of stakeholder participation in regionalisation has now received a substantial boost. At the onset of the research, the close cooperation of provincial governments with the local stakeholders in Canada, and the close cooperation of the federal and state/territory governments in Australia and some bodies performing new duties, such as local and regional organisations (RCBs) certifying positions for the employer-linked visas, was considered to be novel. The novelty now extends to taking advantage, on a wider scale than previously, of the communities' will and their capacity to bring in more migrants to these areas, and to forge
official regional/community partnerships to increase regional skilled (and business) migration in a more coordinated manner. The substantial scale of these provisions especially in Canada, and commencement of similar initiatives in Australia confirms the postulated hypothesis that the policy responses have adopted new models of stakeholder participation to manage regional migration. This constitutes a positive step, and it is expected that, as the policies mature, they will become more institutionalised.

It is also important to observe that the above mentioned community-motivated immigration strategies represent a form of regional development, in line with the community-driven regional development concepts noted in the literature review. These propose that the communities come forward with own ideas and lead their own development. Examples of this approach are found in the practice of the Canadian community immigration strategies. More specifically, as per the tactic proposed in the literature, various community and/or regional and business stakeholders are involved in creating and acting upon their own immigration strategies, as in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Québec and Nova Scotia. Federal and/or provincial funding for regional development initiatives noted in the literature review is available to make these Canadian community immigration initiatives happen in British Columbia and for the regional action plans in Québec. The Canadian community/regional strategies are based on formal undertakings being either agreements signed each time with the provincial governments to bring in nominees as in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Nova Scotia, or are longer-term strategies as in British Columbia, or the Québec regional action plans.

It is worth emphasising that the Canadian provincial immigration policies and the regional development policies are explicitly intended to intersect and be mutually supporting. In British Columbia and Québec the community/regional immigration strategies should be, or are integrated into broader regional development plans (recall from the literature review that the vision of regional development put forward by the Australian federal government involves use of regional migration schemes). The Québec approach, where the regional development councils organise the consultations of local stakeholders with a view to include regional immigration as one means of regional development strategies, best illustrates how this intersection may come to happen. This provincial government’s move away from dispersing immigrants by setting numerical targets, to the regional action plans
for immigration based on the notion of regions’ own responsibility for their development, bears resemblance (albeit retarded) to the abandoning of the idea that the national policies could effectively influence the spatial economic structure, and moving to the locally-driven regional development. Similar community-driven immigration strategies in Australia have been enabled so far in one state (Victorian government funding).

2.6.2 Promotion

Domestic promotion of the regional skilled schemes in Australia and of the corresponding Canadian provincial streams serves to increase awareness and use of the programs by informing the business community about possible ways of meeting its skills shortages. Two methods of promotion and information dissemination were mentioned earlier: seminars for employers and recruitment events jointly run by DIMIA and industry, and the RPOs role of promoting regional skilled schemes and the SMD (see Subsection 2.5.2).

Senior states’ governments officials in Australia explained that promotion of the regional skilled schemes occurred through other arrangements, too.51 For example, in Tasmania the RSMS was being promoted in partnerships with local councils and through local chambers of commerce. In Queensland, the departmental regional offices disseminated information. Individual employers are not the only targeted recipients of such information. Regional development bodies, business organisations and other local stakeholders, such as community and ethnic groups, are informed about the advantages of sponsored/provincial skilled migration. All of these stakeholders have first-hand experience of existing shortages, or have become aware of such shortages through their local networks, and are able to disseminate the knowledge. This promotional activity supports efforts to address the economic policy objective while at the same time promoting an increase in local population numbers.

The advantages of Canadian provincial streams are promoted through many stakeholders. For example, according to the provincial annual reports, employers, professional and trade associations, and community service agencies are recipients of such information (MCAWS BC 2004a:46; Department of Government Relations and Aboriginal Affairs Saskatchewan (DGRAA SK) 2004a:21). Moreover, in British Columbia information is provided to post-

51 As noted by a senior Tasmanian government official on 4 November 2003 and by a senior Queensland government official on 12 December 2003.
secondary institutions (MCAWS BC 2004a:46) and participation at business and trade events to promote the program was reported by Saskatchewan (DGRAA SK 2004a:21). Marketing efforts in British Columbia were reported to result in an increased interest in the PNP, and more new employers using it (MCAWS BC 2004a:47). In Québec, regional development councils, organising the consultative processes of the local stakeholders to work out a regional immigration strategy, act as information conduits. Information and promotion are also part of regional action plans (see for example MICC QC 2005e:8).

The above examples indicate that the Australian and the Canadian provincial governments use converging channels of domestic promotion of their respective skilled migration schemes. This improves their chances of addressing the population and economic objectives. Furthermore, engagement in such multi-pronged activities shows that the governments are highly active and innovative in their approaches to popularising their programs.

Despite some comments heard in Australia reporting low levels of interest in information sessions up until the time when the skills shortage was actually experienced (see Subsection 2.5.2), the positive marketing outcomes, for example in British Columbia, and regular DIMIA activity in organising information events in cooperation with local stakeholders, suggest that these efforts are worthwhile in terms of meeting employers’ needs. Pursuing domestic promotion indicates that this policy instrument performs an essential role in supporting the operation of the Australian and the Canadian provincial schemes.

2.7 Conclusions

This chapter has examined the eligibility factors and the policy instruments used in Australian and Canadian provincial regional migration for offshore and onshore skilled migrants. It has shown how Australia and Canada’s divergent constitutional responsibilities in the matter of immigration have influenced the policy measures they have adopted to respond to population and economic policy objectives. This chapter compared how suitable these measures were in addressing these objectives and what the benefits the policies could potentially bring.
The policies commonly address two population-related objectives: supporting the population increase in their jurisdictions and improving the uneven population distribution, encompassing the migrant population. Second, the economic objective consists of addressing the skills shortages. It was shown that the Australian and Canadian provincial governments have adopted a number of similar generic eligibility factors and policy instruments to operate their respective policies. The constitutional responsibility has yielded some divergent emphases and roles assigned to some of these measures.

In Australia, the federal responsibility for immigration has resulted in the state and territory governments being guaranteed that the migrants have satisfied the same generic federal key eligibility criteria (with some concessions) as the independent (federal) skilled migrants. On the other hand, the governments have determined the Designated Areas and have used other instruments to decide where settlement of skilled migrants might take place within their jurisdictions. The governments were also able to develop some of their own criteria in addition to the federal ones under the state/territory schemes provided to them. By contrast, the shared constitutional responsibility for immigration has enabled the Canadian provincial governments to set up their own eligibility factors and decide on other policy instruments independently of the federal government and of each other. In consequence of that sole responsibility, the socioeconomic trends and the guaranteed mobility rights for permanent residents, the governments have made their entire territories eligible for migration.

These divergent constitutional responsibilities have permeated the entire policy practice in both countries. This has constituted a basis for emphasising two distinctive policy management strategies. In Australia, the strategy involved the cooperation of the federal and state/territory governments, and hence joint management and responsibility for the policy outcomes. In Canada, the provincial governments were exclusively responsible for their policies' management and hence also for their outcomes. This could not be fully supported in the case of the ultimate federal Canadian government's enforcement of prerogatives in relation to the removal of an individual from Canada.

The similar eligibility factors used by the governments in both countries to address the population and economic policies' objectives comprised the age criterion, English/French language ability, skill levels (qualifications), nominated occupation (and pre-arranged
employment in the Canadian provinces), recent work experience and retention factors. Assisting policy instruments in both countries included governments’ support services to migrants and employers, monitoring of visas as well as domestic promotion of the skilled schemes. It was assessed that as a result of the policies, the governments could potentially obtain comparable benefits, such as population increase and maintenance of the current level resulting from settlement of new migrants (including onshore status conversions), population dispersal resulting from these migrants’ settlement in the targeted areas, and alleviation of skilled shortages resulting from these migrants using their overseas qualifications in the job/having skills in demand.

Furthermore, additional benefits following the migrants’ settlement were identified, but their scale could not be assessed due to the observed data difficulties. Also, ‘uniquely onshore’ benefits obtainable in the process of the onshore status conversion were noted. The governmental support services and domestic promotion measures that have been discussed were believed to be worthwhile in terms of supporting the policies’ outcomes, but that a positive contributory role was an assumption as there was not sufficient information to endorse that confidently. All these eligibility factors and other policy instruments were considered potentially capable of addressing the population and economic policies’ objectives in Australia and the Canadian provinces.

The Australian and Canadian policy practices have been shown to emphasise different aspects of the same policy measures. From among the eligibility factors, the policy application of the concept of ‘skills’, in combination with the dispersal measures, was highlighted. Under the federal responsibility for immigration, the concept of ‘skills’ in Australia was characterised by uniform policy application across the country. That involved an innovative solution of applying strict skill levels criteria - identical to the federal ones, and narrowed down by SOL - and another innovative measure of using state/territory and/or regional shortages’ lists. These corresponded to SOL skill levels and were facilitated a match between the migrant’s skills and the local labour market. There was also the federal skills assessment requirement. In combination with the Designated Areas, other determinants of settlement and temporary retention guarantees, such an approach was believed to be potentially capable of addressing the population and economic policy objectives. That has also enabled operation of different migration streams: the regional
family-linked migration, state/territory sponsored migration and employer-recommended migration. The first two groups did not require an employment offer.

A striking feature of the Canadian provincial streams was the dominating role of the employment offer. Contrary to Australia, where the schemes rely heavily on the federal criteria, the employment offer was an innovative provincial response to the Canadian federal criteria for skilled (independent) migrants. It by-passed the situation where equivalent to ASCO-II in Australia skill levels were eligible, but they were not narrowed down by a SOL equivalent. To avoid the mismatch between a migrant’s skills and the labour market, the Canadian provinces relied principally on employers to communicate a shortage. Under the employment offer arrangement, the policy application of ‘skills’ became more liberal than in Australia, with lower level skills being sometimes considered on a regular basis. Although this was noted to potentially result in some lower skilled migration in comparison to Australia, in fact some similar highly skilled occupations were being targeted by the Australian and Canadian jurisdictions, resulting in their direct international competition. In other cases, employer nominations could be made for positions from beyond the shortages’ lists, if justified. As in Australia, the employment offer approach was assisted by the skills assessment, which was deemed another innovative solution in relation to the Canadian arrangements under the federal (independent) migration. This open approach to determining skills explained incidence of non-employer-linked Canadian provincial streams.

The notion that the employment offer aids the economic policy objective was further supported by the provincial retention measures. These involved cooperation with employers and communities. To increase their importance in policy implementation, sometimes their support was formally integrated into the provincial points-tests. Under the non-restrictive settlement arrangements, that cooperation was considered an innovative solution and an assisting ‘soft measure’ (employment offer was one) promoting intraprovincial population dispersal and retention.

Other eligibility factors in the Canadian provinces such as age criteria and English language ability were typically more liberally applied than in Australia. The liberal criterion of age in some Canadian provinces was noted to be attractive to older applicants. On the other hand,
the Australian state/territory governments tested their potential migrants against similar retention factors as the Canadian provinces did for all their migrants.

Some support services provided ideas for further consideration: the ‘meet and greet service’, accommodation arrangements or personalised mailings to promote employment in regions were emphasised as measures that could be used on a wider scale. Moreover, the Victorian searchable online database of employment vacancies was considered innovative and its implementation by other governments was believed capable of assisting an increase in the number of sponsorships. Its adoption by the Canadian provinces could also simplify and accelerate the process of employment search by the nominees.

From among the other policy instruments, the potentially different consequences of visa monitoring in Australia and Canada were highlighted. It was established that under the guaranteed mobility rights, abandoning the nominating province or changing employer did not lead to a visa cancellation and a consequent loss of permanent status in Canada. This, however, could be the potential consequences of leaving the sponsoring jurisdiction or employer prior to the two-year residency/contract duration requirement in Australia, regardless of the initially granted residency status. This also indicated that the retention policy objective was being addressed in Australia through such temporary administrative retention measures. In the Canadian setting, retention could only be incentive-based.

Another striking difference with the Australian approach was the scale of the community/regionally driven initiatives in the Canadian provinces. They were proposed to be implemented on a wider scale in Canada and Australia. These official agreements between the provincial governments and local and/or regional stakeholders were considered potentially able to address the policies’ objectives of the population increase, intraprovincial dispersal and retention, skills shortages (and business development). Under the guaranteed mobility rights, these initiatives were incentive-based and were considered proactive and innovative solutions. In comparison to the innovative solution involving engagement of employers and communities, these initiatives go a step further. They may offer broader support and to a greater number of people, thus better responding to the policies’ objectives. Similar solutions have only recently begun to be adopted in Australia seemingly due to sole DIMIA responsibility for managing some of the regional skilled visas
and geographically restricted settlement under those visas. The Australian developments indicate now that the DIMIA role is not an obstacle to developing such initiatives, although it was expected that they would use the existing visas rather than introduce community-linked streams, as in some Canadian provinces. That area of the policies was believed to be worth monitoring because the continuation and expansion of such initiatives in both countries might soon characterise a new dimension of the policies' development, where the role of these stakeholders would be more prominent.

Examination of the ways the eligibility factors and other policy instruments were applied by the policies has also served to test three hypotheses. Wide-ranging support was established for the hypothesis proposing that Australia and Canada were highly active in innovative regional migration policies. Evidence was provided by the earlier mentioned innovative solutions from both countries as well as by recent policy developments, such as for example enabling WHMs to apply for the SIR visa onshore in Australia, and the new regionalisation measures for international students in Canada.

Furthermore, these recent solutions, the recent introduction of the SIR visa and additional points available under this category, the regional trade skills visa in Australia as well as the recent history of the student streams in two Canadian provinces lead to the conclusion that two potential benefits could be obtained as a result. First, access to a larger pool of potential candidates could be facilitated, assisting in increasing the numbers of regional migrants to fill the skilled shortages. Second, an additional means of supporting the dispersal objective, with a potential to enhance the outcomes, could be pursued. In both countries these measures broaden the scale of the government operations and demonstrate an ongoing commitment to developing regional migration policies.

Support for the other hypothesis stating that Australia and Canada were responding through their policies to new global population movements was also confirmed. These movements were particularly composed of temporary workers and former international students who tended to migrate permanently on having initially resided in the country as temporary residents. Evidence for that hypothesis was found in the flexible policies' responses involving the onshore status conversion provisions from temporary to permanent status.
The last tested hypothesis, stating that the policy responses have adopted new models of stakeholder participation to manage the regional migration, could also be supported. Its confirmation came from the community/regional immigration initiatives being locally driven attraction and retention strategies. In comparison to earlier modest cooperation between the governments with community and regional bodies in both countries, these initiatives were now official agreements between these local actors and the governments. The considerable scale of engaging these stakeholders in policy implementation, especially in Canada, and the commencement of similar initiatives in Australia, has led to the conclusion that the initiatives indeed represent a new model of stakeholder participation in the policy management.

Further to that, these locally-driven community/regional migration strategies in the Canadian provinces were found to be representing a form of regional development, operating on the basis of principles proposed by the community-driven regional development concepts, introduced in Section 1.3 in Chapter One. More specifically, the strategies were based on local initiatives resulting from community and business stakeholder consultations, enabled by federal and/or provincial government support, as per these principles. Hence, the Canadian community/regional migration strategies illustrate how these concepts may look like in practice. It is important to emphasise that in British Columbia and Québec the community/regional immigration strategies are to be incorporated into broader regional development plans (in the vision of regional development put forward by the Australian federal government regional migration schemes are incorporated, too). This demonstrates that the regional migration and regional development policies are explicitly intended to intersect.

The migration eligibility factors of skills and work experience were also found to be practical applications of support to regions, broadening their access to learning and innovation proposed as means of regional development by another concept – the ‘learning region’. It proposes that knowledge acquisition through learning and innovation assists regions in becoming competitive, which in turn enables them to participate in the knowledge-based economy. These eligibility factors are designed to boost the human capital in regions by enabling highly skilled individuals to immigrate and fill critical shortages. Overseas skills and expertise transfer may occur (unless explicitly expected as in
British Columbia). Building and/or enhancing the human capital through these eligibility factors for regional skilled migration facilitates continuation and/or enhancement of business operations, and enables these regional firms to become more competitive. That international knowledge and expertise that regional skilled migrants may offer assists in integration of the Australian and Canadian regional firms into the knowledge-based economy – the ultimate dimension of regional development – as proposed by the ‘learning region’ concept.
Chapter Three
Policy implementation for regional business migration in Australia and Canada

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a comparison of Australian and Canadian regional migration policies for business people. First, an overview of the migration streams is offered, followed by a presentation and a subsequent analysis of the eligibility factors. Dispersal and retention measures are discussed next. Third, the role of the policy instruments corresponding to those examined in the preceding chapter, such as the governmental business support services, governments’ monitoring activities, cooperation with the external stakeholders and methods of international promotion are studied. This analysis assesses the suitability of the adopted eligibility factors and the other policy instruments in addressing the policies’ economic and population objectives. It also serves to show what potential benefits may be brought by these policies. Similarities and contrasts in the Australian and the Canadian policy approaches are noted, which, as in the preceding chapter, characterises their distinctive policy management strategies as well as allows potential, resultant divergent outcomes to be discussed. Innovative solutions are emphasised.

This chapter concentrates on the two most similar regional business migration options: the Australian state/territory sponsored business owner and senior executive categories and the provincial entrepreneurs and managers/senior executives in Canada. Other options that will be discussed are the Australian state/territory sponsored investor, the Québec-selected investor (other Canadian provinces do not offer such option), as well as the Australian state/territory sponsored Business Talent (BT) and the Regional Established Business in Australia (REBA) visas.

3.2 Migration streams and eligibility factors overview

As in the case of skilled migration, business migrants are ‘sponsored’ by the Australian state/territory governments. The Canadian provincial business migrants are ‘nominated’
by the provincial governments, while Québec ‘selects’ its business migrants. Despite similar character of the Australian and the Canadian provincial business migration categories, the divergent constitutional responsibilities for immigration matters in both countries influence the way these schemes operate. As in the case of skilled migration in Australia, the federal responsibility determines that the same key eligibility factors apply to the sponsored migrants across the entire country, and some concessions are made for the state/territory sponsored migrants, as opposed to their unsponsored counterparts. By contrast, the Canadian provincial governments’ sole responsibility for their programs is reflected in these governments individually deciding on the business migration streams and the eligibility factors.

3.2.1 Australia
Two features characterise the Australian approach to business migration. First, both unsponsored and sponsored migrants come on two-stage visas. Temporary (provisional) visas are granted for four years and fulfilling visa conditions allows visa holders to apply for permanent residence. Permanent residence is linked to business performance on the temporary visa (DIMIA 2004g:2). The BT visa, also sponsored by states and territories, is an exception to the two-stage visa rule. These migrants obtain permanent residency upfront (2004g:4). REBA is an onshore permanent residence visa and is the only category where the points-test is used (see Subsection 3.3.4). Otherwise, unlike some skilled regional migrants, neither sponsored nor unsponsored business migrants are points-tested.

Second, migrants are encouraged to set up their businesses in regional, rural or low growth areas, but are not confined in their choice of settlement and business location, unlike some skilled migrants. State/territory governments have their own criteria for sponsorship (DIMIA 2004g:2). This means that the governments may tighten the open approach to settlement by making a capital city location more difficult to settle in. This Subsection shows the business owner, senior executive and investor migration streams first. To illustrate where the said concessions for the two-stage sponsored business migrants have been made, Table 3.1 presents the DIMIA migration streams for the prospective unsponsored temporary business migrants and the standard eligibility factors to provide a reference point.
Table 3.1 DIMIA migration streams and eligibility factors for unsponsored provisional (temporary) business visas in Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility factors</th>
<th>Business Owner</th>
<th>Senior Executive</th>
<th>Investor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 45 when applying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language</td>
<td>Vocational English level (one or more of the following: native speaker; education in English language; employment in English speaking country; IELTS results; accredited English translator/interpreter in Australia). Family members 18+ with no functional English pay language upgrade tuition fee before visa can be granted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Record</td>
<td>Successful business career and nor the applicant or spouse has history of business/investment activities of nature unacceptable in Australia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets value in business/business experience/ownership interest</td>
<td>For at least 2 of the 4 years immediately before applying applicant (or combined with spouse) had net assets in at least qualifying business of at least Australian dollars (AUD $) 200,000.</td>
<td>For at least 2 of the 4 years immediately before applying applicant has occupied a position in 3 highest levels of management structure of a major business and has been responsible for strategic policy development affecting a major component/wide range of operations of that major business.</td>
<td>Total of at least 3 years of experience in directly managing qualifying business/es or eligible investments. For at least 1 of 5 fiscal years immediately before applying, the applicant has managed a qualifying business where he/she has (or together with spouse) had ownership interest of at least 10% of total value of this business, OR in this timeframe has directly managed his/her (or combined with spouse) eligible investments of total value of at least AUD$ 1.5m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business turnover</td>
<td>For at least 2 of the 4 years immediately before applying applicant’s main business/es had annual turnover of at least AUD $500,000.</td>
<td>Does not apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Investment</td>
<td>Does not apply,</td>
<td>At the time of decision, applicant has made a Designated Investment of AUD$ 1.5m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets (business and personal)</td>
<td>Applicant’s (or combined with spouse) has business and personal assets of net value of at least AUDS 500,000 for conduct/establishment of business, lawfully acquired and transferable within 2 years of the visa grant.</td>
<td>For 2 fiscal years immediately prior to application, applicant’s (or combined with spouse) net assets value was at least AUD $ 2.25m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) Qualifying business - enterprise operated for profit through provision of goods, services, or both (but other than provision of rental property) to the public and not operated primarily or substantially for the purpose of speculative or passive investment. DIMIA 2004g:42.
b) Main business - applicant has or has had an ownership interest in the business and he/she maintains, or has maintained direct and continuous involvement in day to day management of the business, in the decision making process affecting the overall direction and performance of the business, and the value of the applicant’s ownership interest (or combined with spouse’s) is or was at least 10% of the total value of the business, and the business is a qualifying business (see above). DIMIA 2004g:42.
c) In Senior Executive category major business is a business (other than a government enterprise) with an annual turnover of not less than an equivalent of AUD$ 50m in each of any 2 of the 4 fiscal years immediately before making the application DIMIA 2004g:44.
d) Eligible investment in relation to a person means: a) an ownership interest in a business; or b) a loan to a business; or c) cash on deposit; or d) stocks and bonds; or e) real estate; or f) gold or silver bullion, owned for the purposes of producing return by way of income or capital gain and is not held for personal use. DIMIA 2004g:41.
e) Ownership interest - interest in a business as a shareholder in a company that carries on the business, or a partner in a partnership that carries on the business, or the sole proprietor of a business, including indirect interest held through one (or more) interposed companies, partnerships or trusts. DIMIA 2004g:42.
f) Designated Investment - investment in a security issued by a state/territory government’s authority, which is specified by the Minister by Gazette Notice for the purposes of investor visa subclauses. DIMIA 2004g:41.

Source: DIMIA 2004g.

Table 3.1 shows that there are two common eligibility factors for all three migration categories: the age limit and the vocational English language ability. Criteria then differ slightly for each category, reflecting the expected nature of business experience in each
one of them. Business owners must have a successful business record. They are assessed against the net assets in business, business turnover level and the amount of the net assets needed to establish and conduct business in Australia. Senior executives are required to possess advanced managerial experience and enough money to establish and conduct business in Australia as business owners. Investors must demonstrate managerial skills in relation to business or investment operations. They are required to make a Designated Investment and possess considerable net assets.

These three categories and generic eligibility factors are replicated under state/territory business migration with concessional criteria. Table 3.2 shows pathways from temporary to permanent migration for these individuals. Table 3.3 shows where the concessions in the eligibility factors for the temporary visa applicants have been made. Table 3.4 presents the eligibility factors for the permanent state/territory sponsored business migrants. Concessions in relation to the unsponsored permanent visa applicants are discussed in the text. Note that Tables 3.3 and 3.4 use terms that are explained in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business background</th>
<th>Provisional (temporary) stage visa</th>
<th>Residence (permanent) stage visa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td>State/territory Sponsored Business Owner (Provisional) visa</td>
<td>Business Owner (Residence) visa OR State/territory Sponsored Business Owner (Residence) visa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Employee Manager</td>
<td>State/territory Sponsored Business Owner (Provisional) visa</td>
<td>State/territory Sponsored Business Owner (Residence) visa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Executive</td>
<td>State/territory Sponsored Senior Executive (Provisional) visa</td>
<td>Business Owner (Residence) visa OR State/territory Sponsored Business Owner (Residence) visa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investor</td>
<td>State/territory Sponsored Investor (Provisional) visa</td>
<td>Investor (Residence) visa OR State/territory Sponsored Investor (Residence) visa OR State/territory Sponsored Business Owner (Residence) visa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DIMIA 2004g.
Table 3.3 DIMIA eligibility factors for state/territory sponsored provisional business visas in Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility factors</th>
<th>State/territory Sponsored Business Owner</th>
<th>State/territory Sponsored Senior Executive</th>
<th>State/territory Sponsored Investor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 55 when applying unless sponsoring state/territory has determined that the applicant's business activity is of exceptional economic benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language</td>
<td>Vocational English level not required. IELTS may need to be taken to demonstrate language ability. Any applicant (incl. family members) 18+ with no functional English pays language upgrade tuition fee before visa can be granted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business record</td>
<td>Successful business career and nor the applicant or spouse has history of business/investment activities of nature unacceptable in Australia.</td>
<td></td>
<td>High level of management skill in relation to an eligible investment or qualifying business. Applicant and spouse have no history of business/investment activities of nature unacceptable in Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business turnover/ experience/ interest</td>
<td>For at least 2 of the 4 fiscal years immediately before applying, applicant had ownership interest in main business/businesses with annual turnover of at least AUD$ 300,000, OR has had sound continuous business employment record in a senior management role in qualifying business for at least 4 years immediately before applying and has demonstrated high level of management skill as senior manager. Senior manager has operational and active management responsibilities, management responsibility over other managers and reports directly to the general manager of the corporation. Such businesses usually have annual turnover of at least AUD$ 1m.</td>
<td>For at least 2 of the 4 years immediately before applying, applicant has occupied a position in 3 highest levels of management structure of a major business and has been responsible for strategic policy development affecting a major component/wide range of operations of that major business. The annual turnover of that business must have been not less than equivalent of AUD$ 10m in each of any 2 of the 4 fiscal years immediately before applying.</td>
<td>Total of at least 3 years of experience in directly managing qualifying business(es) or eligible investments. For at least 1 of 5 fiscal years immediately before applying, applicant has managed a qualifying business where he/she has (or together with spouse) had ownership interest of at least 10% of total value of this business. OR in this timeframe he/she has directly managed his/her (or combined with spouse) eligible investments of total value of at least of AUD$ 750,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Investment</td>
<td>Does not apply.</td>
<td></td>
<td>At the time of decision, applicant has made a Designated Investment of AUD$ 750,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets (business and personal)</td>
<td>Applicant (or combined with spouse) has business and personal assets of net value of AUD$ 250,000 for conduct/establishment of business, lawfully acquired and transferable within 2 years of the visa grant. Applicant (or combined with spouse) also has additional business and personal assets of sufficient net value to settle in Australia.</td>
<td>For 2 fiscal years immediately before applying, net value of the applicant's (or combined with spouse's) assets was at least AUD$ 1.125m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DIMIA 2004g.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility factors</th>
<th>State/territory Sponsored Business Owner</th>
<th>State/territory Sponsored Business Investor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Does not apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language</td>
<td>Does not apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business record</td>
<td>Applicant and spouse have no history of business/investment activities of nature unacceptable in Australia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa held</td>
<td>State/territory Sponsored Business Owner/Senior Executive/Investor Provisional visa. Non-sponsored business visa holders in these categories and Independent Executives on Business (Long Stay) 457 visas may apply, too. Also SIR, TPV and THV visa holders applying for permanent residence.</td>
<td>State/territory Sponsored Investor (Provisional) visa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business activity (ownership requirements)</td>
<td>Applicant has had and continues to have ownership interest(a) and direct and continuous management in actively operating main business(es)(b) for at least 2 years immediately before applying.</td>
<td>Applicant is committed to continue to maintain a business/investment activity in Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business turnover/ Designated Investment</td>
<td>In 12 months immediately before applying applicant’s main business(es)(b) had turnover of at least AUD$ 200,000.</td>
<td>At the time of decision, applicant’s (or combined with spouse) Designated Investment(b) has been held continuously for at least 4 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee requirement/assets in Australia</td>
<td>2 of 3 of the following criteria must be met (unless exceptional circumstances exist): 1. Throughout 12 months immediately before applying main business(es)(b) employed at least the equivalent of 1 full-time employee (not a family member) who is an Australian citizen, Australian permanent resident or a New Zealand passport holder. 2. In that period net value of applicant’s (or combined with spouse’s) assets in main business(es)(b) is at least AUD$ 75,000. 3. In that period net value of applicant’s (or combined with spouse’s) personal and business assets in Australia has been at least AUD$ 250,000.</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency in Australia on provisional visa</td>
<td>Applicant has been in Australia as a holder of a qualifying visa for a total of 1 year in 2 years immediately before applying.</td>
<td>Applicant has been residing, as a holder of State/territory Sponsored Investor (Provisional) visa, in the sponsoring State/territory where the sponsoring authority is located, for a total of at least 2 years in the 4 years immediately before applying.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: DIMIA 2004g; DIMIA 2004i; DIMIA 2004j.
Table 3.2 shows that temporary state/territory sponsored business migrants typically have two options when applying for permanent residency: the unsponsored and sponsored visa categories. The temporary sponsored senior executives may only apply for a permanent visa in one of the two business owner categories. Their business experience qualifies them for the senior executive visa at the initial stage, but they are expected to become business owners, and the permanent residence visa options reflect that. Investors may apply for permanent residence under one of the investor visas as well as under the sponsored business owner visa, if they meet the criteria.

Table 3.3 shows the concessional eligibility factors for the temporary state/territory sponsored business migrants. All three categories have a higher age limit (55 instead of 45 and applicants older than 55 may be considered) and the vocational level of English is not required. Sponsored business owners do not need to meet the level of assets as stipulated in the business criterion and their required annual business turnover is AUD$ 300,000, instead of AUD$ 500,000. The net assets value for the conduct/establishment of business is also lower (AUD$ 250,000, instead of AUD$ 500,000). Although the sponsored senior executives are assessed against the same business experience criteria as their unsponsored counterparts, the annual turnover of the business on which they base their managerial experience is AUD$ 10m instead of AUD$ 50m for the unsponsored candidates. Also, their net assets for business establishment in Australia are concessional - the same as for the sponsored business owners.¹ Sponsored investors may qualify with experience in managing investments of lower value than the unsponsored ones. Their Designated Investment and the net assets value are also considerably lower compared to their unsponsored counterparts.

Table 3.4 shows the eligibility factors for permanent state/territory sponsored business migrants. First, they can have a lower business turnover than the unsponsored migrants (not shown in tables): AUD$ 200,000, instead of AUD$ 300,000. Second, sponsored applicants need to satisfy two out of three eligibility factors under the ‘Employee/assets in Australia’, as opposed to the unsponsored applicants, who must satisfy all of them. Two of these criteria have higher thresholds for the latter. Un-sponsored applicants must have two full-time employees, rather than one, and the net assets value in their main business/es is AUD$ 100,000 rather than AUD$ 75,000. The net assets value in Australia is identical for

¹ Senior executives may also apply for permanent residence under the RSMS category (DIMIA 2004k:1).
sponsored and unsponsored migrants. The residency requirement for sponsored business owners, shown in Table 3.4, is identical to the requirement for unsponsored applicants. The state/territory sponsorship of investors carries the two-year residency requirement in the sponsoring jurisdiction. Understandably, the nature of the unsponsored investor category does not require residency in a particular jurisdiction, however the two-year residency period applies.

3.2.2 Canada

Five major features differentiate the Canadian provincial approach to business migration from the corresponding Australian approach. First, the greater Canadian provincial responsibility for their own migration streams is reflected in the fact that not all governments offer the same business streams and their eligibility factors differ, too. Table 3.5 below presents the provincial eligibility factors for the entrepreneur provincial migration streams and Table 3.6 features the eligibility factors for the manager/senior executive provincial migration streams. Note that Alberta is absent from Table 3.5. It chose not to offer business migration at all. Moreover, only five provinces invite managers/senior executives.

The second difference lies in the character of the latter streams (Table 3.6). Managers/senior executives are typically recommended for nomination by Canadian provincial companies seeking critical staff, as opposed to Australia, where the senior executive category provides an additional option for migration of business owners. This approach is most evident in British Columbia and Saskatchewan. In Nova Scotia, that stream may lead to eventually establishing own business by a nominee (OED NS 2005c:2). The Atlantic streams are unique at Canada’s scale. They straddle the boundaries of managerial and investor characteristics, where the nominees invest in local companies and take on managerial functions there. Due to these interprovincial differences and the different character of these streams in comparison with Australia, Table 3.6 contains the names of each provincial stream for greater clarity. In the case of provincial business entrepreneurs (Table 3.5), the differences in names are not important, since their aims are identical across the provinces and with Australia.

Third, in line with the Canadian policy understanding of ‘region’, where entire provinces are considered regions, the intraprovincial dispersal of business migrants is not encouraged to the extent as it is in Australia. In fact, only British Columbia and
Newfoundland and Labrador have in-built dispersal measures in their eligibility criteria (Tables 3.5 and 3.6).

The fourth difference relates to the fact that provincial business nominees, like their skilled counterparts, obtain permanent residency upfront. In Australia, business performance and retention are guaranteed by the two-stage performance linked visas. In Canada, under the guaranteed mobility rights and permanent resident status of the nominees, the provincial governments use some additional eligibility factors to ensure similar outcomes. Only British Columbia operates on the two-stage visa basis. That means that the entrepreneurs in the regional and unsponsored categories, as well as the key managers/technical professionals, obtain two-year work permits that are convertible into permanent residency based on performance (MCAWS BC n.d.k:2; n.d.c:2).

The final difference consists in a wider use of the points-test than in Australia. They are common in the Atlantic provinces under both migration streams (except Nova Scotia, see Table 3.6). Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador use the federal points system for both streams but require fewer points to qualify (DDT PE n.d.g:1, DITRD NL 2005:1). Saskatchewan uses its own provincial points grid in the Critical Occupations Sub-Category (Table 3.6). This originates from its classification as one of the provincial skilled streams, which are points-tested. Since elsewhere in Canada similar streams are classified as business streams, this Saskatchewan stream is included in this chapter for consistency. New Brunswick points-tests its potential entrepreneurs using the same grid as for the skilled nominees, with some different criteria for both groups (DB NB n.d.f:2–5). In Québec, where skilled candidates are points-tested, information on whether the same approach applies to its entrepreneurs could not be located.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility factors/</th>
<th>YK</th>
<th>BC Regional Business Category</th>
<th>BC Business Skills Category</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>QC</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>NL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
<td>English: good, fair or minimal.</td>
<td>Language competency (English/French) documents must be provided. Level not specified.</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
<td>Applicant rates own ability in English and/or French on 'Selection Certificate': advanced, intermediate, beginner, none.</td>
<td>Basic knowledge of English and/or French expected: fluent, well or with difficulty. Otherwise pre-arrival language training may be required. Points-tested.</td>
<td>20-50. Points-tested. Points decrease if 44+.</td>
<td>21-49. Points-tested. Points decrease if 49+.</td>
<td>19-65. Points-tested&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;. No points for 56-65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/ French language</td>
<td>Reasonable communications skills in 1 of official languages.</td>
<td>Proven skills and financial resources.</td>
<td>Successful business experience, proven skills and financial resources.</td>
<td>Proven experience in business management and significant funds.</td>
<td>Min. 3 years business experience or management background.</td>
<td>Min. 3 years management experience in lawful and profitable business.</td>
<td>Proven successful business owner and/or sr. manager experience in 3 of last 5 years. Points-tested.</td>
<td>Business experience from last 5 years enquired about.</td>
<td>Points depend on level of ability in principal language of applicant: high, moderate, basic, none. Language test results/relevant PNP form document language ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business record/experience</td>
<td>Business background and sufficient proven business experience.</td>
<td>Successful business experience, proven skills and financial resources.</td>
<td>Proven experience in business management and significant funds.</td>
<td>Min. 3 years business experience or management background.</td>
<td>Min. 3 years management experience in lawful and profitable business.</td>
<td>Proven successful business owner and/or sr. manager experience in 3 of last 5 years. Points-tested.</td>
<td>Business experience from last 5 years enquired about.</td>
<td>Min. 5 years of entrepreneur/sr. manager experience. Points-tested.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in business</td>
<td>Min. equity investment Canadian dollars (CAD$) 150,000.</td>
<td>Min. investment CAD$ 300,000 (excl. real estate). Applicant has min. 50% equity.</td>
<td>Amount of capital investment not specified.</td>
<td>Min. equity investment CAD$ 150,000.</td>
<td>Control min. 33.3% of capital of an eligible Canadian business&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
<td>Sufficient funds to finance 1st phase of the project without assistance.</td>
<td>Min. investment CAD$ 200,000.</td>
<td>Min. equity investment CAD$ 200,000 in St. John's; CAD$ 100,000 elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash deposit</td>
<td>Does not apply.</td>
<td>CAD$ 75,000.</td>
<td>Does not apply.</td>
<td>CAD$100,000 + CAD$ 25,000 settlement guarantee.</td>
<td>CAD$ 25,000 settlement and business performance guarantee.</td>
<td>CAD$ 25,000 settlement and business performance guarantee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets</td>
<td>Min. CAD$ 250,000.</td>
<td>Min. CAD$ 600,000.</td>
<td>Min. CAD$ 2m.</td>
<td>Min. amount not specified.</td>
<td>Min. CAD$ 250,000.</td>
<td>Min. CAD$ 300,000 (may include spouse/partner).</td>
<td>Amount depends on business venture proposed; also funds for living expenses for 2 years.</td>
<td>Min. CAD$ 400,000 incl. min. 350,000 equity. Personal net assets points-tested.</td>
<td>Min.CAD$750,000 incl. min. 350,000 equity. Personal net assets points-tested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee requirement</td>
<td>New employment, Min. 2 new jobs.</td>
<td>Min. 5 new jobs.</td>
<td>Direct job creation for Applicants indicate how</td>
<td>Employ min. 3 Quebec</td>
<td>Min. employment for applicant, Preferred</td>
<td>Applicants specify number of jobs as</td>
<td>Direct job creation in the province in addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>6</sup> Not applicable in NL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility factors/ jurisdiction</th>
<th>YK</th>
<th>BC Regional Business Category</th>
<th>BC Business Skills Category</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>QC</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>NL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maintenance/ enhancement of existing opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>provincial residents (excl. family).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>many jobs will be created and/or sustained in business plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
a) This requirement must be met for at least one year in the three years after the applicant has become a permanent resident (MICC QC 2005c:2).
b) Employment of three Quebec residents is part of the business plan that must be submitted. The applicant must, for at least one in the three years after having become a permanent resident, create the equivalent of at least one full-time equivalent job for Canadian citizens or permanent residents other than himself/herself and family members (MICC QC 2005c:2).
c) Nominees in New Brunswick are also points-tested in other, same categories as the skilled nominees: education, work experience and adaptability (DB NB n.d.f:3-4.).
d) Nominees in Prince Edward Island are also points-tested in other, same categories as the skilled nominees: education, work experience and adaptability (DDT PE n.d.j:1,3,4).
e) Nominees in Newfoundland and Labrador are also points-tested in other categories: education, work experience, and adaptability (DITRD NL n.d.f:2,3,4).

Sources: DB NB n.d.b; DB NB n.d.c; DB NB n.d.f; DDT PE n.d.d; DDT PE n.d.h; DDT PE n.d.i; DDT PE n.d.j; Department of Economic Development Yukon (DED YK) 2004; DGR SK 2005a; DITRD NL n.d.a; DITRD NL n.d.f; MICC QC 2004s; MICC QC 2005c; Manitoba Industry, Economic Development and Mines and Manitoba Labour and Immigration (MIEDM and MLI 2005c); MCAWS BC n.d.b; MCAWS BC n.d.c; MCAWS BC n.d.k; MCAWS BC n.d.l.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility factors/ jurisdiction</th>
<th>BC Projects Category</th>
<th>SK Critical Occupations Sub-Category</th>
<th>NS Economic Stream</th>
<th>PE Immigrant Partners</th>
<th>NL Immigrant Partner Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
<td>18-56. Points-tested(^1). No points for 56+.</td>
<td>25-60.</td>
<td>21-49. Points-tested(^2). Points decrease if 49+.</td>
<td>19-65. Points-tested(^3). No points for 56-65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/French language</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
<td>Points-tested. Documented ability in one/both official languages. Employer certifies language ability as sufficient for employment if English/French not first language.</td>
<td>Basic skills in one/both official languages to function in a job situation.</td>
<td>Points depend on level of English and French ability: high, moderate, basic, none. Language test results/relevant PNP form document language ability.</td>
<td>Points depend on level of ability in principal language of applicant: high, moderate, basic, none. Assessment documentation may be requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring/investee company’s business record</td>
<td>Proven record of successful experience in area related to proposed business.</td>
<td>General company information sought.</td>
<td>Government approves companies where contract is to be undertaken.</td>
<td>Investee company provides executive summary business plan to investor, who assesses chances of return from investee company - no government guarantee. Professional counsel in overseeing investment transaction recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects considered/applicant’s experience</td>
<td>For key managers/technical professionals for projects of min. CAD$ 1 m (new investments/expansions only).</td>
<td>Permanent job offer approved as Critical Occupation. Applicant has skills from NOC-11 skill type 0. If no formal accreditation, employer certifies applicant’s skills and experience as sufficient for the job.</td>
<td>6-month middle management contract-salary CAD$20,000. Applicant has business ownership experience/2 years of management experience in last 5 years.</td>
<td>Applicant (investor) becomes director of Board of Directors/manager (NOC-II skill type 0). Business experience from last 5 years enquired about.</td>
<td>Max. 4 immigrant partners for a new business/investment in expanding provincial company. Director/manager role (NOC-II skill type 0) assumed in each case. Applicants have business and/or entrepreneurial skills and expertise, which are points-tested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in business and net worth</td>
<td>Equity investment not required. Sponsoring company’s net worth enquired about.</td>
<td>Equity investment not required. Sponsoring company’s net worth not enquired about.</td>
<td>CAD$ 128,000 held in trust and returned if residence visa refused. Applicant has min. net worth CAD$ 300,000.</td>
<td>CAD$ 200,000 invested in investee’s company shares (companies may pool investment from max. 4 immigrants). Applicant has min. CAD$ 400,000 incl. 350,000 equity.</td>
<td>Min. equity investment CAD$ 200,000 in St. John’s; 100,000 elsewhere (new business/investee’s company shares). Applicant has min. CAD$ 750,000 incl. min. 350,000 equity. Personal net assets points-tested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash deposit</td>
<td>Does not apply.</td>
<td>CAD$ 25,000 settlement and business performance guarantee.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes. Points-tested.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
1 Nominees in Saskatchewan are points-tested in all remaining categories as the skilled nominees: education and training, work experience, supporting family relationship in Saskatchewan, adaptability, community support (Community Support Plan) as well as personal net worth (DGR SK n.d.e;2,4,5,6).  
2 Nominees in Prince Edward Island are also points-tested in other, same categories as the skilled nominees: education, work experience and adaptability (DDT PE n.d.j;1,3,4).  
3 Nominees in Newfoundland and Labrador are also points tested for education and adaptability (DITRD NL n.d.g:3-4).  

Sources:  
DDT PE n.d.e; DDT PE n.d.b; DDT PE n.d.i; DDT PE n.d.j; DDT PE 2005f; DGR SK n.d.a; DGR SK n.d.e; DITRD NL n.d.b; DITRD NL n.d.d; DITRD NL n.d.g; MCAWS BC n.d.c; MCAWS BC n.d.j; OED NS 2004; OED NS 2005c.
Table 3.5 shows that the Canadian provincial eligibility factors for the entrepreneurs are similar to the ones adopted for the purposes of the state/territory sponsored business owner migration in Australia. In contrast to the latter, though, some Canadian provinces have adopted an open approach by not specifying their requirements under some eligibility factors. Candidates are assessed against the criteria of age, English/French language ability, business background, net assets value and employment creation requirement. This open approach may be observed in the case of the first two eligibility factors.

As noted, the Canadian provinces use certain additional criteria to guarantee a certain level of business performance and the retention of their entrepreneurs - permanent residents. These measures include specific amounts of equity investment in business (in Australia it is unspecified) and a cash deposit in some provinces. The latter serves as a business performance and retention guarantee. Furthermore, the Canadian provinces specify the priority/key industry sectors for the entrepreneurs’ activities, which Australia does not do. Overall, in comparison to Australia, the differences among the Canadian provincial streams offer to potential migrants a greater choice of entry criteria.

Table 3.6 summarises the Canadian provincial eligibility factors for the managers/senior executives. They cover age (typically specified limits apply), English/French language ability, and, in the Atlantic provinces, the nominees’ level of investment in business, cash deposit and eligible priority/key industry sectors. In Nova Scotia, the nominees undertake a short-term contract in a government-approved company, where they also invest. This government approval explains why the priority/key industry sectors are not specified.

3.3 Comparative analysis of the eligibility factors

This Section compares the eligibility factors for the state/territory sponsored business owners and senior executives in Australia and the Canadian provincial eligibility factors for the entrepreneurs and managers/senior executives. It looks at the pre-application factors of age and English/French language ability, business background and the other requirements that constitute the core criteria. These are the financial requirements (capital/equity investment in business), the employment creation levels, the cash deposit in the Canadian provinces and the corresponding role of the two-stage visas in Australia. This Section closes
with a comparison of the additional core eligibility factors, of which only the priority/key industry sectors in Canada were mentioned in Tables 3.5 and 3.6. These are the specific types of the economic contribution that the governments in both countries aim to achieve through their programs. Comparison of all factors enables the benefits that these migrants potentially deliver to the sponsoring jurisdictions to be established. Further, comparison allows us to determine how the adopted measures fit the economic and population policies' objectives.

In Australia, as shown in Chapter One (Section 1.7), the aim of the policy in relation to the business migration is to "(...) attract overseas business people to establish new or joint ventures in their [state/territory] regions". Business migration is managed by two-stage visas, intended to reduce the abuse of visas, and to improve the rates of establishing successful businesses. Such arrangements have been in place since 1 March 2003 and they result from the recent trends showing poor regional dispersal of these migrants and a declining business engagement rate. State/territory sponsorship is intended to assist in dispersal as well as better link such migrants with the state and regional development plans (see also Subsection 3.4.1). The concessional criteria are also intended to act as incentives (DIMIA 2004n:41). Therefore, the economic objective of the program is to expand the business activities, while the dispersal principle indicates that the regional areas are particularly targeted.

In Canada, as example of British Columbia illustrates (Section 1.7 in Chapter One), the provincial business migration is pursued to enable "(...) the immigration of key individuals of businesses that wish to locate in British Columbia and the establishment or enhancement of new and existing businesses". Therefore, the Canadian provincial business migration schemes have a similar objective to the Australian one. The intraprovincial dispersal is not a particular policy objective, although, as shown in Table 3.5, British Columbia is indeed one of only two provinces encouraging it (in response to Vancouver being one of the three most popular immigrant destinations).

3.3.1 Age and language ability
The first of the differences in the Australian and the Canadian approaches may be observed in the age eligibility factor. Table 3.3 shows that the DIMIA (concessional) limit for all sponsored temporary business visa applicants in Australia is 55 years. It may be lifted if the
applicant proposes to deliver an exceptional economic benefit. The Canadian provincial requirements are either not specified, as Table 3.5 shows in the case of entrepreneurs, or the age limits may be set higher than in Australia, in which case they are usually points-tested. Such higher age limits apply in Saskatchewan under the Critical Occupations Sub-Category, Nova Scotia Economic Stream and for Immigrant Partners in Newfoundland and Labrador (Table 3.6). The latter is exceptional in Canada’s scale because under both streams it invites applicants up to the age of 65. Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia, where the age limit is set at 60 (Table 3.6), are potentially the most attractive to the older applicants. It is possible that such applicants would possess considerable wealth, which, in turn, could potentially benefit these provinces economically. In Australia, the economic motivation behind lifting the age limit is even more evident as these migrants’ business activity must yield exceptional economic benefits.

Regardless of whether the age is unspecified at all, or it is set high, the differences illustrate the observed independence of the Canadian provincial governments in setting up own criteria, as opposed to Australia. The open approach to not specifying the age limits at all shows that the Canadian provincial governments have discretionary power in deciding whether to nominate an applicant or not.

The language ability eligibility factor is seemingly not given much weight in either country, with exceptions of some Canadian Atlantic provinces. In Australia, the concession, shown in Table 3.3, exempting migrants from the vocational English level, means that the functional English level is acceptable. Table 3.5 shows that in Canada some entrepreneurs must satisfy general language level requirements, for example, “reasonable communication skills” (Yukon Territory), “good, fair or minimal” (British Columbia), or must rate their language skills as “advanced, intermediate, beginner or none” (Québec).

Other provinces are more specific, though. For example, Saskatchewan demands that candidates for the Critical Occupations Sub-Category (Table 3.6) document their language ability (-ies) in the same way that it requires its skilled applicants to do so (compare Table 2.4 in Chapter Two). New Brunswick has its own scale of language ability for entrepreneurs (Table 3.5) but it prefers international language test results for non-native English/French speakers (for example, IELTS in case of the English language), or other written evidence detailing training in, and use of, English/French; official documentation
of education in English/French; official documentation of work experience in English/French; or other applicable documentation. This is the CIC-style approach to testing the language ability (DB NB n.d.f:14).

As noted, Prince Edward Island uses the Canadian federal points system and it has also adopted the Canadian federal language benchmarks of high, moderate, basic and none (Tables 3.5 and 3.6). Alternatively, as New Brunswick, it accepts relevant provincial forms, where the applicants specify how they meet the language requirements. Prince Edward Island requires moderate language ability (DDT PE n.d.i:1), which, if tested by IELTS, would correspond to a minimum 5.0 on each of its components (CIC 2003j). In turn, this corresponds to the vocational English level in Australia, which the state/territory sponsored candidates do not need to meet. Therefore, some Canadian provinces may have higher requirements in that regard than Australia. In any case, nominees in Canada typically attend a personal pre-nomination interview, which may serve to test their language fluency. Where the requirements are expressed in general terms, as in Yukon or British Columbia, this provides an additional selection tool.

It was noted in interviews that if language ability were a problem, a business migrant could hire a fluent English speaker to make sure that all business regulations were observed. While this may seem reasonable, it may be not completely cost-free. Pointing out to the small-scale business operations in regions, one RCB from regional Queensland noted that hiring an actual interpreter could eat up a portion of the turnover [a qualifying criterion for a residence visa]. A regionally based senior Queensland government official noted that such companies might also be vulnerable, and gave an example where a company hired such consultant to interpret and liaise with the government but in the end lost money and the consultant was made redundant.² In Canada, a senior Manitoba government official responsible for provincial business migration noted that English language was not an issue in the context of a considerable level of investment, where hiring an office worker with fluent language skills was affordable.³ Generally, it seems that, with exception of the Atlantic provinces, the language criteria are not given much weight in the assessment process since other criteria have more impact on the potential economic benefits obtained through the business migration schemes.

---

² Both interviews took place on 24 November 2003.
³ Interview took place on 26 March 2003.
3.3.2 Business background and other requirements

Business background. Business record and business experience serve to assess whether a candidate has sufficient skills to conduct a business activity in a sponsoring/nominating jurisdiction, and contribute to economic development. Table 3.3 shows that in Australia business record and experience are separate DIMIA eligibility factors for the sponsored temporary business owners and senior executives. In both categories, business record denominates a successful career and a clear business history. The business experience eligibility factor is expressed in specific terms. Business owners may prove their experience either by having had an ownership interest in a business(-es), with an annual turnover of at least AUD$ 300,000, or by having had four years of senior managerial experience in a business with an annual turnover of at least AUD$ 1m. Senior executives must prove their recent managerial experience in a business with an annual turnover of at least AUD$ 10m.

Such a strict approach, where the performance benchmarks are determined in financial terms, is also carried on to the permanent visas. Table 3.4 shows that temporary business owners (and senior executives) applying for a permanent residency must prove that they have had ownership of their business and have directly, actively managed it for at least two years immediately before applying. They must also satisfy the annual business turnover criterion, set at AUD$ 200,000.

The criteria individually established by each jurisdiction in Canada vary, but they generally seem more flexible than in Australia. For example, Table 3.5 shows that the Yukon Territory and British Columbia assess entrepreneur applicants against criteria such as “business background and sufficient proven business experience” (Yukon Territory) and “successful business experience, proven skills and financial resources” (British Columbia Business Skills Category). Such an approach gives the governments the power to assess what is “sufficient”, “successful” or “proven” in each case, and this may differ depending on the case, proposed location and other criteria.

The majority of governments east of Manitoba (and inclusive of Manitoba) take a partially similar approach to that of Australia, demanding a fixed period of business owner or managerial experience (usually three years, Newfoundland and Labrador requires five). Within this group, New Brunswick and Newfoundland and Labrador have adopted the
strictest approach to testing business experience. Both allot points for business sales/turnover (below or above CAD$ 500,000); number of employees (fewer or more than ten); total assets (less or more than CAD$ 250,000) and authority for decisions (business owner or manager) (DB NB n.d.f:5; DITRD NL n.d.f:2).

Similar criteria are also used by other jurisdictions (including the Yukon Territory and British Columbia, presented above) but in generic terms, that is, without such specific financial and other benchmarks (DED YK n.d; MCAWS BC n.d.l; n.d.b; DGRAA SK n.d; MIEDM and MLI 2005a; DDT PE n.d.h). This means that these governments may assess the candidate’s business record and experience using a significant degree of discretion. This is the case even in provinces, where the period of business experience is specified (Manitoba, Québec and Prince Edward Island). It may be concluded that in comparison to Australia, where the pre-application business performance must meet specific benchmarks, the majority of the Canadian provinces have adopted a more flexible approach, which may be attractive to applicants unable to meet the strict Australian criteria of years of experience, ownership interest or level of annual business turnover. The Canadian options may also be attractive to those who prefer a choice of criteria, available thanks to the sole provincial responsibility for their programs, as opposed to identical criteria across Australia.

Different eligibility factors must be satisfied by the applicants and the companies (if applicable) under the manager/senior executive categories across the Canadian provinces. Table 3.6 shows that in British Columbia and Saskatchewan, where individuals are nominated for specific positions in a business, these businesses’ backgrounds and performances are screened. The financial range of the eligible projects in British Columbia suggests that the potential nominee’s background is thoroughly tested, too. In Saskatchewan, the candidates are subject to the provincial points test for the skilled nominees and the standard benchmarks apply.

The approach to testing potential nominees in that category differs among the Atlantic provinces. Newfoundland and Labrador maintains its pre-application business performance benchmarks as shown above for its entrepreneurs (DITRD NL n.d.g:2). Prince Edward Island uses the same set of generic criteria (without specific financial and other benchmarks) as for its entrepreneurs, to assess the previous business experience and
performance of the candidates (DDT PE n.d.h:2). Nova Scotia requires two years of management experience and provides general guidelines as to the type of this experience. Its detailed criteria are available on request (OED NS 2005c:1–2). This allows the latter two governments a considerable degree of discretion. There emerges a picture of provincial approach based less on fixed benchmarks, as evidenced in Australia, and more of an open attitude towards assessing the strengths of each applicant. This may enlarge the pool of initial candidates available and interested in settlement and operating a business in the provinces.

Regardless of the approach to testing the pre-application business experience, whether involving strict criteria or a flexible attitude, as in the Canadian provinces, both methods seem potentially able to assist in selecting the most suitable individuals, with sufficient skills, thus addressing the policy objective of economic development through migration.

Other requirements. Further eligibility factors cover core criteria: capital/equity investment levels in business, the employment creation levels, the cash deposit in the Canadian provinces and the role of the two-stage visa process in Australia. In consequence of the divergent constitutional responsibilities in immigration matters in both countries, residency status that the Australian and the Canadian migrants obtain on entry, and building on the strict and flexible approaches identified so far, these core criteria are built on, and accentuates, the differences in the policy approaches of Australia and Canada. The state/territory sponsored business migrants in Australia and the Canadian provincial business migrants must also engage in business activities at a senior level. This reflects the very nature of these business programs and is not discussed further.

The first difference in the Australian and the Canadian provincial approaches may be observed in the application of the capital/equity investment level in business. In Australia, the strict criteria used to test the pre-application business experience of the candidates make other eligibility factors simple. Table 3.3 shows that prospective business owners and senior

---

4 The capital investment level in Australia is not precisely defined (explanation is in the text) but this term is used for the purposes of the comparison with the Canadian provincial levels. The term 'equity investment' adopted by some Canadian provinces is used here to differentiate their requirements from the Australian ones.

5 Statements on the required active role in business at a senior level in Australia can be found in DIMIA (2004g:4). That requirement regards also the BT visa holders in Australia (2004g:4). REBA applicants must also actively manage their businesses (2004a:1). Canadian provincial statements may be consulted for example in: DED YK 2004:2; MICC QC 2005c:2, or MCAWS BC n.d.c:2.
executives are required to possess business and personal assets of net value AUD$ 250,000 for conduct/establishment of business. Furthermore, they must possess sufficient additional net assets for settlement. The amount is unspecified. This means that it is up to the applicant to decide how to distribute these assets and how much of the funds to use for the conduct/establishment of business to invest, and how to use the settlement funds to meet the criteria for the residence stage business owner visa. For that visa, applicants must meet the specified annual business turnover level, the specified net assets value in business, as well as the specified net assets value in Australia. Second, in line with the nature of business migration, there is the employee requirement. For a business owner applying for permanent residency this is one of the elective criteria and involves employing at least one full-time employee (or equivalent) other than a family member (Table 3.4). In other words, business migrants are expected to contribute to employment creation locally.

The Australian approach to the core eligibility factors demonstrates that the two-stage visa arrangements and the fairly rigorous assessment of the pre-application business experience enable a split in the financial and other performance criteria between the two stages, and keep them simple in character and number. The two-stage arrangements are innovative since they respond to the recent trend of falling business engagement rates (see introduction to this Section) by guaranteeing the establishment of business activity. By default, at the same time they also support the retention of migrants and their business activities, which is another policy intention. This whole approach seems potentially able to deliver the economic benefits of the capital investment in business and the employment creation, provided that migrants succeed. Furthermore, the additional required assets will be spent on housing itself and related payments, consumer needs and the like, thus also providing additional benefits of increased consumer demand and spending. Data to precisely assess the impact of these benefits would be difficult to obtain, but nonetheless these additional benefits should be noted. All in all, such an approach seems potentially suitable to address the economic development policy objective.

By contrast, the Canadian provinces (except British Columbia) do not revaluate the nominees' performance to support their permanent visa application. For that reason, as well as due to the generally open approach identified earlier, their governments must ensure upfront that the candidates meet all criteria so that their programs address the
economic development objectives. The open approach is balanced by other measures that make the core eligibility factors in Canada stricter than in Australia.

The first difference lies in the Canadian provinces typically separating the net assets value from the required equity investment in business. That equity investment and the net assets are determined sums and each province has individually specified their levels. Table 3.5 indicates that only Saskatchewan, Québec and New Brunswick do not precisely specify the amount of the equity investment. However, Québec specifies the percentage of capital that must be owned by migrant. The net assets’ values in Saskatchewan and New Brunswick are not fixed either.

Unlike in Australia, where the AUD$ 250,000 applies across all jurisdictions, those who consider Canadian provincial migration have a wider array of financial requirements. The lowest equity investment at Canada’s scale is required in regional Newfoundland and Labrador - CAD$ 100,000 (Table 3.5). Yet, there is also a high net assets value requirement (CAD$ 750,000), of the same amount for the regional and metropolitan location. The highest amount of investment and net assets value is required by British Columbia (Business Skills Category), while the Yukon Territory and Manitoba have identical levels of equity investment and net assets value (Table 3.5).

The employment creation eligibility factor is individually applied by each Canadian province. Table 3.5 shows that Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Newfoundland and Labrador, in the typical open approach, advise their prospective nominees that jobs should be created for residents beyond family members. Newfoundland and Labrador, in similar manner, informs its potential Immigrant Partners that employment creation should be one of the results of their activity (DITRD NL n.d.b:4). Manitoba and Prince Edward Island leave it to applicants to specify in their business plans (Table 3.5). The highest and most specific requirements apply to the Business Skills Category in British Columbia (five employees) and to Québec entrepreneurs (three employees other than the applicant and their family) (Table 3.5). Self-employment is also an option. In fact, this is a separate business migration category in Québec (MICC QC 2005c:3), a minimum requirement in
New Brunswick (Table 3.5) and an option within the entrepreneur migration in Prince Edward Island (DDT PE n.d.d:1).\(^5\)

The Canadian provincial approach to the core eligibility factors demonstrates that under a regime that grants permanent residency instead of temporary visas, as in Australia (British Columbia excepted), the upfront and more specific financial requirements (equity investment and net assets) act as guarantees of targeted economic benefits. Such criteria also tighten the flexibly applied eligibility factors discussed earlier. These tighter criteria, in combination with the employee requirement, are established so that Canadian provinces may potentially obtain similar economic benefits as those identified in Australia: capital investment in business, employment creation and similar additional benefits (see above) resulting from migrants’ settlement. Therefore, it may be concluded that the Australian and Canadian approaches address similar economic development policies’ objectives with divergent measures. These differences notwithstanding, it may be concluded that the business and personal assets for the conduct/establishment of business in Australia (for capital investment), the level of equity investment in business in Canada and the level of employment creation, indicate that the governments in both countries intend to use their business migration schemes to develop the small business sector.

The second difference, expanding on the above observation that the Australian and Canadian governments use divergent measures to address similar policies’ objectives, may be found in the way the retention is handled. In Australia, the state/territory governments are guaranteed retention of individuals and their business activities by the federally established two-stage visa process. In Canada, in absence of such federal retention guarantee, with migrants obtaining permanent residency upfront (British Columbia excepted) and under the guaranteed mobility rights, there must be a measure in place that diminishes the chance that migrants will abandon the province that has sponsored them and take their investment elsewhere.

That measure is the cash deposit (Table 3.5). Manitoba, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador require, on top of the equity investment and net assets value, an additional payment from the entrepreneurs to guarantee business performance. In the

\(^5\) The Québec Self-Employed Worker Program is not further discussed in this thesis due to lack of relevant data.
Atlantic provinces, there is also a settlement guarantee payment for the entrepreneurs. As a business performance guarantee, the deposit resembles the business turnover requirement from Australia, which is one of the qualifying factors for the permanent visa there. As a settlement guarantee, it corresponds to the two-stage visa arrangements in Australia.

In Manitoba, the deposit is released once the investment in the proposed business area has been verified. Nominees have two years to fulfil the agreement (MIEDM and MLI 2005c:5,10). In Prince Edward Island, the business performance guarantee is released if the business is operating. The funds are forfeited if the business plan is not followed, or the applicant fails to initiate a business within a year of receiving a permanent visa (DDT PE n.d.d:2; n.d.b:3–4). The settlement guarantee deposit is also released one year after landing, if the business is fully operational and the applicant resides in the island (DDT PE n.d.d:2).

In Newfoundland and Labrador, the single business performance and settlement guarantee paid by the entrepreneurs is fully refundable one year after landing, if the required investment was made, the business is fully operational, the applicant is self-employed in it and resides in the province (DITRD NL n.d.a:2). Similar single guarantee deposits are payable by the other category in Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador (Table 3.6).

The two-stage visas in Australia and the business turnover absent from the Canadian schemes may potentially constitute better retention and performance guarantees than the deposits. The deposit of CAD$ 25,000 may provide an easy passage to pay one’s way into Canada, especially for the Newfoundland and Labrador nominees, required to have net worth of CAD$ 750,000 - more than required in regional British Columbia (CAD$ 600,000). Where there is no deposit, the retention is based on loyalty to the sponsoring province - a factor that cannot be controlled. As in Australia, while the eligibility factors discussed earlier were deemed potentially able to address the economic development policies’ objectives, the retention outcomes and expected economic benefits may be diminished if the nominees move away from the nominating province. There may be scope for a reduced effectiveness of the cash deposit measure and the reliance on loyalty. On the other hand, from an individual’s perspective, the cash deposit notwithstanding, the
permanent residency option in Canada may seem to offer greater stability than the temporary status granted initially in Australia.

The measures adopted to achieve economic benefits from managers/senior executives are especially interesting in Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador (Table 3.6). The merge of the managerial and investor functions suggests that the economic benefits could potentially be enhanced for these provinces. Since an investee company in Newfoundland and Labrador may accept up to four investors - Immigrant Partners (or these nominees may jointly set up a new company), the accumulated financial benefits and skills transfers may potentially be considerable. On the other hand, providing both benefits from an individual nominee’s perspective, in combination with fairly strict eligibility factors at Canada’s scale, may drive some potential applicants away to other Canadian provinces.

Newfoundland and Labrador is one of the provinces promoting regional dispersal under both streams (Tables 3.5 and 3.6). The other is British Columbia, offering regional and unrestricted migration streams for entrepreneurs. Both provinces apply differential equity investment levels, and British Columbia also differentiates the employment level. Regional migration in the latter means establishing a business outside the Greater Vancouver Area (MCAWS BC n.d.k:2) and Newfoundland and Labrador targets areas outside St. John’s. Other Canadian jurisdictions do not formally apply such differential eligibility factors but the aforementioned degree of discretion allows lower than typically required investments to be accepted, if the business is proposed in a regional area.

Comparison of the above eligibility factors for the state/territory sponsored business migrants and the provincially nominated entrepreneurs shows that under different Australian and Canadian entry regimes, their governments have adopted partially divergent policy measures to obtain similar economic benefits from their schemes: the capital/equity investment in business, employment creation and additional economic benefits resulting from migrants’ settlement. It appears that these measures may potentially address the economic development policies’ objectives. By contrast, the retention seems to be better addressed in Australia than in Canada, which may potentially diminish the expected economic and population benefits in the latter.
It can be concluded that the Australian policy, which relies on the two-stage visa arrangements and on a strict approach to testing migrants against the pre-application eligibility factors, may in consequence operate on the basis of a few fairly uncomplicated and limited in number DIMIA criteria, while states and territories are guaranteed the retention of individuals and their business activities. By contrast, the Canadian provincial governments solely responsible for their schemes' criteria and outcomes, and who receive permanent residents, ensure by tightening the earlier open approach and by building up additional measures, that the expected economic benefits can be delivered. As anticipated in Section 3.1, two distinctive policy management strategies begin to emerge.

3.3.3 Economic contribution - principal business migration categories

This Subsection deals with additional core eligibility factors. These are the Australian and Canadian provincial specific types of the economic contribution that the business migrants are expected to deliver. These types of contributions complement the discussed deliverable economic benefits.

The Australian and Canadian approaches differently address the delivery of these specific types of economic contribution. In Australia, under the two-stage visa arrangements, the strict but simple criteria presented above are complemented with six DIMIA types of that contribution. DIMIA requires that sponsored and unsponsored temporary stage business owners and senior executives operate businesses that can be categorised as at least one of these six types (DIMIA 2004g:4). Having such a general framework established at the federal level allows the state/territory governments to concentrate on customising these criteria to obtain the targeted economic results in line with their objectives and needs.

These six types include: a) development of business links with international markets; b) creation/maintenance of employment in Australia; c) export of Australian goods/services; d) production of goods/services that otherwise would need to be imported; e) introduction of new/improved technology, or f) contribution to commercial activity and competitiveness within sectors of the Australian economy (DIMIA 2004g:4). Two principal forms of customisation are: expanding some points; and selecting some of them for prospective residence applicants and/or capital city-bound applicants. Both support the dispersal policy objective as they promote the regional location of business. DIMIA does
not differentiate these types of economic contributions for unsponsored and sponsored applicants.

The Canadian provinces that do not have federal support akin to the Australian jurisdictions continue the ‘all guarantees upfront’ strategy by applying additional criteria to ensure that their nominees-permanent residents deliver the expected economic benefits. Two additional eligibility factors serve that purpose. First, the nominees’ businesses must fall within one of the priority/key industry sectors (Tables 3.5 and 3.6). Entrepreneurs in the Yukon Territory, British Columbia (Regional Business category), Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick and Newfoundland and Labrador are subject to this approach (Table 3.5). The same approach is taken to managers/senior executives in Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador (Table 3.6). Table 3.7 below compares the priority/key industry sectors across the Canadian jurisdictions. It provides a summary rather than an exhaustive list of all targeted sectors in each Canadian province. This would involve a more detailed discussion looking at subsectors of these industries, which extends beyond the focus of this thesis. In individual cases, some sectors marked in Table 3.7 as not applicable could potentially be included.
Table 3.7 Priority/key industry sectors for PNP business migration and Québec industry sectors of expertise and excellence in Canada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority/key industry sector/jurisdiction</th>
<th>YK</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>QC&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>NL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (farming in general)</td>
<td>Yes (agribusiness)</td>
<td>Yes (farming in general)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agri-value</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (R&amp;D)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (and pharmaceuticals)</td>
<td>Yes (and pharmaceuticals)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural industries</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental industries</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (environmental technologies)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology (IT)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes (and telecommunications)</td>
<td>Yes (and communications)</td>
<td>Yes (and communications)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (and communications)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (and oil and gas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Value-added) processing and manufacturing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (manufacturing)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) British Columbia lists ‘High Technology’ and it is taken that it comprises IT (MCAWS BC n.d.k; 2).
b) This column represents the provincial sectors of expertise and excellence (MICC QC 2005g:1–2; see also link Bio-food). It is not obligatory to engage in business in these sectors, but they offer advantages.
c) R&D - research and development.
d) Agriculture, fisheries and forestry are excluded unless an exportable technology is involved (DDT PE n.d.e; 2).

Sources: DB NB n.d.c; DDT PE n.d.e; DED YK 2004; DGR SK 2005a; DITRD NL n.d.i; MCAWS BC n.d.k; MICC QC 2005g; MIEDM and MLI 2005c; Technology PEI n.d.
Table 3.7 shows that Canadian provinces target many of the same industry sectors, meaning that they compete with each other for migrants. In comparison, the Australian state/territory governments provide, on their websites, in addition to the customised DIMIA types of specific economic contribution, lists of the key industry sectors where opportunities for business migrants exist. Many sectors overlap with those listed by the Canadian provinces. If the Australian states and territories ever turned to targeting them for the purposes of the sponsored business migration, the competition between the Australian and the Canadian jurisdictions would become enhanced.

The second eligibility factor guaranteeing economic benefits in the Canadian provinces is the requirement that the business operation be value-added. This is ensured in three ways. Listing specific industry sectors, where the value-added component is present/implied is practised by the Yukon Territory, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island (Immigrant Partners) and Newfoundland and Labrador in relation to both streams (DED YK 2004:2; DGR SK 2005a:2; DB NB n.d.c:2; DDT PE n.d.e:2; DITRD NL n.d.i:1). Informing that the nominee’s activity should enhance the economic activity in the priority sectors/add economic value is used by the Yukon Territory, British Columbia (Regional Business Category), Saskatchewan and Manitoba (DED YK 2004:1; MCAWS BC n.d.k:2; DGR SK 2005a:1; MIEDM and MLI 2005c:9–10). Finally, some governments list specific types of ineligible activities. The combination of the priority/key industry sectors and the value-added requirements make the Canadian provincial approaches to securing the economic benefits quite elevated.

In addition to these two eligibility factors, four Canadian jurisdictions apply Australian-style enumeration of the specific types of the economic contribution under their entrepreneur streams. This makes the standard of entry criteria to these jurisdictions

---

7 For example, in Manitoba, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador real estate and construction companies, as well as financial services are ineligible (MIEDM and MLI 2005c:10; DDT PE n.d.d:1; n.d.e:2–3; DITRD NL n.d.a:1; n.d.b:3).

8 At least one of these jurisdictions (Saskatchewan) admitted after this part of the analysis had been completed that the combination of these criteria was too restrictive to attract migrants. The province is considering eliminating them and allowing instead operating retail or services businesses. It will be interesting to see whether other provinces will follow. Other changes that may take place include the introduction of differentiated investments required for two provincial largest cities and the rest of the province and establishing three subcategories in the new Entrepreneur Category. The former solution would bring the number of Canadian provinces influencing the location of business by applying different financial criteria to three. (DGR SK n.d.f:1–3, 5, 7). These changes are an example supporting the observation that regional migration policies continue to be developed and adjusted.
quite high. The Yukon is seeking people “(...) that would enhance the production and marketing of goods, services, exports, technology and research in the priority sectors” (DED YK 2004:1). Saskatchewan lists identical types of contribution, but limits them to production only (DGR SK 2005a:1).

British Columbia uses the term ‘significant benefit’ (formally applied to the Business Skill and Projects Categories; Regional Business Category is expected to contribute to regional development; MCAWS BC n.d.c:2; n.d.k:2). It is taken that the employment creation/maintenance; degree of expansion of export markets for the province’s products and services; secondary benefits to other related industries or transfer of skills and knowledge to Canadians in emerging technologies should be considered. Since all applications shall be assessed for the economic benefits for the province (MCAWS BC 2002:1), this covers also the potential region-bound nominees. Combination of all aforementioned criteria with the two-stage visas, as well as with high financial thresholds, makes British Columbia the most difficult to be nominated for.

Newfoundland and Labrador requires positive impact of the entrepreneurs’ businesses on the provincial economy and an improved market access for the province’s goods and services (DITRD NL n.d.a:4). Such an approach means that ‘quality control’ measures are in place and they are potentially able to deliver the targeted economic benefits, but in this province, these criteria, in combination with the tight eligibility factors and the points-test, may make the province difficult to become nominated for.

Other Canadian jurisdictions advise that proposed businesses should deliver a ‘significant’ economic benefit/contribution. This is the case of Manitoba, Québec and the Yukon Territory (MIEDM and MLJ 2005c:5; MICC QC 2005c:1; DED YK 2004:1). Saskatchewan sees the significant impact in expansion of diversification of the economy and provides some examples (DGR SK 2005a:2). New Brunswick requires economic benefits to be delivered to the province (DB NB n.d.f:2). No similar requirement is asked of prospective entrepreneurs in Prince Edward Island. The ‘significant’ benefit approach, where it is not further specified, usually works together with the priority/key industry sectors. In Newfoundland and Labrador, Immigrant Partners must meet the same criteria as entrepreneurs above (DITRD NL n.d.b:4).
The above account demonstrates that the Canadian jurisdictions principally use two additional eligibility factors to increase the chances of obtaining specific types of the economic contribution. From a policy aims’ perspective, the combination of the priority/key industry sectors with the value-added requirement, as well as the third measure (Australian-style criteria), suggest that such tools should potentially be able to bring the targeted benefits. This further shows that in the face of similar economic development objectives, the governments have found performance and economic contribution guarantees in identical policy instruments. From an individual’s perspective, though, meeting all applicable criteria may be challenging.

These approaches to determining the specific types of economic contribution complement and strengthen the overall strict character of the Canadian entry requirements and tighten the initial open approach to the eligibility factors. They crown the ‘all guarantees upfront’ strategies set up in response to the permanent status of the nominees, and reflect the sole responsibility of the governments for outcomes of their policies. The highly targeted Canadian provincial approach is also a response to the one adopted by the federal government in Canada, where no limits are placed in terms of eligible industry sectors. Entrepreneurs entering under the federal program must contribute to the economy and create jobs (CIC 2003k:1). Under such circumstances, the Canadian provincial policies are innovative in adopted solutions, as they are designed to address, in the best possible way, the governments’ economic development objectives.

Business migrants in Australia are expected to provide a ‘valuable’ input into the Australian economy (DIMIA 2004g:4). The states and territories typically target the delivery of the specific economic benefits by customising some of the DIMIA criteria in accordance with their economic objectives. The only exception is New South Wales, which instead requires a certificate from a candidate’s accountant (including for permanent residency) explaining how the DIMIA requirements are met (see links from DSRD NSW n.d.c gateway site). Some indication of general business activity aspects considered by New South Wales is offered in its guidelines for submitting business

---

9 Details of requirements from the Australian Capital Territory became available after this Section had been finally reviewed for updates (May 2005) and hence they are not included. The Territory sponsors business owners and senior executives, and its criteria do not depart from those discussed. It does not have specific requirements for permanent residence applicants.
proposals (see ‘How to Apply’ from DSRD NSW n.d.c gateway site). Western Australia refers to minimum DIMIA criteria for provisional and residence stage applicants in regional areas but has additional requirements for Perth-based residence stage applicants and also other criteria supporting the regional location of businesses.

Two of the DIMIA specific types of the economic contribution are creation/maintenance of employment and introduction of new/improved technology. The governments customise these criteria for sponsorship of temporary migrants. At this stage, the employment question is open (“How many jobs will be created?”). The second criterion is able to be expanded, for example, by adding new skills (Tasmania); new/improved business skills (South Australia); contributing new skills/innovations (business owner) and developing new skills (senior executive) in the Northern Territory. Queensland expects technology transfer (DED TAS 2004a:1; Immigration SA n.d.g:2; DBIRD NT 2003c:1; 2003f:1; DSDI QLD 2005d:1; 2005f:3).

Other customised options are the export of goods/services and/or import replacement. New exports are listed, for example, by Tasmania; import replacement by South Australia; new export markets (business owner) and new industry and business knowledge including potential new markets, industry/business links (senior executive) by the Northern Territory (DED TAS 2004a:1; Immigration SA n.d.g:2; DBIRD NT 2003c:1; 2003f:1). The last example illustrates that the jurisdictions may combine two separate DIMIA criteria; in this case, export activity and development of business links. This explains why each DIMIA criterion is not covered separately by the governments.

Development of business links with international markets is addressed by South Australia under “expanded trade and improved business links with overseas markets” (Immigration SA n.d.g:2) but “expanded trade” may also cover exports missing as such from the export/import criteria above from this state. The last DIMIA criterion of adding to commercial activity and competitiveness within sectors of the Australian economy is listed by Victoria and South Australia (see link from SMP VIC n.d.a gateway site; Immigration SA n.d.g:2). Queensland is interested in regional or industry development (DSDI QLD 2005d:1; 2005f:3).
Not customising every single criterion does not mean that the governments are uninterested in them. There is usually space for additional information, which may address other DIMIA criteria not specifically customised, as examples from Victoria or Queensland illustrate (see links from SMP VIC n.d.a gateway site; DSDI QLD 2005d:1; 2005f:3). Similarities in customising the DIMIA specific types of economic contribution suggest that the governments offer sponsorship to achieve similar economic outcomes.

Queensland illustrates how the governments may customise the DIMIA criteria to enhance regional dispersal of migrants, in line with the policy objective. Other states also promote the regional business location. In Tasmania, investment in a rural area is one of the customised, preferred economic benefits that temporary business migrants may deliver (DED TAS 2004a:1). In Western Australia and Queensland a reverse approach applies. Additional (and identical) requirements apply to the permanent visa applicants, whose businesses are located in Perth and Brisbane, respectively. Apart from standard applicable DIMIA criteria (that is, to satisfy at least one of the six types of contribution), these two states require that out of the three criteria, one must be also met. In fact, it is a narrower selection of DIMIA criteria and includes: a) generating (new) employment; b) introducing new skills/expertise/technologies/innovations; or c) developing export markets/replacing imports (Small Business Development Corporation Western Australia (SBDC WA) n.d.b:1; DSDI QLD 2005d:1; 2005f:3).

Western Australia encourages regional location by offering a financial incentive to potential migrants (see Table 3.9 for eligibility). For temporary visa applicants aged over 55, investment in business in a regional area, in conjunction with one more criterion (or any combination of at least two listed criteria - see below) is considered an exceptional economic benefit to the state. This list, in comparison to the Perth-based applicants (see above), is enlarged. It contains, apart from the regional location, and points b) and c) from the paragraph above, a large amount of new capital investment and significant flow on effect of the business activity to the local economy. Creation of a significant number of new jobs replaces the generation of new employment listed for the Perth applicants (SBDC WA n.d.b:1,2). In Victoria, applicants above that age should demonstrate that at least one of these benefits, like employment creation, export activity, introduction of new technology or capital investment, can be delivered (SMP
VIC n.d.d:2). Other governments do not provide similar guidelines. Tasmania also informs permanent visa applicants of four additional conditions, one of which is operating a business in non-metropolitan area. Tasmania’s government advises that applicants will be informed which criterion they will need to meet (DED TAS 2004a:2).

The governments’ approach of specifically requiring one of the criteria to support a permanent visa application is intended to prompt an auto-selection of business location (regional or in capital city), where migrants expect to meet the criteria. These strategies are innovative in addressing the policy principle of dispersal. They may only be pursued by the state/territory governments since the six DIMIA criteria apply to the unsponsored business migrants, too. On the other hand, these instruments can only encourage, rather than compel migrants to set up businesses in regions. All in all, it may be concluded that the customised DIMIA criteria, including the dispersal measures, are potentially able to address the targeted economic and population policy outcomes. Differential policies’ outcomes in Australia and Canada may result though from the strict (Canada) and seemingly universal (Australia) character of the types of the economic contribution in these countries, as explained above.

The comparison of the additional core eligibility factors completes the analysis of the corresponding sponsored Australian and Canadian provincial business migration options. Their two distinctive policy management strategies are now able to be fully characterised. In Australia, as a result of the federal responsibility for immigration matters, guaranteed retention thanks to the two-stage visas and the few uncomplicated DIMIA eligibility factors, the state and territory governments are able concentrate on fine-tuning the DIMIA specific types of economic contribution to achieve their preferred economic outcomes. As in the case of state/territory sponsored skilled streams, sponsored business migration allows them to exercise some control over the entry criteria. The role of the state/territory governments illustrates how, in a system where immigration is a federal responsibility, some duties may be delegated to the subnational governments in a view of enabling a national policy to deliver benefits tailored to the needs of these jurisdictions. Australia then represents one distinctive policy management strategy based on federal and state/territory governments’ cooperation in establishing the eligibility criteria and joint responsibility for the policy outcomes.
In Canada, as a consequence of the shared responsibility for immigration matters, resultant sole responsibility of the governments for their policies, and in response to nominees becoming permanent residents, the provincial governments have adopted a different approach to that of Australia's. Overall, it is strict, especially where the criteria for the specific economic benefits tighten the initial flexible approach. The Canadian provincial governments perform a double role, combining the responsibilities of the Australian federal government and the state/territory governments. Therefore, their approach represents another distinctive policy management strategy: where the governments are fully responsible for their entry criteria, and, consequently, also for the policies' outcomes. These two strategies show how similar economic policy objectives may be addressed with different policy instruments.

By comparing the approaches to eligibility factors in Australia and Canada, the economic benefits targeted by the policies are able to be summarised. Migrants in both countries are expected to use their accumulated business skills and acumen to benefit the jurisdiction concerned. They are further expected to make capital/equity investment, create employment and provide additional benefits as a result of their settlement. The approach to determining the specific types of the economic contribution in Australia and Canada differs. When customised in Australia, these types of contribution typically involve the introduction of new/improved technology and skills, export and/or import replacement activities (where the former may be combined with development of business links with international markets), and contribution to commercial activity and competitiveness within sectors of economy/industry development. Another aspect of customisation involves promotion of the regional dispersal by some Australian jurisdictions, which corresponds to the population policy objective.

In Canada, the expected specific types of economic contribution are stricter than in Australia, but in relation to the Canadian federal program they are also innovative. The Canadian provinces use the priority/key industry lists, expect value-added activities, list ineligible business operations and some also use the Australian-style enumeration of the specific types of the economic contribution. The economic benefits expected by the Australian and the Canadian governments have appeared similar at the earlier stages, but tighter criteria at this stage indicate that the Canadian provincial economic policy objectives are enhanced in comparison to the former. Nevertheless, all the adopted
approaches in each country seem potentially able to deliver on the targeted economic policy objectives, that is the adopted measures seem suitable.

The eligibility factors for the principal business categories in both countries suggest that the balance is tipped towards the economic objective rather than addressing the population outcomes. Although retention seems to be well addressed in Australia in comparison to Canada, and the dispersal of migrants is a policy objective intended to be achieved with concessional criteria, the encouragement for regional dispersal, despite being an innovative solution and fitting the policy objective, may not be sufficient to achieve any considerable scale results. The Canadian provinces seem even less equipped to deal with retention issues, and the cash deposit, let alone the expected loyalty, may not guarantee a full success. Furthermore, the intraprovincial dispersal is only being pursued by two provinces, that is, at a minimal scale. This suggests that the policies' population outcomes in both countries may be modest.

Nevertheless, it has to be acknowledged that these business migration streams offered under the regional migration policies in Australia and Canada\(^\text{10}\) provide examples of efforts to support economic development of states/territories/provinces and their regions along the lines of the 'learning region' concept of regional development. The discussed additional core eligibility factors (specific types of expected economic contribution) in Australia and the two additional eligibility factors and Australian-style criteria of economic contribution in the Canadian provinces are means of learning and innovation. This concept proposes that learning and innovation are instruments of regional development enabling regions to become competitive and linked into the modern knowledge-based economy (see Section 1.3 in Chapter One).

The Australian state/territory sponsorship for business migrants is intended to assist in their dispersal [into regional, rural or low growth areas] as well as better link them with the state and regional development plans. To meet DIMIA criteria, their businesses must have at least one of the six characteristics mentioned at the beginning of Subsection 3.3.3. Those most obviously linking states/territories and their regional areas into the global, knowledge-based economy are: a) development of business links with international markets; c) export of Australian goods/services; d) (goods/services) import

\(^{10}\) These streams are: state/territory sponsored business owner and state/territory sponsored senior executive in Australia, and entrepreneurs and managers/senior executives in the Canadian provinces.
replacement; and e) introduction of new/improved technology. In fact, those specific types of economic contribution are most often chosen by the state/territory governments when customising the six DIMIA criteria to meet their specific economic needs. Their customised eligibility factors such as the new/improved business skills; new expertise; development of new business links in international markets; introducing innovations; new industry knowledge; technology transfers; exporting new products or exporting to new markets; and import replacement (may result for example, from new technologies) are all examples of means of learning and innovation.

In four Canadian provinces, the Australian-style criteria of economic contribution, such as for example the transfer of skills and knowledge to Canadians in emerging technologies; secondary benefits from nominees’ businesses to other related industries; expansion of diversification of the provincial economy; enhancements of production and marketing of technology, research and exports in the priority sectors; and expansion of export markets/improved market access for provincial goods and services represent similar means of learning and innovation. Furthermore, two principal eligibility factors commonly used by the Canadian provinces are a) the limitation of nominees’ activities to preferred priority/key industry sectors and b) the requirement that their businesses be value-added. In case of the first factor, these industry sectors may be targeted because they are a backbone of a provincial economy; they may offer considerable development and profit prospects for particular provinces; or the provinces may already have or aspire to have competitive advantages in these sectors. In all these cases but especially in the latter two international expertise and innovation are paramount to success. The value-added requirement further strengthens the expectation of knowledge transfer and innovation.

These eligibility factors illustrate how the policies may assist the Australian states/territories, the Canadian provinces and the regional areas in both countries in building, expanding and enhancing activities, capacities and quality of businesses and in making them more competitive in that process. That connection to international knowledge and practices that migrants may offer through their overseas-gained and tested business skills and expertise, personal business networks, and facilitated through native language skills may help better integrate the Australian and Canadian
jurisdictions and regions within them into the modern knowledge-based economy—the ultimate dimension of regional development proposed by the ‘learning region’ concept.

### 3.3.4 Other business migration categories

This Subsection examines first the DIMIA eligibility factors for the BT and REBA visa applicants and the customised, economic contribution expected from these two groups. Next, it looks at the eligibility factors for the state/territory sponsored investors. Last, it discusses the remaining Canadian provincial categories: the Québec-selected investors and farmers nominated by Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Table 3.8 features the basic DIMIA eligibility factors for the BT and REBA visa applicants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility factors</th>
<th>Business Talent Visa (BT)</th>
<th>Regional Established Business in Australia category (REBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Under 55 when applying unless sponsoring state/territory has determined that the applicant’s business activity is of exceptional economic benefit.</td>
<td>20-54. Points-tested. No points for less than 20 and for 55 and over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English language</strong></td>
<td>Vocational English level not required but any applicant (incl. family members) 18+ with no functional English must pay second instalment (English language upgrade tuition fee) before visa can be granted.</td>
<td>Points-tested. Better than functional; functional; bilingual in non-English languages; limited English earns points. No English earns no points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business record</strong></td>
<td>Successful business career and nor the applicant or spouse has history of business/investment activities of nature unacceptable in Australia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous visa held</strong></td>
<td>Permanent residency granted upfront.</td>
<td>Independent Executive Business (Long Stay) 457 visa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business activity</strong></td>
<td>For at least 2 of the 4 fiscal years immediately before applying applicant had net assets (or combined with spouse) in a qualifying business 9, where he/she had ownership interest 10, of at least of AUD$ 400,000 value.</td>
<td>Applicant has had ownership interest 10 of at least 10%, in main business/es 9 in a Designated Area for at least 2 years immediately before applying and continues to have such interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business turnover</strong></td>
<td>For at least 2 of the 4 fiscal years before applying, applicant’s main business/es 9 had annual turnover of min. AUD$3m.</td>
<td>In each of 2 years immediately preceding application, applicant’s main business/es 9 has had turnover of min. AUD$ 200,000 OR exports of min. AUD$100,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee requirement/assets value</strong></td>
<td>1. Employee requirement: not further specified.</td>
<td>1. Points-tested. Main business/es 9 has had min. 2 full-time (or equivalent) Australian permanent residents, citizens or eligible New Zealand citizens (non-family) employed throughout the 2-year period prior to application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Applicant (or combined with spouse) has business and personal assets, lawfully acquired and transferable to Australia within 2 years after visa grant, of net value of at least AUD$ 1.5m.</td>
<td>2. Applicant’s (or combined with spouse) total net assets in Australia for the 12 months prior to application were greater than AUD$ 200,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Applicant’s (or combined with spouse) total net assets in Australia/available for transfer within 2 years, are points-tested. Min. AUD$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8 DIMIA eligibility factors for state/territory sponsored BT and REBA visas in Australia. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility factors</th>
<th>Business Talent Visa (BT)</th>
<th>Regional Established Business in Australia category (REBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000 earns points. 4, 2 years prior to application applicant has had (or combined with spouse) net assets in main business/es in Designated Area of total value of at least AUD$ 75,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency in Australia on provisional visa</td>
<td>Does not apply.</td>
<td>Temporary residency on a Business (Long Stay) 457 visa for at least 12 months cumulatively out of last 24 months before applying. REBA is available in Designated Areas excluding Sydney, Newcastle, Wollongong, Brisbane, Sunshine Coast, Gold Coast, Perth metropolitan area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a) For explanation of terms see Table 3.1.
Sources: DIMIA 2004g; DIMIA 2004o; DIMIA 2005i.

Table 3.8 shows that the BT and REBA visas are permanent residence visas and the applicants are assessed against the same eligibility factors as the temporary state/territory sponsored business owners and senior executives. REBA, unlike the BT and other categories, is points-tested and available to people who have established a business in a Designated Area whilst being on the Independent Executive Business (Long Stay) 457 visa. REBA provides a path to permanent residency for those who do not apply for a further onshore status extension or choose not to apply for a sponsored permanent residence business owner visa (DIMIA 2005i:1).

Table 3.8 shows that the BT visa candidates, as the temporary business migrant candidates, benefit from the higher age limit, and that exceptions are considered on similar grounds as for these other groups. REBA applicants have their age points-tested. The functional English language level applies to the BT visa applicants, as is the case of the temporary business migrant candidates. REBA applicants are consequently points-tested for their English language ability.

The business background under both categories in Table 3.8 is determined identically as for the temporary business migrants and the business experience is also expressed in specific terms. Moreover, under each category there is a specifically determined annual business turnover level, which for the prospective BT migrants is quite high. These two groups are subject, as the temporary business migrant candidates, to the net assets value

---

11 The Independent Executive category is part of the Long Stay temporary business (457) visa. Table 2.1 in Chapter Two shows that regional employers may use this visa to sponsor skilled people for temporary residence. Section 2.4 in Chapter Two shows how that temporary visa may lead to permanent residence under RSMS.

202
requirement. For the BT visa applicants, the net assets value of at least AUD$ 1.5m is considerable. REBA applicants must meet the requirement of the total net assets value greater than AUD$ 200,000 and net assets in business valued at least AUD$ 75,000. Although the net assets value must exceed AUD$ 200,000, only a minimum of AUD$ 500,000 earns points. Generally, the financial criteria for REBA are similar to state/territory sponsored business owner (residence stage), but that level of total net assets sets this category apart. Points increase relative to the assets’ value and the maximum level giving most points is AUD$ 2.5m (DIMIA 2005i:3).

Moreover, REBA candidates must satisfy the employee requirement, which is higher than for the state/territory sponsored business migrants applying for permanent residence and is points-tested. Although the minimum number of employees is two, employing three workers earns more points (DIMIA 2005i:3). The employment requirement for the BT is not further specified by DIMIA (that is, for example the minimum number of local jobs created/maintained).

The targeted economic benefits expected from the BT visa holders are customised DIMIA types of specific economic contribution and these migrants must operate a business falling within at least one of these types. In absence of the two-stage visa, their residence depends on meeting the visa obligations or else visas may be cancelled (see Subsection 3.4.2). Some governments also use financial criteria to influence the business location of these migrants in attempt to encourage regional dispersal. The following paragraphs look at how the state/territory governments influence the location of the BT migrants’ businesses and how they customise the types of specific economic contribution.\(^\text{12}\)

Financial measures to encourage dispersal are used by Victoria and South Australia. Both differentiate, similarly to British Columbia and Newfoundland and Labrador, the amount of investment in their capital cities and regional areas. As of May 2005, AUD$
750,000 is required for investment in Melbourne, as opposed to AUD$ 500,000 elsewhere (SMP VIC n.d.d:3). Investment of at least AUD$ 2m is required for Adelaide and AUD$ 1.5m in regional South Australia (Immigration SA n.d.a:2). Western Australia favourably perceives a proposed regional business location, although no similar financial criteria as above are used (SBDC WA n.d.b:2). From this it can be concluded that only the Northern Territory and New South Wales have no formal measures supporting the regional location of their sponsored business migrants.

All criteria for business migrants were first compared between September–December 2004 but the policies are being continuously developed. When these criteria were reviewed in May 2005, some websites had been improved, URLs changed and criteria were adjusted. One of the adjustments consisted of lowering the investment requirements in Victoria for the BT visa holders from AUD$ 2m for Melbourne and from AUD$ 1m for regional Victoria (see current levels above). Similarly, British Columbia has reduced the required investment under its Business Skills Category from CAD$ 1m to CAD$ 800,000 currently binding (Table 3.5). This may indicate that the initial requirements in Victoria and British Columbia were too high for potential migrants.

Current of May 2005, South Australia, Western Australia and the Northern Territory customise DIMIA criteria for the BT category. An exceptional economic contribution is highlighted in each case. In South Australia, migrants must meet the government’s economic development aims and objectives (Immigration SA n.d.a:1). The Northern Territory informs migrants that the strength of the value of the proposed activity to, and its alignment with, the Economic Development Strategy of the Territory is assessed (DBIRD NT 2003a:1). In Western Australia, the substantial economic contribution is assessed, taking into consideration the type of the proposed activity, level of investment and the impact on the state economy (SBDC WA n.d.b:1–2).

These frameworks then comprise customised criteria, indicating the preferred types and level of economic contribution. Migrants are expected to create/maintain sustainable

---

13 According to DIMIA criteria, BT applicants aged over 55 must also deliver an ‘exceptional’ benefit. It is unclear what would be considered ‘exceptional’ for such older applicants, since their whole operation must deliver such benefit. Individual considerations may take place in such cases.
employment in South Australia, generate skilled employment/a large number of new jobs in Western Australia, and if they choose the Northern Territory, new employment is expected (Immigration SA n.d.a:1; SBDC WA n.d.b:2; DBIRD NT 2003b:1). The DIMIA criterion of introducing new/improved technology is also considered. In South Australia, it comprises R&D, while in Western Australia (as for Perth-based applicants and those aged over 55) and in the Northern Territory, the introduction of new skills/technologies/innovations (or expertise in Western Australia) is considered beneficial (Immigration SA n.d.a:1; SBDC WA n.d.b:2; DBIRD NT 2003b:1).

Export development/import replacement is listed as a desirable form of economic contribution by each of these jurisdictions. In South Australia, export development overlaps with a separate DIMIA criterion of developing business links with overseas markets and covers trade expansion. In the Northern Territory, trade development is a separate criterion from the new export markets and imports replacement (Immigration SA n.d.a:1; SBDC WA n.d.b:2; DBIRD NT 2003b:1). The last DIMIA criterion of adding to competitiveness of business sectors in the economy is listed by South Australia.

South Australia further expands the DIMIA criteria by listing formation of alliances with other businesses in the state (Immigration SA n.d.a:1). For Western Australia, additional benefits consist in a significant flow on effect to other sectors of economy, or a significant new capital investment (SBDC WA n.d.b:2). Unlike South Australia, where the level of investment in Adelaide and elsewhere in the state is determined, Western Australia (see above) and Northern Territory leave this criterion open by listing new capital (DBIRD NT 2003b:1). Finally, Queensland informs migrants that their proposed business should be of an equivalent level to their one in their home country. Further, Queensland requires that it should be demonstrated how the business will positively impact the industry in which the applicant will be operating in, or how the applicant’s talent and investment will enable the industry to grow (DSDI QLD 2005a:2).

As in the case of sponsored temporary business migration, the states’ approach to customisation of criteria for the BT visa applicants builds on, and complements, the character of the strict, basic DIMIA criteria, with exception of the two-stage visa
arrangements. The fine-tuning of specific types of economic contributions also reflects the participatory role of the state/territory governments and the federal government's principal responsibility for immigration matters. Hence, the approach to determining the specific types of economic contribution expected from these migrants supports the observation about the distinctive Australian strategy of managing sponsored business migration.

The BT migrants, being permanent residents, are subject to higher criteria than the sponsored temporary business migrants. These criteria are safeguards for delivering the expected specific economic benefits. This resembles the Canadian provincial strategies that also manage the permanent residents and for that purpose apply all eligibility factors upfront. The BT visa requirements prove from a different perspective than Canadian, that the residency status influences the eligibility criteria.

The specification of criteria for the REBA category seems to be the case only in Victoria and the Northern Territory. Victoria advises candidates that their economic contribution should be demonstrated by employment creation, export activity, introduction of new technology, or capital investment (SMP VIC n.d.d:3). The Northern Territory lists identical generic criteria, as shown above, for the BT visa applicants (DBIRD NT 2003c:1). Other governments rely on DIMIA requirements (Table 3.8), which at least guarantee employment creation and dispersal. This suggests that of the whole range of sponsored business visas, only REBA is rigorously designed to meet the regional dispersal policy principle, while also providing other economic benefits resulting from operation of businesses (Table 3.8). Although the customisation of the criteria for the REBA category occurs to a smaller degree than in the case of the BT visa applicants, the requirement for state/territory sponsorship also supports the distinctive character of the Australian policy management strategy.

The aforementioned customised eligibility factors for the BT and REBA visa applicants in Australia, such as for example introduction of new skills, technologies, expertise or innovations; trade development; developing new export markets/import replacement; alliances with other state-based businesses; and significant flow on effect to other sectors of state economy are efforts to broaden the jurisdictions' access to learning and innovation, proposed by the 'learning region' concept as instruments of regional
development. Just as in case of the principal business migration categories in Australia (see Subsection 3.3.3), these customised eligibility factors illustrate how the regional migration policy may assist in making the state/territory and regional business activities in their jurisdictions more competitive by allowing in such selected individuals. According to the 'learning region' concept, this competitiveness is a key factor to participation in the modern knowledge-based economy and the migrants' international knowledge and practices may help to better integrate the state/territory and regional economies into it. It also appears that the BT visa category may be more targeted than the principal business migration categories to support state/territory strategic economic objectives.

The basic DIMIA eligibility factors for the state/territory sponsored investors are presented in Tables 3.3 and 3.4.¹⁴ DIMIA excludes them from its specific types of economic contribution. Instead, these migrants must maintain the Designated Investment for four years before being eligible to apply for a permanent visa. However, the state/territory governments have expanded the DIMIA requirement the Designated Investment and require migrants to become involved in a business activity other than investment.¹⁵

There is an expectation that these investors will engage in a business activity whilst being on the temporary visa or after their investment matures. For example, Victoria expects its investors to have commenced or to have planned to commence a business activity when seeking sponsorship for a permanent visa (see links from SMP VIC n.d.a gateway site). South Australia seeks details of intended business activity after the investment matures from the temporary and permanent visa applicants (Immigration SA n.d.g:2, n.d.h:3). The Northern Territory requests from permanent visa applicants details of any investment activities (in addition to the copy of the Designated Investment), as well as of ownership in a business (DBIRD NT 2003d:1). Queensland seeks general

¹⁴As a result of continued expansion of the policy, commencing from 1 July 2005, the states and the Northern Territory may also sponsor retired investors on a temporary basis. It is too early to discuss the economic benefits resulting from their migration and that option also falls beyond the final update of the material for this thesis (May 2005). Yet, it is an innovative solution with the potential to expand economic benefits for jurisdictions. Differential investment levels and other financial criteria encourage dispersal (DIMIA 2005j:1–2). Regional/low population growth metropolitan areas exclude: Sydney, Newcastle, Wollongong, the New South Wales Central Coast, Brisbane, the Gold Coast, Perth, Melbourne and the Australian Capital Territory (2005k:2). At the time of writing, in early July 2005, governments are adding information for interested candidates on their websites.

¹⁵The Australian Capital Territory does not offer sponsorship to investors (Business ACT 2005c:1).
information regarding the proposed business (DSDI QLD 2004a:2). The continuation of business/investment activities is expected from the residence stage migrants (DSDI QLD 2005e:2), and limited information regarding the business/investment activities carried out is sought (DSDI QLD 2004b:1).

The principal economic benefit from sponsoring investors is their Designated Investment. The economic benefits resulting from establishing a business may be delayed. The nature of that category supports the observation made earlier that, in Australia, the policy represents a distinctive management strategy involving joint federal and state/territory governments' criteria and responsibility for the policy outcomes.

In Canada, only Québec operates an Investor Program in a pure sense. In absolute financial terms its requirements are lower than under the state/territory sponsored investor category in Australia. Rather than a net assets value of AUD$ 1.125m in Australia, net worth of CAD$ 800,000 is required. The minimum absolute level of investment in Québec is also lower: CAD$ 400,000 as opposed to AUD$ 750,000 (MICC QC 2005c:2; DIMIA 2004g:15). The investment is made for five years through a stockbroker or a trust company and serves to fund an assistance program for small and medium-size enterprises in Québec (MICC QC 2005c:2).

Finally, there are the migration streams for farmers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. In Saskatchewan, prospective farm owners/operators should have available equity (net worth of at least CAD$ 500,000) and supply a signed offer to purchase a farm/land for a new operation. They should also demonstrate relevant knowledge and experience (for example, documentation of education and training, work experience, or financial documents pertaining to their previous operations). As under other categories, Saskatchewan farmers are expected to actively operate their farms (DGR SK 2005b:1).

Manitoba has added that stream in early 2005 (Government of Manitoba 2005:1). It targets farmers aged less than 40, interested in establishing/purchasing a farm, with at least three years of relevant experience, with a minimum net worth of CAD$ 150,000,

16 Farmers may also migrate under the provincial programs to other Canadian jurisdictions because agriculture is one of the priority/key industry sectors targeted for provincial business migration. Compare Table 3.7.
and willingness to commit at least CAD$ 150,000 to the venture. A cash deposit must also be paid and it is released once the business has been established. As above, farmers must become actively involved in their farming operations (MIEDM and MLI 2005d:4,8,9). Both streams for farmers and for the Québec investors provide additional illustrations of the distinctive Canadian provincial policy management strategies, where the provinces individually decide on the streams they will offer and the entry criteria.

In Australia, farmers may be sponsored by states and territories as business migrants, yet only Tasmania extends a special welcome to them (DED TAS 2004e). Although similar sponsored programs for particular business migrant groups are not likely to be established in Australia, for the sake of orientation in international trends, governments should be aware of the existence and entry requirements under the corresponding business provincial schemes in Canada.

The eligibility factors used under all categories discussed in this Subsection are able to be used to summarise the types of the economic benefits targeted by the policies in both countries. In the case of BT and REBA visa holders in Australia, as under the business categories discussed earlier, migrants’ skills and business acumen are targeted. The states and territories similarly expect to benefit from their capital investment, employment creation and additional benefits resulting from their settlement. The customisation of the specific types of economic contribution for the BT migrants may potentially deliver the targeted exceptional benefits. In absence of the two-stage visa process, their residence is guaranteed by visa cancellations provisions. Although under REBA most jurisdictions seem to rely on the DIMIA basic eligibility factors, these nevertheless are able to benefit these jurisdictions through employment creation, and importantly, through supporting regional dispersal. REBA is indeed the only business category guaranteeing the dispersal. The targeted benefits under the state/territory sponsored investor category include their Designated Investments. The additional benefits resulting from the investors’ settlement are delivered immediately, but contributions, such as employment creation, is delayed.

The investment made by the Québec investors serves as an additional source of support for the local business assistance programs, and the presence of these individuals in the province may potentially bring additional benefits resulting from their settlement.
Saskatchewan and Manitoba expect to benefit from the farmers' experience and accumulated wealth, investment and spill-over benefits resulting from their settlement. In sum, the eligibility factors under all streams discussed here are similar to the ones identified in the principal business categories, suggesting that similar economic benefits may also be delivered. Therefore, these other business migration categories provide additional avenues for obtaining these benefits as well as appear similarly capable of addressing the economic policies' objectives in both countries.

A further observation may now be made, once all principal and other business categories have been discussed. Australia has a greater number of sponsored initial migration options than the Canadian provinces, suggesting that it has resorted to more aggressive tactics. This provides another illustration of different tools being used to meet similar economic development objectives. This greater number of options exists under the same principal DIMIA criteria, meaning that the states and territories have fewer opportunities than the Canadian provinces to compete with each other for business migrants. Nevertheless, having many sponsored entry options potentially gives them a chance to attract more investment and benefits from other targeted economic results.

This Section has illustrated also that the arrangements for the state/territory sponsored business migrants in Australia and the provincial business migrants in Canada continue to be enhanced and expanded. Four recent solutions merit attention. First, in Australia, the move in 2003 to two-stage visas, in response to earlier trends, intended to improve performance and address retention, should be noted. Second, the recent reduction of financial requirements for BT visa applicants in Victoria, making that category more accessible, is worth highlighting. In Canada, the corresponding adjusted financial criteria for the British Columbia Business Skills Category, rendering it more accessible and therefore potentially increasing the potential pool of applicants, merit attention. Last, the recently added stream for farmers in Manitoba, aimed at supporting the development of the agricultural sector of this province, should be emphasised.

These recently introduced and existing solutions represent a combination of innovative instruments working to deliver benefits tailored to the jurisdictions' particular needs. In Australia, the dispersal efforts and the choice of visas that the governments may use
should be highlighted in that context. In the Canadian provinces, innovation consists in criteria better corresponding to the jurisdictions’ needs than the Canadian federal business migration program. Therefore, it can be concluded that these arrangements support the hypothesis that Australia and Canada are highly active in innovative regional migration policies.

### 3.4 Support services and monitoring activity

This Section extends the discussion on the Australian state/territory and the Canadian provincial business schemes by analysing the role of the additional policy instruments. First, it looks at various business support services offered by the governments at the pre and post-arrival stage. Second, it discusses the monitoring of migrants in both countries.

#### 3.4.1 Support services

This Subsection discusses the support services offered to business migrants by the Australian state/territory and the Canadian provincial governments. These services support the delivery of the expected economic benefits and hence deserve attention. Table 3.9 presents selected services offered in Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/territory</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>- 'Meet and greet service'; - Accommodation and rental car booking at government rates; - Introduction to key members of finance and business sector; - Locating suitable land and infrastructure; - Fast-tracking investment project approvals; - Information and assistance accessing the federal government business facilitation programs; - Assistance in recruiting and training staff; - Assistance accessing export markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>Referral to Office of Small Business is provided, which helps to: - Explore market and feasibility research options; - Consider business development opportunities, including business planning⁶; - Access information and obtain referrals to other agencies able to assist with research required to develop realistic strategies to operate business in Victoria. Through cooperation with local government and other agencies migrants can be advised about existing commercial opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Business Establishment Incentive Package (BEIP) comprising: - <strong>Exploratory Visit Support</strong>: hotel accommodation bookings made (government rates may apply); arranged visits to business and industry organisations, the Business Centre and possible business locations; introductions to real estate and business agents, and other appropriate industry and business specialists; arranged visits to schools; referrals to registered migration agents; - <strong>Networking and Referral Service</strong>: individual referrals to designated officers in relevant state government’s agencies; links to: trade and industry associations and federal government agencies; regional development boards; industry assistance programs; business support organisations and business brokers; - <strong>Relocation Service</strong> (a choice of the following services available for a total of 24 hours during first 3 months): arrival meet and greet; needs analysis; temporary accommodation coordination; home search (rental or purchase); settling in program; education assistance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/territory</td>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Business Orientation Service:</strong> individual training sessions in small business management leading to Certificate IV in Small Business Management;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Industry Consultancy Subsidy:</strong> contribution of up to AUD$ 2,500 ($ to $ basis) to employ a business consultant to help develop the migrant’s enterprise potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>-Economic and lifestyle data;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Business opportunities and research;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Industry, professional and community networks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Business licence and taxation requirements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Establishing and developing a business in the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Business Migrant Incentive Program (BMIP):</strong> available to those intending to, or operating a business/investment activity in a regional area. Prospective sponsored temporary visa applicants, BT visa applicants and Independent Executive Business (Long Stay) 457 visa holders qualifying for sponsored residence business skills visa are eligible. Contribution of up to AUD$ 1,500 pays costs of business consultant to prepare a business proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Advice on starting a business; licensing, and business planning assistance programs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other assistance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Business consultations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Programs and assistance to develop awareness and skills in e-business;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Free workshops and seminars (topics may include: business planning, marketing and bookkeeping);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Business Growth - funding and development services to established business to enhance business performance, profitability, employment and market penetration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For exploratory visit, migrants may obtain informative briefings about business in the Territory and be put in touch with relevant government agencies and private sector organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>-Specialist advice on business skills visas Queensland government sponsorship requirements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Tailored business and industry information and links to relevant business resources and industry personnel to ensure migrants make an informed choice about their proposed business;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Upon arrival, appropriate services to migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pre-application consultant’s service:</strong> for potential migrants with identified type of business they want to commence/industry they want to operate in. Individual or group interviews arranged to discuss requirements of the state sponsorship and to provide advice and targeted business information. Service is recommended prior to submitting application for sponsorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pre-application consultant:</strong> assists in market research, which must be reflected in business proposals for sponsorship. Examples of assistance: specialist industry knowledge; requisite licenses; taxation requirements and possible supply chains, access to public and private sector agencies and industry organisations (this information is also online). Community links; local councils; schools and Technical and Further Education [colleges] (TAFEs) also provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Post-arrival services:</strong> coordinated by a Business Support Coordinator and delivered by network of departmental regional centres. Needs-based. Examples of assistance: training and skills development workshops; individual consultations and research services; business mentor assistance; retail leasing guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Greater China region migrants:</strong> access to pre and post-arrival services and a specialist Chinese speaking officer. Examples of assistance: pre-application services for market research purposes; help with intending market visits; coordination of after care services; business information and referrals to ethnic business groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>-Tailored assistance to help in business set-up and growth;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Business and investment information;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Identification of commercial opportunities in regions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Assistance in finding new markets;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Enterprise improvement programs to enhance international competitiveness and assistance in international promotion;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Assistance to develop, commercialise and promote new technologies and to adopt innovative practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listed elsewhere:**
- Information, advice and connecting people with relevant business networks;
- Information on business sessions (topics may include: industry sector information including investment opportunities; introduction to potential joint venture partners; regulations and other relevant information.

In the 2003 review, the state/territory governments’ support in Australia was recognised as an additional policy tool that could be employed to disperse business migrants more effectively and link them to state and regional development plans (see also introduction to Section 3.3). Table 3.9 shows that the governments have identified similar services as being useful to business people. Advice, contacts to business, government and community bodies are standard services. What draws attention is the support in business planning, as listed, for example, in Victoria and Queensland services. This is a central and mandatory element of each application for sponsorship in Australia, as well as in the Canadian provinces (see also Subsection 3.5.1).

Some governments go to great lengths to support their business migrants. This is understandable since the longer-term economic benefits and retention depend on successful transition from temporary to permanent status based on the business performance. Hence, early wide-ranging assistance is crucial to assist in that objective. The most attractive is the services package offered by South Australia. It shows exceptional commitment, with dedicated support during the exploratory visit, initial settlement coordination, opportunity for training and support for business development. These services were also highlighted by a senior South Australia government official.\(^{17}\)

The exploratory visit mentioned by some governments (Table 3.9) provides an opportunity for prospective migrants to learn about business opportunities and the business environment, and for the government to provide targeted information. Some senior state government officials confirmed that some prospective sponsored business migrants come out for such visits.\(^{18}\) Another aspect of the support services that merits attention is the financial incentive offered to regional migrants sponsored by Western Australia (see also Subsection 3.5.1).

In Queensland, the pre and post-arrival services, including dedicated support for the Chinese-speaking migrants, are worth noting. In each case, promoting the support services offered to candidates for sponsored business visas is likely to act as an incentive, in addition to the sponsorship itself. In May 2005, when the above information was reviewed for updates, comparable services were yet to be found online in the Australian Capital Territory; however, one Territory senior official noted that

\(^{17}\) Interview took place on 12 November 2003.

\(^{18}\) These officials were interviewed on 5 November 2003 and on 13 November 2003.
some pre and post-arrival services were being offered to sponsored business people.19 The recently launched Territory’s own skilled and business migration strategy comprises support services to sponsored business migrants (Business ACT 2005b:9).

Examination of the Canadian provincial approaches to support services - as presented online - revealed that British Columbia, Manitoba, Québec and New Brunswick actively assist in exploratory visits. They are mandatory for prospective nominated business migrants practically across all provinces. They may be used by governments to provide various orientation services. Applicants usually undergo an interview prior to formal nomination and these are often part of the exploratory visits. The fact that assistance is communicated online may be an added attraction (additional incentive), as is the case in Australia.

This assistance comprises services such as targeted advice and referrals, and an introduction to the federal-provincial business centres located in each jurisdiction. These provide services and information for identifying business opportunities, researching the market, writing a business proposal, getting to know the regulatory requirements and the like. Governments run information seminars covering a number of business migration and settlement related issues (MCAWS BC n.d.e:1; MIEDM and MLI 2005b:1; 2005c:6; MICC QC 2005a:2) and offer individual counselling sessions with economic advisors (MCAWS BC n.d.a:1; MICC QC 2005a:3).

Québec stresses that information regarding business opportunities in regional areas is provided during the exploratory visits (MICC QC 2005a:2), supporting the provincial dispersal effort. The ministerial website is linked to a host of information on regional areas. On arrival, a ministerial representative greets all Québec-selected migrants at any of Montréal’s airports. If this service is missed, migrants are requested to contact a departmental integration officer in the area they intend to live (MICC QC 2004d:1). Such appointments serve to provide orientation and necessary referrals to any particular services that a migrant may require (2004c:1–2). Services involve a tailored interview with an economic advisor, visits to the regions and training seminars (2004b:1–2). Entrepreneurs settling in regions may benefit from the help of a business mentor to carry out their business plan (Gagné 2003:10). As mentioned by a senior Manitoba

19 Interview took place at 8 August 2003.
government official responsible for business migration, regional business opportunities in Manitoba were discussed at seminars, but attendees were city-focused.  

Manitoba also provides pre-arrival orientation services. Importantly, this involves advice in identifying key business organisations and resources in the migrant’s industry sector (MIEDM n.d.:1). This corresponds to the policy objective of migrants successfully operating in the targeted priority/key industry sectors (see Subsection 3.3.3). New Brunswick’s support during the exploratory visit consists of arranging meetings in business sectors and in geographic areas of interest to the prospective migrants (DB NB n.d.e:1). Other provinces may offer similar direct, personalised support on request, but it is not communicated online as in these four provinces. Therefore, one may get the impression that initial support is mostly available through online information.

There is a range of online business related information, provided by the sponsoring/nominating governments, for prospective and settling business migrants in Australia and in the Canadian provinces. Moreover, to help make an informed location choice, governments provide information regarding the lifestyle in their jurisdictions, covering issues such as the cost of real estate, transportation, education and health care options, banking and other services like entertainment. Finding contacts to community ethnic organisations involves following links from the business migration websites. Regional and community socioeconomic briefs communicate the business opportunities and lifestyle quality to potential business migrants. The amount of information and the detail it goes into differs among the jurisdictions. All the aforementioned resources are not separately referenced since they are available through chains of links or entry links scattered around websites. A search can be conducted by using the principal governmental websites listed in Appendices VI and VII.

The above evidence suggests that the Australian state/territory governments may be offering more direct, personalised support services to their sponsored business migrants than the Canadian provincial governments, that are seemingly reliant on their own and/or third party online information. In Australia, support services going beyond online information and referrals to third parties are often an integral part of the sponsored

---

20 Interview took place on 26 March 2003.
business migration experience and are usually quite prominently displayed online. Their presentation style may increase their appeal. An 'incentive package', such as South Australia's, simply makes an impression. On the basis of the located information, some initial direct personalised assistance could be confirmed only in four Canadian provinces. Hence, it seems that the support services of some Canadian provincial governments could be improved, or where they already exist, they need to be more noticeably and attractively communicated.

The support services and information are intended to facilitate research, aid understanding of business opportunities, and assist in proposing and managing a business that will meet the visa conditions (especially in Australia), which ultimately will translate into the targeted economic benefits established in the preceding Section. In that context, the services correspond to the economic policies' objectives and seem potentially able to support the delivery of these targeted benefits. Indirectly, they may also contribute to retention. In Australia, the services are explicitly intended to assist in dispersal.

At this stage of the policies' development, it is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of these services in the state/territory and the provincial programs. At the time of the interviews, the interval between the March 2003 changes to business visas, including the role of the business support services, was too short for the Australian governments' officials to offer substantial comments. In Canada, only four governments were found to offer comparable services but feedback was unavailable. Although no conclusive remarks can be offered, it may be assumed that the continuation and range of these services is based on some internal governmental assessments indicating that these services are well worth the effort.

3.4.2 Monitoring activity
The character and the consequences of the monitoring activities are influenced by the entry conditions for the sponsored business migrants in Australia and the business provincial migrants in Canada, as well as by the governments' responsibilities for managing the programs. In Australia, monitoring serves the visa compliance and the evaluation purposes and DIMIA is responsible for both activities (DIMIA 2004:1). In Canada, programs' evaluations are part of the federal-provincial agreements, they
regard provincial skilled and business migrants and serve to assess these programs' effectiveness (see Subsection 2.5.3 in Chapter Two).

**Australia.** All state/territory business migrants are subject to a DIMIA monitoring survey. This survey is sent out to temporary sponsored business owner and senior executive visa holders as well as to the permanent residents (the survey is sent to BT visa holders 24 months after their initial entry). It enquires about the nature and performance of the business activity/activities, and enables the reporting of any difficulties in engaging into business. At any time following its completion and before the four-year temporary visa expires, migrants may apply for a permanent sponsored visa, provided they satisfy the eligibility factors. BT visa holders may be contacted, in addition to DIMIA, by their sponsoring states and territories to verify their business activities (DIMIA 2004g:5). Failure to return a completed survey might adversely affect a permanent residence application in the case of the temporary visa holders. If the BT visa holders do not engage in a business activity as required (see Subsection 3.3.4) and fail to return the survey, their permanent visas may be cancelled (2004g:4). Finally, migrants are monitored 36 months after arrival; sponsored investors complete that survey, too (2004l:1,2).

The survey performs a double function. First, it enables the character of the migrants’ business activities to be evaluated. Second, testing the business performance of temporary visa holders fulfils the visa compliance purpose and assists in determining whether a permanent visa may be granted. These provisions for visa cancellations for the state/territory sponsored temporary and permanent business migrants resemble the arrangements for the sponsored temporary and permanent resident skilled migrants. Similarly, the decisive element is the compliance with visa conditions rather than the status granted (see Subsection 2.5.3 in Chapter Two).

To track migrants’ whereabouts, all temporary sponsored visa applicants and BT visa applicants must sign a declaration stating that they will keep DIMIA informed about their current residential address and any changes thereof (DIMIA 2004g:4). REBA migrants must also keep DIMIA informed of their address for a period of three years and they must also participate in surveys (DIMIA 2005i:3). Business migrants may also
be subject to site visits in the post-arrival period. For example, in 2002–03, five per cent of such sites were visited (Part 2, Output 1.1: DIMIA 2004c).

If, during the three-year monitoring period, DIMIA becomes aware of potential grounds for a visa cancellation, this intent is communicated to the individual concerned, and if DIMIA is unsatisfied with the response, it proceeds with the cancellation (DIMIA 2004:i:2,3). The seriousness of the cancellation grounds, potential consequences and the individual’s situation are considered (2004:i:3). As one DIMIA officer explained, such a decision is always made on an individual basis. Any genuine effort given to pursuing business activity is considered, and other issues such as strong links to Australia are taken into account. There have been visas cancelled.21 For example, DIMIA reports that in 2003–04 there were 1,183 business visas cancelled (sponsored and unsponsored visas) (2004d:36). Although the stock of sponsored and unsponsored business migrants in Australia is not reported, which prevents to see the magnitude of that phenomenon, it is interesting to note that this figure is almost equal to the number of visas granted to business people sponsored by the governments in the same period: 1,193 (2005:i:43). A senior state government official responsible for business migration added that under the new (2003) regulations, state and territory governments are obliged to check the legitimacy of business migrants’ activities.22 Despite that responsibility, DIMIA remains in charge of monitoring.

In addition to the monitoring survey obligations, business visa applicants sign a DIMIA declaration at the provisional and residence stage, acknowledging that their application may be refused or any visa granted may be cancelled if they give false or misleading information. This requirement is identical as for the skilled migrants (see Subsection 2.5.3 in Chapter Two). That means that there are two grounds for a visa cancellation, as in the case of the skilled migrants. First, the non-compliance with the visa conditions, such as not completing or returning the survey, or business-related grounds as established in the survey. The state/territory governments’ role in checking legitimacy of the migrants’ operations is auxiliary. The other reason may be supplying false information to DIMIA. Such division of responsibilities further supports the observed distinctive policy management strategy, involving both the federal and the state/territory
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21 Interview took place on 18 November 2003.
22 Interview took place on 11 August 2003.
governments, and confirms DIMIA sole constitutional responsibility for immigration matters.

**Canada.** Potential business migrants are not informed of such strict monitoring consequences, as is the case in Australia. This stems from the fact that, once admitted as permanent residents, and guaranteed the mobility rights, their unsatisfactory business performance or moving to another province, cannot be a reason for cancelling a visa, similar to the case of the skilled provincial migrants (see Subsection 2.5.3 in Chapter Two). Only in British Columbia is the support for the application for a permanent residence performance-linked. In the worst case scenario, some provinces may retain the cash deposit as a penalty if the nominees are underperforming or have relocated, but this does not carry a consequential loss of the permanent resident status. The financial consequence is the only discouraging outcome. Clearly then, contrary to Australia, where the unsatisfactory monitoring outcome (including business-related grounds) may lead to a visa cancellation, not meeting the conditions of nomination by a Canadian province does not carry such serious potential consequences of a permanent resident status loss.

On the other hand, as explained in Chapter Two (Subsection 2.5.3), skilled and business provincial migrants sign a CIC declaration stating that they understand that any false statements or concealing material in their permanent residence application may result in their exclusion from Canada and may be grounds for their prosecution or removal (CIC 2004j:4). Some governments require an identical declaration on their own forms to be signed. Others require an acknowledgment that false statements or concealment of information may cause refusal of application or, if applicable, the nomination. This shows that, similarly to Australia, the contents of the submitted documents may result in prosecution or removal. Further, this means that compared to Australia, the federal Canadian government holds the ultimate prerogative in relation to removal of an individual from Canada. This role of CIC does not allow to fully confirm the distinctive Canadian provincial policy management strategy. In general, the grounds for removal of the provincial business migrants in Canada are limited in comparison to Australia, as a result of their permanent resident status.
An evaluation of the success of the provincial business programs requires knowledge about migrants’ whereabouts in these provinces. In comparison to Australia, where this is a standard DIMIA requirement, the provincial approach is not a uniform one, despite tracking down of the nominees being part of the agreements with the federal government. For example, contact details of migrants are required by Manitoba, and in Nova Scotia all nominees participate in the program evaluation (MIEDM and MLI 2005a:7; OED NS 2005a:1). In Québec, all selected migrants meet with an integration officer to record their landing and personal details (MICC QC 2004c:2). In Québec, the Longitudinal Immigration Database and matching data on permanent entry of Québec-selected migrants with the provincial health insurance records are used as tracking measures (compare Subsection 2.5.3 in Chapter Two). It cannot be established at this stage how successfully, and on what basis, the evaluation takes place. Given the freedom of settlement, and, if the migrants’ location is not known to the nominating governments, it seems that only the Longitudinal Immigration Database may be able to track them down.

In sum, the Australian and Canadian approaches to monitoring, and their potential consequences generally replicate those established in relation to their skilled migration programs.

3.5 External stakeholder engagement and promotion

Regional migration programs must be effectively communicated in order to make them work. This Section looks at further policy instruments used to market the Australian state/territory and the Canadian provincial governments’ migration schemes. First, it compares the ways of governments’ cooperation with the external stakeholders. These are the migration agents (called immigration consultants in Canada)\(^{23}\) and other intermediaries engaged in promotion and facilitation of business migration. Second, other international marketing strategies are compared. As anticipated in Chapter Two, both Subsections contain comments on skilled individuals migrating under the Australian and Canadian programs (see Section 2.6). Although the cooperation with the agents and international promotion are not exclusive to these state/territory and the

\(^{23}\) Wherever the term ‘agent(s)’ is used, it is a generic term covering migration agent(s) and/or immigration consultant(s).
provincial migration programs, both methods were very often mentioned in their context and therefore they merit attention.

3.5.1 Migration agents/immigration consultants and other intermediaries
The agents participate in the policies by promoting alternative (to the federal programs) migration schemes and/or the advantages of less popular destination jurisdictions. By providing information, they contribute to raising awareness about the programs, and, if successful, trigger migration enquiries. The agents also pre-screen potential candidates against the governments’ criteria so that the latter can obtain acceptable applications for nomination. Other intermediaries may be business consultants, for example.

Since an interview covering business migration was rarely complete without referring to the agents, it may be assumed that the majority of sponsored/nominated business migrants use their services. In Australia, temporary visa applicants, such as business owners and senior executives, as well as the BT visa applicants constitute the potential supply side. In Canada, candidates for provincially nominated entrepreneurs are the principal clients.

The assistance of such agents may be sought to meet the requirement of submitting a business proposal. As illustrated by example of Queensland in Table 3.9, the proposal must reflect market research. The governments typically require a description of the proposed business activity, management and ownership structure, including role and/or ownership interest of the applicant, and proposed investment, employment and other types of economic contribution as applicable. The proposal must also include the costs involved in establishing/purchasing a business, a profit forecast; as well as evidence that research and analysis into business trends has been undertaken (see for example DED TAS 2004a:1–2; Immigration SA n.d.g:1–2; DSDI QLD 2004c:4–6). The required knowledge must reflect local conditions and hence, the agents’ assistance is useful. Similar questions are asked by the Canadian provincial governments (see for example DED YK 2004:3; DGR SK 2005a:2–3).

There is strong evidence for the supporting role of the agents in operating the sponsored business migration schemes in Australia. In Tasmania and South Australia, cooperation with them was mentioned by senior state government officials as one of the methods of
promoting the business opportunities under these schemes. Providing the agents with relevant information to promote business opportunities was also deemed in one of them to be bringing a number of migrants to the state. Similarly, a Western Australia government official mentioned that the agents were recipients of relevant information used to promote business opportunities in the state. Building relationships with them over time can be followed by comparing recent governmental annual reports (SBDC WA 2001:17; 2002:14; 2004:16).

In South Australia, the website, the agents, and the SMD, in the case of skilled migrants, were reported by the aforementioned official as principal tools of promoting the sponsored migration. South Australia distributes promotional kits to migration agents with information on sponsored business and skilled visas, support services offered by the state government, a brochure featuring information about Adelaide, and a compact disc featuring case studies. Promotional materials, including electronic ones, are also available for regional areas.

A short-term contract between an applicant and a business consultant engaged to write a proposal for intending regional migrants in Western Australia (see Table 3.9) provides an illustration of the consultants’ auxiliary role in regional business development, in line with the dispersal policy principle. This also acknowledges the in-house knowledge that can they offer. For example, in 2002–03, 122 applications were approved for funding and in 2003–04, 15 applications were approved (SBDC WA 2003:18; 2004:15-6).

A Queensland government official reported that applications for the sponsored business categories were usually submitted via an agent. It was reported that agents receive assistance through seminars, where they learn about requirements for an acceptable business proposal. Moreover, Queensland electronically advises agents about the government’s services for their clients, and technical issues of the application process for the sponsored visas (DSDI QLD 2004d).

In New South Wales, international promotion of business opportunities in cooperation with the agents was abandoned in 1996, and, since then, the government has been

---

24 Personal communication from 13 January 2004 and an interview on 12 November 2003.
25 Interview took place on 13 November 2003.
26 Interview took place on 20 November 2003.
concentrating on other forms of promotion. New South Wales publishes electronic newsletters for agents, advising them about technical aspects of the application process, updating them about new regions opening up for regional skilled migration, refined requirements for sponsored business migrants and alike (see link from DSRD NSW n.d.c gateway site).

At the time of the interviews, Victoria was still defining its cooperation with the agents. A senior Victorian government official deemed it beneficial to enter into a working relationship with a group of agents to promote Victoria in the Chinese market. China was noted to be one of the countries supplying a significant number of business migrants. A reason to engage in cooperation with agents in China was the fact that some of them were migrants once settled in Victoria and turned agents, who would be coming back to China to open offices there. Having the language advantage, they were believed to be suited to promoting Victoria. In 2005, according to the government website, the Victorian government provides information and participates in seminars to assist agents, accountants, legal firms and others to promote the state as a business migration destination (SMP VIC n.d.b:2).

Recent skilled and business migration strategies released in Australia demonstrate that cooperation with the agents is a continuously developing aspect of sponsored migration. The Northern Territory’s government sees the migration services industry, among other players, as a strategic partner in enhancing the Territory’s access to migrants. With strong commercial orientation, the industry is perceived as a potential broker for the Territory. To raise the Territory’s profile among intending migrants, the government commits itself to actively seeking and developing strategic partnerships and linkages with the industry (DBIRD NT n.d.a:8). Therefore, the Territory can be expected to join other Australian jurisdictions in cooperating with agents, as illustrated above. The Australian Capital Territory’s strategy refers to working with the agents to manage the demand for the sponsored visas through selection and pursuit of particular target markets (Business ACT 2005b:5). Enhanced activity in these markets (see Subsection 3.5.2) will involve promotion to the agents of the Territory’s sponsorship program and

---

27 This was explained by a senior state government official responsible for business migration interviewed on 11 August 2003.
28 Interview took place on 28 October 2003.
services. The agents will then provide relevant information to the applicants (2005b:7,8).

The above evidence indicates that governments are active in educating agents about opportunities in their states and have well-established methods of doing so, such as the targeted distribution of promotional materials and information seminars. Moreover, materials promoting regional areas as in South Australia, and the financial incentive offered by Western Australia to prospective regional sponsored business merit attention, as such initiatives support the policy’s dispersal principle. The Territories illustrate that cooperation with agents is being developed. In the light of the established cooperation in some states, and this direction to be taken by the Territories, and considering the worldwide competition for skilled and business migrants, it may be assumed that such relationship will mature and more agents will be recruited to raising the profiles of the Australian and Canadian jurisdictions to potential migrants.

The exact outcomes of their engagement remain in-house knowledge. The impression of the author was sometimes that details were too sensitive to be revealed, which is understandable, considering that jurisdictions compete for migrants. Under such circumstances, it must be assumed that the continuation of this cooperation is considered beneficial by the governments - it is resulting in successful sponsorship applications of migrants with preferred business profiles, who expand the business activities in the sponsoring jurisdictions. It that sense, these activities support the economic policy objective and indirectly also increase growth in regional migrant population levels.

There is less evidence for the supporting role of agents aiding the delivery of provincial programs in Canada. This results from the more recent history of some PNP’s, which, at the time of the field research, were at an initial phase. On the other hand, there is more evidence that supports the importance of other intermediaries in the provincial programs. A senior Manitoba government official responsible for business migration commented that tours abroad aimed at raising awareness about the provincial business migration program, undertaken in cooperation with the agents, would usually gather between 500–1,000 attendees at the information seminars. Moreover, the applications
accepted from the attendees, following the presentations, hovered around 200 per year.\(^{29}\) Furthermore, private recruiters could be useful to sectoral employers. Klymchuk (2002:3) reported that Manitoba Medical Association used them to attract South African doctors. These examples demonstrate how agents assist in recruiting migrants with preferred business and skills profiles, as in Australia.

In the Eastern Canadian provinces, the cooperation with the agents is being developed, and the use of agents could potentially increase the numbers of nominees. For example, an update on the New Brunswick PNP (Lampart 2004:n.p.) contained information that the province was prepared to work with immigration professionals and guidelines clarifying their role in the PNP process were being developed. Apart from screening the prospective applicants against the PNP criteria, they were also expected to participate in the exploratory visits and retention/settlement activities (2004:n.p.). Prince Edward Island seems to be a step ahead. Its PNP is currently marketed through a network of Canadian and offshore immigration lawyers and consultants. The success of the program “(...) reflects their professionalism, energy and integrity”. In 2002–03, their network was expanded from five to 25 (DDT PT 2003:20). These examples resemble the intention of the two Territories in Australia and demonstrate that agents are now being recruited and integrated into some PNPs’ frameworks, and their roles are being defined.

Other intermediaries are also integrated into the provincial migration processes. For example, in British Columbia, health professionals interested in becoming nominees can only have their applications processed if they are pre-screened (for credentials and other related issues) by a provincial recruitment company (MCAWS BC n.d.n:1). Nova Scotia is another example of having drawn an external stakeholder into an institutionalised cooperation. Its government has contracted a local company as a worldwide marketing coordinator for its PNP (Cornwallis Financial Corporation 2004:1). It works to attract business and skilled nominees. On the government program website, prospective business nominees are informed that part of their financial investment covers consultancy fees (OED NS 2005a:2).

\(^{29}\) Interview took place on 26 March 2003.
Institutionalised cooperation exists also between the Québec government, stockbrokers and trust companies authorised to participate in the Québec Investor Program (MICC QC 2005b). In Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador, the prospective Immigrant Partners are recommended to retain legal counsel in relation to their intended investment in the investee company (Table 3.6). The Canadian examples illustrate that the agents, the recruitment agencies and other financial intermediaries participate in attracting skilled and business migrants to the provinces, corresponding to the policies’ objectives.

As in Australia, the effectiveness of the cooperation with these stakeholders cannot be evaluated. Except for Manitoba, where an approximate number of applications for nomination were reported as a result of cooperation with agents, such outcomes could not be located for other provinces. The evidence remains general and these stakeholders’ positive role in addressing the policies’ economic objectives, and the numerical growth of migrants may be assumed from the governments having integrated them into the policies’ management and by developing links with them. This suggests that in internal governmental assessments that cooperation is likely deemed valuable in terms of achieved results. In few cases, these stakeholders are exclusively responsible for, or otherwise linked to, the number of nominees (Nova Scotia, health professionals in British Columbia and the Québec Investor Program).

All in all, the evidence from the interviews and the other documents suggests that two major trends have emerged. First, the Australian and the Canadian provincial governments are active in their cooperation with the agents and other intermediaries and some governments are now establishing similar ways of cooperation. The latter development supports an observation made in relation to available visas that the policies continue to be developed. The cooperation with these stakeholders expands that statement by demonstrating that developments take place also in the wider programs’ environment and not strictly only in relation to the entry options.

Second, this close cooperation is already institutionalised in some jurisdictions, where the governments have well-established ways of directly providing information about business opportunities to the agents. This shows that similarities in the Australian and the Canadian regional migration policies extend beyond the generic eligibility factors to
the convergent approaches to cooperation with such stakeholders, which seems suitable to support the economic policies' objectives. Founded on mutual benefits and trust, the agents are well positioned to bring to the attention of governments migrants, whose business (or occupational) profiles fit the local conditions.

The evidence of established and expanding agents' networks gathered from the interviews and other documents supports one of the hypotheses that the Australian and the Canadian policy responses have adopted new models of stakeholder participation to manage the regional migration. The near future may see a number of agents, deliberately drawn into cooperation with and for the governments. They will effectively become the governments' third/outreach arm - pivotal partners in marketing opportunities under the sponsored/nominated migration schemes. Given this industry important, growing role in the migration process, interviewing the agents in the future should be considered. This would allow for a better understanding of their role and their relations with the governments. This current research was undertaken under time and resource constraints that prevented from including these individuals as informants.

3.5.2 Promotional strategies

The Australian and the Canadian governments use wide-reaching international marketing strategies. The interviews and other available documents point to three convergent methods that they use: engaging governmental overseas trade/commercial offices, undertaking promotional and recruitment tours in the targeted markets and participating at international migration marketing events. These methods are not exclusive to the regional skilled and business migration and may be part of a larger portfolio.

In Australia, the role of the overseas trade/commercial offices was highlighted in three interviews in the context of attracting applications for sponsored business migration.30 These offices, enabling the governments to have direct access to potential migrants whom they can sponsor, were providing relevant information and promoting their respective jurisdictions. Government websites reveal that the majority of the Australian governments maintain them. They are typically located in China (separate offices are maintained in Hong Kong), Singapore (covers also Malaysia), South Korea, India and

---

30 These interviews were conducted on 12 November 2003, 13 November 2003 and 20 November 2003.
Representations in Indonesia, Taiwan, United Arab Emirates and the U.S.A. are less conventional. Outposts in Europe always include an office in the United Kingdom (London). In one of these interviews, it was noted that the overseas promotion of skilled and business migration to the state was being pursued jointly.

In Canada, maintaining permanent trade/commercial offices seems, according to the websites, somewhat less widely practised. Apart from similar focus on selected Asian countries and the United Kingdom, offices are also located in some Spanish-speaking and some French-speaking European countries. For example, Alberta maintains its offices in China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea, Japan, United Kingdom, Germany and Mexico (MED AB 2004d:38). Québec has its own immigration offices in (Paris, Brussels and Vienna, reflecting the francophone links and active recruitment across some countries of southeastern Europe and Russia). Québec offices are also located in Mexico, Argentina, Syria (covering Middle East and India), Hong Kong and New York. Maghrebine migration is managed from within Québec (MICC QC 2005m). Québec offices, as their websites indicate, organise information sessions in these countries and the adjacent regions. Their location coincides with the targeted markets. For example, the Québec government was targeting the South American countries in recognition of the economic conditions conducive to migration, as well as due to the cultural and linguistic proximities, facilitating integration into the Québec society.\(^\text{31}\) Despite overseas offices being seemingly less common than among the Australian governments, the above locations indicate that some Canadian provinces may nonetheless directly target migrants in more countries than the Australian jurisdictions.

Promotional tours overseas to raise awareness about their migration programs in targeted countries is the second method often mentioned in the interviews. For example, a senior Tasmanian government official informed, not quoting any specific numbers, that such tours to South Africa were worthwhile, suggesting that some migrants have arrived as a result. Presentations at such tours were assisted by an agent, a real estate representative and a banker.\(^\text{32}\) This illustrates how the cooperation of agents and governments works in practice.

---

\(^{31}\) This was observed by a senior Québec government official dealing with regional matters on 1 April 2003.

\(^{32}\) Personal communication from 13 January 2004 and interview on 5 November 2003.
Non-migration-oriented events were also used for migration promotion. For example, one senior state government official in Australia noted that if another department travelled to showcase the state, relevant immigration-related materials would be presented there. Similar opportunities were also taken advantage of in state-federal cooperation. For example, New South Wales reported that following a presentation at a conference organised by the Australian Commerce and Industry Office in Taipei, and attended by migration agents and potential migrants, a number (unspecified) of applications for sponsorship followed (DSRD NSW 2004a:27).

Western Australia and the Australian Capital Territory were seeking migrants for sponsorship, too. Apart from the prime market for the sponsored business migrants to Western Australia being Southeast Asia and Indonesia, in 2001, business migrants from the United Kingdom, South Africa and Zimbabwe were targeted, too. A state delegation to South Africa and Zimbabwe involved giving a series of promotional seminars (SBDC WA 2001:17). In the following year, Indonesia was reported as the leading business migration market for the state, with Malaysia, Singapore, South Africa, Zimbabwe and the United Kingdom being growing markets (2002:14). In the Australian Capital Territory, Western Europe, Asia, U.S.A., Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and the Middle East are targets for the sponsored skilled and business migration (Business ACT 2005d:2).

In Canada, British Columbia promoted its PNP on missions to South Korea, Taiwan, China and Singapore (Huynh 2004:12). Manitoba (along with British Columbia, Ontario and Québec) went on promotional and recruitment missions to selected South American countries in 2000 (MLI 2001:64). A senior Manitoba government official responsible for business migration noted that visits promoting the provincial business migration were undertaken (up to 2003) in South Korea, China, the United Kingdom, Germany and Iran.³³

In 2001, a Manitoba recruitment mission to Argentina undertaken in cooperation with the Jewish Federation of Winnipeg and Manitoba Business Council resulted in more than 60 exploratory visits. In the following year, 18 nominees landed, bringing with them family members (MLI 2002:48; 2003a:48). In 2004, a recruitment mission

---

³³ Interview took place on 26 March 2003.
promoting provincial migration went to South Korea and China (MLI 2004a:52). Recruitment of Filipino nurses, which involved a test in the Philippines (so that nurses could avoid the trap of non-recognition of skills), was a success, too. Over 40 registered nurses and 35 licensed practical nurses landed in 2001 under the PNP and are now employed in various Manitoba’s regions (MLI 2002:48; Huynh 2004:13).

In comparison, two Québec interviewees highlighted recruitment missions in a targeted market - France. Other sources also comment on their success. For example, missions to France and Belgium undertaken to address specific regional skilled shortages, resulted in a large proportion of these professionals (nurses and speech therapists) working in the regions (Gagné 2003:4). Recent ministerial annual reports inform that as a result of missions in France, South America, Eastern Europe and Romania, ‘selection certificates’ were issued (MRCI QC 2003:12; 2004d:20). As in the case of overseas offices’ location, Canadian targeted markets for provincial migration are again wider than the Australian ones. While selected Asian countries are targeted by the jurisdictions in both countries, thus indicating convergence of interests in that world region, selected South American countries and French-speaking European countries are also targets for potential provincial migrants.

Participation at international migration exhibitions is the third method of promoting sponsored/nominated business and skilled migration. The largest show of that kind - ‘Emigrate’ - takes place in London. Government officials from all Australian states reported their presence at this event. This event appears to yield results. For example, Western Australia regularly reports the number of business and skilled migrants (always in excess of 100; in 2001 only business migrants were referred to) that are interested or will relocate to the state, following the show (SBDC WA 2001:17; 2002:14; 2003:19). After one of them, the government expected to see an assets’ transfer valued more than AUD$ 60m into the state (2002:14). Similarly, some Canadian provinces reported presence (MED AB 2004c:71; DGRAA SK 2004a:21; MLI 2001:64).

There are also smaller events where Australian and Canadian migration schemes are promoted. For example, Australian governments showcase at such events as the DIMIA China Business Migration Open Days (SBDC WA 2004:16), or Australia Migration

---

34 These missions were stressed by a Québec City city council officer interviewed on 21 March 2003 and one senior Québec government official interviewed on 1 April 2003.
Information Day at the Australian High Commission in London (DSRD NSW 2005:1). In Canada, participation in immigration events in Germany (MED AB 2004c:71), the Netherlands, Belgium and South Korea were reported (DGRAA SK 2004a:21). Participation in the Netherlands exhibition was also mentioned by one of the interviewed senior state government officials in Australia. Reports available from the Canadian Eastern provinces indicate promotional activities raising awareness about their PNPs have been undertaken, yet no similar details as above are revealed. All in all, there are venues, such as London and the Netherlands, where the Australian and the Canadian governments’ presence coincide, further illustrating their common interests.

The evidence gathered from interviews and other documents shows that the Australian and the Canadian governments use similar channels for international promotion of business (and skilled) opportunities in their jurisdictions. In addition, their global interests coincide in the same world regions: Asia and Europe. That means that in seeking migrants for sponsorship/nomination they directly compete with each other. Canadian interests extend also into Central and South America, and in the case of Québec, into some French-speaking or ‘francisable’ countries. On the other hand, the Australian governments seem to have located their interest also in South Africa. In all cases, the aforementioned initiatives expand the governments’ outreach and complement the role of the agents and other intermediaries.

Practical outcomes of these identified policy instruments are difficult to assess with one universal measure. A state deems it an achievement if a number (unspecified) of business applications for sponsorship follow a presentation overseas. Jurisdictions may provide numbers that range from 18 to over 100. Positive results of recruitment missions undertaken in order to attract health professionals (numbers are specified in two out of four cases) are highlighted as they ease existing skilled shortages and, importantly, fill them across provincial regions. This demonstrates that it is impossible to establish a one-fits-all scale and evaluate success of these promotional strategies against strict benchmarks. A modest number of applications following any promotional activity for an off-the-mainstream jurisdiction may be judged a success, whereas the same number for a large, popular destination state/province may pass as a standard result. Hence, it may be assumed that that as long as governments report the outcomes, this suggests that they have been internally assessed as benefiting the
sponsoring/nominating jurisdictions, in line with their economic policy objectives. They also support the intended growth in numbers of regional migrants.

It may be concluded that pursuing cooperation with the agents and other intermediaries and promoting the Australian and the Canadian provincial business (and skilled) migration schemes internationally is innovative in that it multiplies occasions for increasing awareness about the schemes, and, in consequence, increases chances of obtaining the preferred economic benefits. This provides additional support another hypothesis that Australia and Canada are highly active in innovative regional migration policies. It may be finally assumed that these policy instruments are central to the policies' development and that they will likely be continued and enhanced.

3.6 Conclusions

This chapter has compared the eligibility factors and other policy instruments used in the Australian and the Canadian regional business migration policies. It has shown how the divergent constitutional division of powers in immigration matters in Australia and Canada, the different initial resident status obtained by migrants, as well as the guaranteed mobility rights in Canada have influenced the character and effectiveness of the adopted policy measures. The cross-country analysis has served to establish how suitable these measures were in addressing the economic and population policies' objectives and what potential benefits could they bring to the concerned jurisdictions.

The economic policy objective has been found to be similar in both countries. It consisted of the development and enhancement of business activities in the concerned Australian and Canadian jurisdictions. The character of the eligibility factors in both countries, particularly the levels of capital/equity investment in business and levels of employment creation further indicated that the governments were interested in developing their small business sectors. The population policy objective of regional dispersal of migrants and their targeted business activities was made explicit in Australia. In Canada, only two jurisdictions were pursuing such intraprovincial dispersal. The analysis of the adopted policy measures indicated somewhat different capacity of the policies to equally well address both objectives.
Two general observations have been made in relation to the economic policy objective. First, the Australian state/territory and the Canadian provincial governments were addressing it with similar generic eligibility factors and policy instruments. In consequence, it was assessed that the governments could potentially obtain comparable economic benefits, most notably capital/equity investment and employment creation. Second, these policy measures were considered potentially suitable to address the governments’ objective of developing business activities.

The governments in both countries emphasise the roles of these similar eligibility factors differently. These included the pre-application factors of age and English/French language ability, business background and other requirements. The latter constituted the core criteria: the capital/equity investment in business; the employment creation levels; the cash deposit in the Canadian provinces; and the corresponding role of the two-stage visas in Australia. The additional core eligibility factors covered the six DIMIA types of specific economic contribution customised by the state/territory governments in Australia and a number of criteria applied by the Canadian jurisdictions.

These underlying differences mentioned above have resulted in the Australian and the Canadian provincial approaches representing distinctive policy management strategies. In Australia, that strategy involved the cooperation of the federal and the state/territory governments, which was observed in the joint management of the eligibility factors, application of federal guarantees at the state/territory level (two-stage visa arrangements) and other policy measures such as for example monitoring. The policy outcomes were also a joint responsibility. By contrast, the Canadian provincial governments were exclusively responsible for setting up their eligibility factors, they individually managed their policies and were entirely responsible for their outcomes. That could not be fully supported only in the case of the ultimate federal Canadian government enforcement prerogatives in relation to removal of an individual from Canada. These policy management strategies, and the preceding observation about the role of the Canadian federal government correspond to observations made in the preceding chapter with regard to administration of the skilled streams in both countries.

In consequence to the business migrants in Australia being subject to federal criteria, the applicants had to satisfy strict but simple eligibility factors, such as age and business
experience - the latter being expressed in specific financial terms. By contrast, the sole responsibility of the Canadian governments has resulted in these governments often using a considerable degree of discretion in assessing the applicants’ suitability in terms of age, often the English/French language ability(-ies) and business experience.

The emphases on the roles of these generic eligibility factors diverged even further. In Australia, the temporary business migrants needed to have a specified net value assets of which part was expected to be used for the capital investment, additional (unspecified) settlement funds and they were expected to create employment and achieve a specified annual turnover in business to qualify for the sponsored permanent visa. These criteria, simple in character and number, resulted from the two-stage visa arrangements and an earlier strict approach to testing the candidates. That whole approach seemed capable of delivering the targeted economic benefits and the two-stage visa process was also addressing the retention of migrants, which was one of the policy intentions.

At this stage, two reasons explained the Canadian provincial governments’ divergent approaches to the Australian one. First, the permanent resident status of migrants does not require a re-evaluation of their business performance to support a permanent visa application (except British Columbia). Second, the initial open approach is unsuitable in addressing the economic policies’ objectives adequately. Accordingly, the Canadian provincial governments were found to have adopted more and stricter eligibility factors to compensate for their initial flexibility and to guarantee that the targeted economic benefits be achieved. These factors involved specified levels of equity investment, net assets value for settlement and the employee requirement. Another difference with Australia was the cash deposit, which, as a business performance and a settlement guarantee corresponded to the business turnover requirement and the two-stage visa process in Australia, respectively. Yet, given the migrants’ permanent status, coupled with their guaranteed mobility rights, these measures’ potential effectiveness in delivering these economic and retention outcomes was feared to be diminished. This was also the case of the expected loyalty of migrants to their provinces. Hence, the first potentially divergent policy outcome with Australia (see above) has been established. On the other hand, from an individual migrant’s perspective, the permanent status offered in Canada has been considered possibly more attractive by offering stability in comparison to the temporary status in Australia.
The Canadian provincial eligibility factors have been further tightened to guarantee the
delivery of the specific types of the economic contribution. Unlike in Australia, where the
state/territory governments customised the DIMIA types of the economic contribution to
best suit their interests, the provincial governments turned out to be more demanding by
specifying particular industry sectors for migrants' business operations, by
specifying/implying the value-added character of their activities, by listing ineligible
industry sectors and by using the Australian-style enumeration of the specific types of the
economic contribution. These differences suggested another potential divergent policy
outcome consisting in the expected Australian economic benefits being more universal in
comparison to the tight requirements in Canada. It was further suggested that meeting all
applicable criteria to be nominated by a Canadian province could be quite challenging for
potential candidates.

Such divergent emphases notwithstanding, it was assumed that the common deliverable
economic benefits included the application of the migrants' business skills and acumen,
increased capital/equity investment, creation/maintenance of employment, as well as
additional benefits resulting from their settlement, similar to the ones identified in the
preceding chapter. The scale of the latter could not be assessed due to the unavailability of
data. The specific types of the economic contribution were also believed to be deliverable,
despite the noted potential differences in the actual outcomes. Similar benefits were noted
in the principal and other business migration categories.

Contrasting conclusions have been reached in relation to the population policy objective.
Apart from the potentially reduced retention (and potential economic) outcomes in the
Canadian provinces noted earlier, another observation was made in relation to the policy
objective in Australia. Regional dispersal of business migrants was considered potentially
insufficient to deliver the preferred outcome on a considerable scale due to a sole reliance
on encouragement to establish businesses in regions. Of the entire range of the sponsored
visa options, only REBA has been found capable of addressing the dispersal principle as
well as delivering other benefits to the Designated Areas, resulting from operation of such
businesses. In combination with the intraprovincial dispersal pursued only by two
Canadian provinces, the Australian and the Canadian approaches suggested that the
economic considerations were dominant motives to operate these schemes.
The additional core eligibility factors (specific types of economic contribution) for state/territory sponsored business owners, senior executives, BTs and REBAs in Australia, and the corresponding eligibility factors for the provincial entrepreneurs and managers/senior executives in Canada being means to achieve these economic (and to a lesser degree, population dispersal) outcomes were considered to be practical applications of support for economic development to states/territories/provinces and their regional areas. This support broadens their access to learning and innovation, which are emphasised by the 'learning region' concept as means of regional development. It proposes that knowledge acquisition through learning and innovation assists regions in becoming competitive, which in turn enables them to participate in the modern knowledge-based economy. These eligibility factors are designed to allow in individuals who may assist the Australian states/territories, the Canadian provinces and their regions in both countries to expand, enhance and diversify their business base, its capacity and quality, and to help make their economies more competitive in this process. That connection to international business knowledge and practices that these migrants may offer, may help to better integrate the Australian and Canadian jurisdictions and their regions into the modern knowledge-based economy – the ultimate dimension of regional development proposed by the 'learning region' concept.

As with the preceding chapter, this chapter has also served to establish whether the policies could satisfy some of the proposed hypotheses. Support was found for the hypothesis stating that Australia and Canada have been highly active in innovative regional migration policies. Solutions illustrating that the policies are being continuously expanded and adjusted were highlighted. Recent solutions, such as the two-sage visa arrangements, responding to the earlier trends and aimed at enhancing the expected economic and retention outcomes, and the nonetheless innovative dispersal measures in Australia have been noted. Another recent Australian solution involved reducing the financial requirements for BT visa applicants in Victoria to make that category more accessible, and the wide range of available sponsored business visas, allowing governments to potentially maximise economic benefits were also noted in that context.

In Canada, a comparable reduction of financial thresholds in British Columbia under its Business Skills category, rendering it more accessible than previously and therefore increasing the government’s access to potential migrants merited attention, too.
Furthermore, the provincial highly demanding criteria, responding to a lack of specific economic contribution under the Canadian federal business migration program, were considered innovative as they better addressed the individual provincial economic priorities. Last, the recently introduced stream for farmers in Manitoba aimed at supporting the development of the provincial agricultural sector was noted.

Evidence for that hypothesis was further found in the role of the wide-ranging marketing strategies similarly pursued by the Australian and the Canadian provincial governments, and comprising cooperation with external stakeholders and international promotion. While the above solutions may be seen as improving the policies’ outcomes onshore and increasing the pool of potential applicants, the marketing strategies address the latter objective by multiplying occasions, at various forums, for increasing awareness about the schemes. That, in turn, increases chances of the governments of obtaining the preferred results. Moreover, these marketing policy instruments were believed to be central to the policies development and their continuation and enhancement was prognosticated. Both the former solutions and the marketing strategies illustrate the Australian and the Canadian provincial governments’ activities and the ongoing commitment to developing their policies.

There were generally fewer contrasting features in terms of applying these additional policy instruments than in the case of the eligibility factors. These policy instruments included the governmental support services, monitoring of visas, the aforementioned cooperation with the external stakeholders and the international promotion. The support services, the cooperation with the external stakeholders and the methods of international promotion were illustrated by examples of activities from both countries. Any actual effectiveness of these instruments could not be decisively established due to such knowledge being exclusive to the governments concerned. Also, in the case of the international promotion, no universal scale for measuring the governments’ success could be established. It was assumed that the continued use of these policy instruments was based on the internal governmental assessments considering their outcomes worthwhile (also suggested by the frequency of mentioning the role of the agents and different forms of international promotion in the interviews), and hence implying their suitability to address the economic policies’ objectives. Cooperation with the agents and international promotion was further noted to be supporting numerical growth of migrants.
The support services in Australia were additionally intended to assist in regional dispersal, and their role in possibly assisting with retention was noted. Some dedicated services were highlighted, most notably in South Australia. The Australian state/territory governments were seemingly offering a more direct personalised support than their Canadian counterparts, who appeared to be largely relying on own and/or third party online information. Furthermore, the former services appeared to be better communicated online. That difference led to propose that the support services of some Canadian provincial governments could be improved, or if existing, be more noticeably and attractively communicated.

The governments in both countries were either cooperating with the external stakeholders to promote business (and skilled) opportunities or were embarking on such cooperation. In the former case, they had well-established ways of conveying targeted information to the agents for diffusion, while the intentions/activities of the others expanded the statement on the developing character of the policies by showing that the enhancements occurred also in the wider policies’ environment and not only in relation to the eligibility factors. Both characteristics of the governments’ activities led to confirm another hypothesis that the Australian and the Canadian policy responses have adopted new models of stakeholder participation to manage regional migration. Indeed, the role of these stakeholders seemed so crucial to the policies’ success that they were expected to become the governments’ outreach arm in marketing opportunities under the sponsored/nominated migration schemes. Interviewing migration agents should be considered as part of the future research priorities to better understand their role in the migration process and relations with the governments.

Three convergent methods of international promotion, and, in fact, also location of interests of the Australian and the Canadian provincial governments in same world regions were highlighted. The governments’ interests most often coincided in Asia and Europe, showing that the Australian and Canadian governments were directly competing with each other for business and skilled migrants.

The particular exception from among these similar policy instruments was the nature and possible consequences of the monitoring of visas. As in the case of skilled migrants, it was shown that regardless of the granted residence status, a migrant’s visa could
potentially be cancelled in Australia if non-compliance with the visa conditions (for example, on business-related grounds) were identified. By contrast, in Canada provincial migrants who were permanent residents, and who were guaranteed the mobility rights, could not lose their permanent status as a result of underperformance in business or by moving away from the nominating province. In such situations some provinces could retain a cash deposit, which was the only possible penalty.
Chapter Four
Regional migration policies: success or failure?

This chapter examines how well regional migration policies in Australia and Canada have addressed their population and economic objectives. Regardless of the different emphases on eligibility criteria and other policy instruments employed in both countries, it was concluded in the earlier chapters that both policies were potentially capable of addressing these objectives. This chapter uses available statistics, other publicly available data and information obtained through interviews to provide an assessment of the extent of the effectiveness these policies. In line with the issues identified in the population/immigration strategies, and the trends targeted by the combination of these policy tools, as discussed in the preceding chapters, the success of the policies is discussed in the context of delivering two core outcomes: population-related and economic. The criteria for success are set out in Section 1.8 in Chapter One.

The population impacts of the policies are discussed in Section 4.1 below separately for Australia and Canada. Skilled and business streams are considered together here firstly because the latter are much smaller in both countries and it would be impracticable to discuss their population impact separately, and secondly because both streams are not always differentiated in the statistics. Section 4.2 examines the economic impact of these streams in Australia and Canada but here the skilled and business streams are differentiated. The assessment of the population and economic benefits hinges on the availability of data. The statistics are neither complete nor are they presented in the same detail across years. In this instance it has been necessary to make assumptions in order to evaluate the data.

At this stage in their program development, the effects of some of the eligibility factors and policy instruments presented in two preceding chapters cannot be fully evaluated. This results from the short history of the policies and a lack of comprehensive aggregate data that could establish trends and enable offering their assessment. The economic impact of the age limit and the English/French language ability eligibility factors may be evaluated to a limited extent and predominantly on the basis of skilled Australian and Canadian streams. In Canada, some comments regarding the second
factor are offered on the basis of business migration. The evaluation of the economic effects of the work experience factor is limited but the corresponding pre-application business experience factor could not be evaluated in any of the countries and therefore is not mentioned at all. Discussion of retention factors in the context of the skilled schemes is also restricted, and the external stakeholders’ support within the community initiatives is only assessed on the basis of the Canadian experience. Policy instruments such as government support services for skilled and business migrants, and domestic and international promotion of the schemes, as discussed in the preceding chapters, could not be evaluated, either. The additional benefits resulting from the settlement of migrants were acknowledged in earlier chapters but no further evaluation is able to be offered at this stage. With incidental exception of international promotion, these benefits and the policy instruments are not discussed. Nevertheless, there is substantial evaluation material available on these programs.

On the other hand, there is a need to commence in the near future data collection and to focus on researching the role of these eligibility factors and policy instruments that impact can be evaluated to a limited degree, or can not be evaluated at all at this stage. That will enable a broader, more comprehensive scope of evaluation, which should be able to better inform future enhancements of the policies in Australia and Canada.

4.1 The population impacts of regional migration policies

The population impacts of the policies are discussed using a common framework but with slightly divergent perspectives in each Subsection (4.1.1 Australia, 4.1.2 Canada). First, the absolute numbers of regional migrants in different categories are shown (Australia only), followed by a distribution of the overall visa grants among the Australian states and territories and of landings among the Canadian provinces. In Australia, the distribution of different visa categories by states and territories is also shown. Next, the regional migrants’ contribution to the population increase is considered. This involves analysis of regional migrants’ proportion in the annual migrants’ inflows into states, territories and provinces, and their contribution to the respective population growth figures. Total growth in population impact of continued
policies is also discussed. Evaluation of the achieved dispersal and retention outcomes closes each Subsection.

4.1.1 Australia

The Australian statistics make it possible to track the number of visa grants under the SSRM initiatives. They are presented in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSMS</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1 021</td>
<td>1 092</td>
<td>1 734</td>
<td>2 214</td>
<td>8 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STNI/SMV</td>
<td>State/territory</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1 628</td>
<td>2 958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDAS</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1 002</td>
<td>1 597</td>
<td>4 465</td>
<td>7 547</td>
<td>15 025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1 744</td>
<td>2 384</td>
<td>1 575</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>9 035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSBS</td>
<td>State/territory</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>1 193</td>
<td>869a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REBA</td>
<td>State/territory</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>172b</td>
<td>37 640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SSRM visas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 126</td>
<td>1 753</td>
<td>2 804</td>
<td>3 309</td>
<td>3 846</td>
<td>4 136</td>
<td>7 941</td>
<td>12 725</td>
<td>38 6 090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total skill stream visa grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 550</td>
<td>34 670</td>
<td>35 000</td>
<td>35 330</td>
<td>44 730</td>
<td>53 520</td>
<td>66 050</td>
<td>71 240</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SSRM visas as % of skill stream visas</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) SSRM visa grants distribution is not available for all categories.
b) SAL - Skilled Australian Linked visa, where applicants received bonus points because their sponsor lived in a Designated Area. These migrants could next apply under a Skilled-Regional Sponsored (SRS) category, and now SDAS. See DIMA 2000:19; DIMIA 2002:20 and Table 1.1. in Chapter One.
d) Figures for SSBS and REBA visa grants do not include the 2003–04 visa grants because their distribution is not available.


Table 4.1 shows that in each year there has been an increase in the aggregate number of regional visa grants (figures include principal applicants and dependants). They reached almost 13,000 in 2003-04. These visas have been also increasing as a proportion of the total skill stream, except in years 2000-01 and 2001-02. In fact, they more than quadrupled in percentage points between 1996-97 and 2003-04. In terms of the total number of the visa grants under the 2003–04 Migration Program (114,360), the SSRM visa grants constituted 11.12 per cent (calculation based on DIMA 2005l:21,39).
Table 4.1 indicates that the greatest component contributor since 2001–02 has been the SDAS category, followed by SAL and RSMS. The 2002–03 and the 2003–04 years show that the visa grants under STNI/SMV begin to catch up. SSBS and REBA considered jointly as state/territory sponsored business visas constitute the bottom group with lowest accumulation of visa grants.

Table 4.2 shows the visa grants distribution (skilled and business migrants and their dependants) across the Australian jurisdictions in 1998–2004. Earlier years are not presented due to incomplete data. The regional migrants are not numerically and statistically differentiated in the settler (permanent) arrivals statistics by states and territories published by DIMIA (2003a:10,11; 2005h:8,15,16). Also, the regional migrants visaed in any given year may not arrive in the same year. However, for the purposes of the evaluation of the policy population impact, it is assumed for simplicity that the visaed individuals in a given year arrive in the same year.

Table 4.2 Distribution of SSRM visa grants across Australian states and territories 1998–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>6,459</td>
<td>17,325</td>
<td>49.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>8.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>6,291</td>
<td>18.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>3,309</td>
<td>3,846</td>
<td>4,136</td>
<td>7,941</td>
<td>12,725</td>
<td>34,760</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
a) For the year 1998–99 data on visa grants distribution across states and territories are incomplete. Total figures are available for all visa categories (DIMA 2000:20). Their distribution is reported by Parliament of Australia (2001:various Tables) for all visa categories but SAL and SSBS. Since in 1999–2000 over 60 per cent of SAL and their regional counterparts (SRS) had sponsors in Victoria (DIMA 2000:20), it is assumed that in 1998-99 of the total SAL visa grants (1,744) 60 per cent (1,046 individuals) also had sponsors in Victoria. The remaining 698 visa grants are then evenly distributed across the remaining jurisdictions (7) to the result of 100 each. Further, the total number of SSBS visa grants (59) is divided by the total number of jurisdictions to the result of approximately 7 visa grants per each one of them. Due to these assumptions and rounding, the outcomes for 1998-99 are only indicative and cells do not add up to the total figure.
b) Due to assumption and rounding in the 1998–99 column, the total figure minimally differs from the total figure that would be obtained by adding up the totals from each year.

Table 4.2 demonstrates that Victoria and South Australia have been the most frequently designated destinations for regional migrants. These states had the highest starting
bases in 1998–99 and have been steadily increasing (note some fluctuations in South Australia between 1999–2000 and 2001–02) the numbers of their regional migrants. This is reflected in the percentage distribution of the SSRM visa grants among the jurisdictions: Victoria has so far attracted almost 50 per cent of all regional migrants and South Australia just above 18 per cent. Elsewhere, the annual figures have been much lower and there have been some fluctuations in all jurisdictions but Western Australia. Overall, following Victoria and South Australia, Queensland came third, Western Australia fourth and New South Wales took fifth position. None of these latter had more than 10 per cent of the total visa grants.

A number of factors explain this distribution. First, it is difficult not to associate the success of Victoria and South Australia with the eligibility for regional migration of their capital cities (except the SIR visa in Victoria). Hence, where large cities are eligible, the numbers of regional migrants are considerably higher than elsewhere. Second, use of all available visas appears important. Until the end of the period covered by Table 4.2, Queensland, Western Australia and New South Wales have not been sponsoring the STNI migrants, whereas Victoria and South Australia have. Yet, use of selected visas is only part of the explanation. Tasmania uses STNI and is not a top destination for regional migrants. Third, other lifestyle factors, such as geographical location and climate, come into play. This would explain the position of Tasmania, located on the fringe of the continent, and the Northern Territory, characterised by extreme climate conditions.

All jurisdictions promote their programs internationally. Since no single, universal scale of evaluating the success of promotional activities could be established, wherever governments report outcomes of their promotional activities it can be taken that they bring some results. It must be therefore assumed that they have paid off. Next, the pre-existing economic opportunities that make migration to a particular jurisdiction attractive are important. Migration may depend on labour market demand in different jurisdictions. For example, RSMS nomination depends on an identified shortage in a regional or a low population growth area, employer’s interest in the scheme and matching that with an interested migrant (Parliament of Australia 2001:48–9). That cannot be engineered. Finally, the intensity of pursuing regional migration is a
politically motivated decision. All in all, a number of factors, not all controllable by the governments, are in play.

It should also be noted that the distribution of the SSRM visa grants by state/territory is different from the destinations of all other migrants. Table 4.2a illustrates these differences using the 2002–03 period as an example. It gives their rough estimate though, because completely comparable data are not available. To show these differences, it is necessary to assume that all regional migrants visaed in 2002–03 arrived and/or changed their status onshore in that period and were therefore represented in the settler arrivals and permanent onshore status conversions (termed by DIMIA ‘permanent additions’, see note 1 below) in 2002–03. In reality, if the data on either visa grants, or arrivals/onshore status conversions were readily available for both categories, the results could possibly be different from those shown in Table 4.2a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/territory</th>
<th>SSRM visa grants</th>
<th>Settler arrivals and permanent onshore status conversions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>4 146</td>
<td>52.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1 324</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 941</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
a) Figures of settler arrivals and permanent onshore status conversions were obtained by subtracting the SSRM visa grants from the figures of ‘permanent additions’ reported in Table 4.6 below.
Source: Author’s calculations based on Tables 4.2 and 4.6.

Table 4.2a shows that the percentage distribution of the SSRM visa grants was more favourable for Victoria and South Australia than their respective percentage shares of the distribution of the settler arrivals and permanent onshore status conversions. By contrast, New South Wales attracting the largest percentage proportion (and real numbers, too) of the settler arrivals and permanent onshore conversions, received a low percentage share of the SSRM migrants. Tasmania and the two Territories received low percentage shares of migrants under both categories considered here, but clearly the regional schemes gave
each one of them a higher percentage share in the migrants’ distribution than under the non-regional schemes.

Having looked separately at distribution by program type and by state/territory, it is helpful to look at the distribution for specific programs by state/territory. Tables 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 show the SDAS, RSMS, SSBS and REBA visa grants distribution.

Table 4.3 Skilled-Regional Linked, Skilled Regional Sponsored (SRS), and SDAS visa grants distribution by Australian states and territories 1996–2001.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>64.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 002</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 415</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
a) Visa grants distribution for the 2001–04 period is unavailable.
b) Visa grants distribution for the year 1996–97 is unavailable.
c) Due to unavailability of visa grants distribution for the year 1996–97, the total in this column does not add up to the total shown as that includes grants from 1996–97.


Table 4.3 shows that Victoria and South Australia have been the most popular destinations for family-linked regional migrants. South Australia was the second leading state but with smaller numbers. Elsewhere, the numbers have been low. Distribution of SDAS arrivals in 2003–04, reported in the most recent SDAS official survey (DIMIA 2005b:2), confirms Victoria’s top position, showing that some 61 per cent of SDAS migrants went there, driven by the eligibility of Melbourne for settlement. This was followed by Queensland (11 per cent), New South Wales (10 per cent), Western Australia (8 per cent), South Australia (7 per cent), the Australian Capital Territory (2 per cent), Tasmania (0.5 per cent) and the Northern Territory (0.4 per cent).

Table 4.1 featured also the annual visa grants under the SAL category. The visa grants distribution could only be located for years 1999–2000 and 2000–01. In both years Victoria was in the top position with 62.29 per cent (1,485) of visa grants in 1999–2000.
and 61.46 per cent (968) of visa grants in 2000–01 (calculations based on DIMA 2000:20 and DIMIA 2002:21) Table 4.4 shows the visa grants distribution under the RSMS category.

Table 4.4 RSMS visa grants distribution by Australian states and territories 1996–2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>na b)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>11.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>48.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>3201</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
a) Visa grants distribution for the 2001–04 period is unavailable.
b) Although RSMS commenced in 1995–96, the first year where the complete number of visa grants was available is 1996–97. Parliament of Australia 2001:24.
c) Due to unavailability of visa grants distribution for the year 1996–97, the total in this column does not add up to the total shown as that includes grants from 1996–97.

Since 1997–98, despite some fluctuations, South Australia has been the top destination for RSMS migrants (Table 4.4). Despite similar fluctuations, Queensland became the second most popular state and Western Australia came third. Except South Australia, the visa grants for other jurisdictions were low in each one of the years. Although no visa grants distribution for the following years was available, OECD (2004:108) reports that South Australia has led in RSMS visa grants from 1996–97 through to 2002–03 (25.1 per cent of all visa grants). It also shows that across that period not Queensland but Victoria has been the second most popular destination for RSMS migrants (15.6 per cent of all visa grants).

The STNI/SMV categories have actively been used by South Australia, Victoria and (from 2002–03) Tasmania. In 1997–98, 1998–99 and 1999–2000 total figures shown in Table 4.1 reflected exclusively the South Australia’s nominations (16,169 and 9 nominations, respectively). The 2000–01 figure (85) in Table 4.1 represented 36 South Australia’s nominations, 47 Victorian nominations and also 2 nominations for the Australian Capital Territory (DIMIA 2002:21). In 2002–03 and 2003–04 Victoria and South Australia have led in nominations with Victoria in the top position. In 2002–03 it
nominated 437 individuals and a much higher number in 2003–04 (1,003 persons). South Australia nominated 353 individuals in 2002–03 and 566 people in 2003–04. Tasmania’s nominations in these two years were much lower: 4 and 59, respectively (2004n:39; 2005i:41).

Victoria also reports success with the newest skilled visa - the SIR. As of February 2005, there were almost 500 applications to migrate to regional Victoria. Of those, 320 individuals have been nominated by the state government (Campaign News Victoria (Campaign News VIC) 2005:2). The number of nominations equalled almost a third of 2003–04 STNI nominations (1,003 persons, see above). SIR attracts additional points and the take-up rate in Victoria may reflect the opening up of migration opportunities to a larger number of people than previously. The success with this visa is due to cooperation with regions that have nominated ‘participating agents’ from their local organisations, who advise the government about migrants’ employability (Campaign News VIC 2004a:2). Employment, which is not a visa condition but is one of the requirements to apply for a permanent residency, is a crucial issue. Successful employment will impact on longer-term retention in regions, which the government indicates it is keenly interested in. Table 4.5 shows the visa grants distribution for the SSBS migrants and REBA migrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSBS</td>
<td>RE BA</td>
<td>SSBS</td>
<td>RE BA</td>
<td>SSBS</td>
<td>RE BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
a) No SSBS visa grants distribution prior to 1999–2000 could be located. Figures up to year 2002–03 include only state/territory sponsored business owners and senior executives (OECD 2004:107). Similar details are not available for year 2003–04. In REBA established in mid–1997, applications could only have begun in 1999 due to applicants being required to have been in business for two years prior to applying. Parliament of Australia 2001:87.
b) Due to unavailability/partial availability of visa grants distribution for the years 2001–02 on, the total in this column does not add up to the total shown as that includes all annual visa grants.
c) According to DIMIA (2004n:41), Western Australia sponsored in 2002–03 the highest percentage of the SSBS and REBA migrants (33 per cent) of the total figure of 419.
d) Figures are calculated on the basis of percentages of these migrants that the reported states sponsored. See DIMIA 2000:43

Table 4.5 shows that initially the business visa grants in each state involved often very low numbers. In early years, unlike under the skilled categories, Tasmania led in nominations mostly due to REBA. By 2002–03, the overall numbers rose considerably, with Western Australia becoming the leading sponsoring state. It maintained this position in 2003–04, while South Australia and Queensland were catching up with lower but equal numbers of visa grants. Success of these three states seems likely to result from the proactive approach to international promotion of business opportunities, including cooperation with migration agents.

Having shown the general visa grants distribution across states and territories and distribution of particular visa categories by states and territories, it is now possible to discuss these migrants’ contribution to the annual inflows of all migrants into states and territories. Using visa grants distribution from Table 4.2 and the number of annual settler arrivals and ‘permanent additions’ (onshore visa grants) by states and territories in Table 4.6, Table 4.7 presents the percentage contribution of these migrants into annual migrants’ inflows.

Some assumptions apply. First, it is assumed that visa grants distribution by states and territories in Table 4.2 is equal to these migrants’ arrivals (and permanent additions) in each state and territory in any given year. In other words, these migrants are represented in settler arrivals and permanent additions in Table 4.6. In reality, that assumption might need to be adjusted. For that reason, and due to other inaccuracies that could not be avoided (see notes to Tables 4.2 and 4.6), the results shown below are indicative rather than a precise illustration of regional migrants’ contribution. Since their impact on the population is to be measured, the total settler arrivals’ and

---

1 The ‘permanent additions’ are a consequence of policy development, which resulted in a rising number of onshore permanent status conversions. It is a sum of settler arrivals and permanent onshore status conversions (DIMIA 2004n:6). Statistics of ‘permanent additions’ are available for years 2001–02 through to 2003–04. On the other hand, it can only be stated with certainty that SSRM visa grants in Table 4.2 include onshore permanent status conversions in 2002–03 and 2003–04 figures (see DIMIA 2004n:40; 2005l:42). No such information could be located for year 2001–02. Therefore, it is taken that Table 4.2 represents SSRM visa grants without onshore conversions until 2001-02 inclusive, while figures for 2002-03 and 2003-04 contain the onshore conversions. To maintain coherency, Table 4.6 shows settler arrivals’ figures until 2001-02 inclusive and the permanent additions’ figures for years 2002-03 and 2003-04.
permanent additions’ figures are considered and these represent outcomes not only under the migration program but also under the humanitarian program and the non-program migrants.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>35 141</td>
<td>39 311</td>
<td>46 745</td>
<td>35 301</td>
<td>51 121</td>
<td>56 876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>17 291</td>
<td>19 319</td>
<td>24 159</td>
<td>21 374</td>
<td>30 693</td>
<td>37 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>16 028</td>
<td>17 286</td>
<td>19 535</td>
<td>15 825</td>
<td>19 809</td>
<td>24 761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>3 320</td>
<td>3 105</td>
<td>3 183</td>
<td>3 316</td>
<td>4 674</td>
<td>6 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>10 672</td>
<td>11 512</td>
<td>11 565</td>
<td>10 954</td>
<td>15 221</td>
<td>18 672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>1 042</td>
<td>1 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1 115</td>
<td>1 075</td>
<td>1 890</td>
<td>2 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>84 131</td>
<td>92 272(^\text{a})</td>
<td>107 366</td>
<td>88 900</td>
<td>125 860</td>
<td>148 884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a) Figures are based on intended state/territory of residence that settlers state on arrival in Australia (DIMIA 1999:59; DIMIA 2003a:8; DIMIA 2005h:2). They may not represent migrants’ distribution with absolute precision.

b) From 1999–2000 onwards cells do not add up to the ‘Total’ figures because they contain also ‘Other Territories’ (Jervis Bay, Christmas Island and Cocos (Keeling) Islands) and from 2001–02 also ‘Unknown’. See DIMIA 2003a:8,42 and DIMIA 2005h:8,45.

Sources: DIMIA 1999; DIMIA 2003a; DIMIA 2005h.

Table 4.7 Percentage of SSRM migrants in settler arrivals and permanent additions by Australian state and territory 1998–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>17.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>22.31</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23.56</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>28.32</td>
<td>33.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>27.48</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>24.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>17.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>19.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s calculations based on Tables 4.2 and 4.6.

Table 4.7 shows that across the whole reference period Victoria has had a steady growth of regional migrants as a proportion of settler arrivals and permanent additions. Regional migrants have also constituted high proportions of settler arrivals and permanent additions in South Australia. That state has had a low number of total settler arrivals during that period, just above 3,000 per year until 2001–02, but the 2003–04 number of permanent additions was above 6,000. Up until 2001–02 regional migrants represented approximately one-fifth (and drawing closer to a quarter in 2000–01) of the settler arrivals in the state. Once they exceeded 1,000, their proportion in the now permanent additions jumped to close to one-third (2002–03), and to 33 per cent in 2003–04 (Table 4.7). Although the absolute figures of regional migrants have placed
South Australia as the second most popular state behind Victoria, due to much lower absolute figures of settler arrivals and permanent additions, these migrants have had a much greater relative impact on the migrants’ inflows than in Victoria.\(^2\)

Tasmania and the two Territories have had low numbers of settler arrivals, permanent additions and low fluctuating numbers of regional migrants. These low fluctuating numbers of migrants represented high but also volatile proportions of settler arrivals and permanent additions in each of these jurisdictions. In 2003–04, the presence of regional migrants among permanent additions to the Australian Capital Territory was almost 20 per cent and almost 25 per cent in Tasmania. International promotion in Tasmania and recently launched immigration strategies in the Territories (discussed in the preceding Chapter) may increase the number of regional migrants in these jurisdictions in the future and may assist in stabilising their volatile rates in settler arrivals and permanent additions observed so far.

To date, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia have had the lowest proportions of regional migrants in their settler arrivals and permanent additions (Table 4.7). The latter two states now seem to be moving forward (see 2003–04 in Table 4.7), but New South Wales has just reached the 1.5 per cent threshold of migrants in its permanent additions in 2003–04. All in all, except for South Australia, and to a smaller degree Victoria, regional migrants have had either a minimal or inconsistent relative effect on migrants’ inflows.

The impact of the policy on population growth itself can be evaluated by looking at the jurisdictional distribution of SSRM visa grants. The numbers of granted visas for states and territories (from 2000–01 onwards in Table 4.2) and the total population growth figures in the states and territories for these years (Table 4.8) are used to show migrants’ contribution to the total population growth in the Australian jurisdictions (Table 4.9). The most recent period of the policy operation is considered (2000–01)

\(^2\) Some could argue that arrival of 3,000 or 6,000 people annually to South Australia - a jurisdiction of 1.5m (according to the 2001 Census; see ABS 2003c:6) - is numerically insignificant. Yet, if regional migration were not encouraged and supported the outcome would be worse. Support for the regional migration has helped this state welcome a total of 23,755 settlers and permanent additions across the whole reference period. Without regional migrants that figure would be 17,464 (calculations based on Tables 4.1 and 4.6). With continued support it can be expected that the proportion of regional migrants among now permanent additions to South Australia will continue to increase.
because this is when the numbers of regional migrants became significant, nearing 4,000 grants annually.

Some data imperfections preclude precise calculations. Therefore, the evaluation should be treated with caution as it is based on rough estimates. For example, SDAS migrants not restricted in settlement can move interstate in the year of arrival. In such cases they would be counted as contributing to the population growth of the state they relocate to. The publicly available statistics do not allow for a precise disentanglement of such internal migration outcomes. As above, it is assumed the SSRM visa grants represent actual migrants’ arrivals in a given year.

Table 4.8 Total population growth and growth rates in Australian states and territories 2000–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>89 004</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>58 893</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>63 387</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>52 502</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>67 409</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>82 026</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>6 690</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>6 968</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>26 700</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>23 394</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>2 207</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>4 102</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2 195</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia a)</td>
<td>259 860</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>227 739</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a) Includes ‘Other Territories’: Jervis Bay Territory, Christmas Island and the Cocos (Keeling) Islands. ABS 2005a:10,31.

Table 4.9 Percentage contribution of SSRM migrants to population growth in Australian states and territories 2001–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>12.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>32.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>40.15</td>
<td>24.96</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>52.17 c)</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>58.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a) The SSRM migrants’ arrival did not offset the negative population growth in the Northern Territory but they reduced the decline. The value represents the percentage value of that reduction of the population decline.
Source: Author’s calculations based on Tables 4.2 and 4.8.
Table 4.9 shows regional skilled and business migrants and their families as a percentage of total population growth in states and territories. In New South Wales, Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory, their growing contribution over time reflects the relation between their generally increasing numbers (Table 4.2) and decreasing population growth (Table 4.8). Yet, in New South Wales and Queensland only recently has the contribution to population growth exceeded 1 per cent and still remains low.

The regional migrants' impact on population growth broadly replicates their impact on the settler arrivals and permanent additions discussed earlier. Victoria and South Australia, as the top receiving states, have seen a steady increase of the migrants' contribution to their respective populations' growth. In Victoria, these migrants represented around one-tenth of the population growth in 2003–04 (Table 4.9). In South Australia, where the population growth has been the lowest of all southeastern mainland states in all years (Table 4.8), regional migration constituted a relatively higher annual proportion of population growth than in Victoria. In 2003–04, that proportion constituted around one-third of the population growth. In Western Australia, the number of regional migrants has been growing, but their contribution to population growth remains below four per cent.

In the remaining jurisdictions, the rates of contribution to population growth have been volatile. For example, in Tasmania the 155 arrivals contributed 40 per cent to the total population growth in 2000–01. Despite Tasmania receiving higher number of regional migrants, their share of the population growth has decreased to 5.9 per cent in the final year (2003–04), while total population growth has been on the increase. In the Northern Territory, a (comparably) low figure of 154 (2003–04) has contributed around 10 per cent of the total population growth, while in the preceding year a slightly lower number was insufficient to prevent negative population growth. In the Australian Capital Territory, in 2003–04 regional migrants contributed almost 60 per cent to the total population growth, which latter was nonetheless itself very low (Table 4.8). Under such circumstances, the impact of the policy in these three jurisdictions has not yet become clear. In New South Wales and Queensland, regional migrants have contributed least to the population growth to date. Note that the population growth is falling in New South
Wales (Table 4.8), while Queensland is the most rapidly growing state in the country, and is therefore less concerned with finding additional sources of growth.

All in all, in relation to the population growth objective, pursuing regional migration policy has been the most beneficial for South Australia and Victoria. These states have had the highest proportions of regional migrants in their settler arrivals, permanent additions and the population growth figures. In Tasmania and the two Territories, these migrants represented high but volatile proportions in settler arrivals and permanent additions, and often high but also generally volatile proportions in the population growth figures. New South Wales and Queensland have so far benefited little from regional migrants’ contribution to their population growth, but in Queensland, unlike in New South Wales, these migrants have recently (2003–04) represented a higher proportion of permanent additions. Western Australia has shown the same pattern as Queensland.

The policy has only begun bringing some considerable population-related results, limited to two states. But a remaining question is what might happen in the future to the contribution of regional migrants to population growth, given the recent adoption and rapidly changing nature of these programs. If it is assumed that the policies will continue, three possible scenarios of total growth in cumulative population impact of the regional policy can be proposed to help fix ideas as to future possibilities.

The period chosen for projection base for all three scenarios is the SSRM visa grants between 2003–04 and 2023–24; that is, two decades. The initial adopted base for all scenarios is the latest reported visa grants’ figure of 12,725 (2003–04). A low growth scenario then projects that the number of visa grants will decrease each year by 1,000. A stable growth scenario is the next alternative and is based on an assumption that the last reported visa grants’ level of 12,725 is maintained for each subsequent year until 2023–24. Finally, a high growth scenario assumes an additional 4,000 visa grants each year (this is a rounded average of visa grants’ annual growth between 2001–04 based on Table 4.2). Under each scenario it is also assumed that in 2004–05 the visa grants’ level will stay at 12,725. Table 4.10 reports the projections’ results showing the values for every five years.
Table 4.10 shows that under the low growth scenario decreasing visa grants would result in growing the cumulative migrants’ numbers for around a decade. The cumulated visa grants would peak at 100,150 in 2016–17 (not shown in Table 4.10) when the last 725 people would arrive. Such a scenario could be a result of a major policy review that would find the program not capable of delivering on its objectives and therefore should be phased out, or a result of a dramatic government change, where pursuing regional migration would cease to be a policy priority.

If the stable growth scenario materialised, there would have been almost 140,000 regional migrants visaed over the decade to 2013–14 and then another 100,000 by 2023–24. This would likely require country-wide implementation of the Canadian and Victorian-style local and regional migration initiatives, and continued international promotion. Other external conditions might need to be met, such as for example continued skill shortages and the continuation of other social trends that would justify maintenance of the regional policy to the electorate.3

The high growth scenario would require maintaining interest in regional migration to the extent of the additional 4,000 people each year (note that for 2004–05 5,000 places have been allocated for the new visa - SIR; see DIMIA 2005i:21). As in the preceding scenario, there would need to be a number of other conditions met including the economic and social ones. Adding the consequent 800,000 of new settlers by 2023–24 would require careful urban planning, including infrastructure considerations as well as mitigating the environmental consequences. Even if the numbers were levelled off at some point in that type of scenario, the cumulative effect of the settlement of regional

---

3 For example, one such trend could be the maintained pattern of fertility rates. They have recently only minimally risen from the 2001–02 level of 1.73 to 1.75 in 2003–04 (ABS 2005a:21).
migrants would remain clearly noticeable. Whether such numbers would be needed, viable and acceptable would be decided in the policy process, probably with significant input from the local and regional authorities.

So far the trends and the cumulative effects of the policy have been discussed. This has proceeded in terms of visa measures, and settler arrivals and permanent additions, and has concentrated on state/territory outcomes. A further type of analysis involves looking at the dispersal and retention outcomes. The policy aims to disperse and retain migrants in regional and low population growth areas. There are no comprehensive data that would allow a fully detailed assessment of the policy success in achieving dispersal but the available information enables some broad evaluation.

Directing almost 18 per cent of the entire skill stream in 2003–04 to the Designated Areas and other targeted areas seemingly supports the population growth and dispersal objective. Yet, this growth may not always be occurring in genuinely regional areas. Most of migrants coming under the regional categories (skilled and business) are estimated to locate in Australia's capital cities. Although only a minority settle in Sydney, Perth and Brisbane, two other capitals are the main destinations: Melbourne and Adelaide (Birrell 2003:20). The SDAS migrants' preference for Melbourne, mentioned earlier, is the best illustration of the policy partially missing its regional growth target. On the other hand, this metropolitan skew is understandable since Melbourne has a greater number of communities and overseas-born residents than the regional areas.

The DIMIA (2005b) SDAS survey outcomes clearly document that Melbourne domination. The reported poor retention rates in regional areas also indicate a moderate degree of further dispersal. This is illustrated by high proportions of migrants who settled initially in regional (non-metropolitan) areas and had relocated by the time of the survey, the great majority to metropolitan areas. For example, 64 per cent of SDAS migrants with a sponsor from regional Victoria were not living in regional Victoria at the time of the survey. Lower losses but still above a 50 per cent mark outcomes were established for New South Wales and Queensland, where migrants with sponsors in regional areas were not living in regional areas at the time of the survey (2005b:11).
This indicates less than 50 per cent of success rates in lastingly dispersing migrants into regional areas and a 36 per cent success rate of regional retention in Victoria.

Some of these subsequent moves were to Melbourne - 9 per cent of all SDAS migrants with a sponsor outside Melbourne were living in Melbourne. They raised the proportion of Melbourne-based SDAS migrants: already 58 per cent of principal applicants with a sponsor from Melbourne lived there (2005b:11). Ten per cent of SDAS migrants moved immediately to non-Designated Areas upon arrival (the equivalent of almost 800 SDAS migrants in 2003-04) (2005b:10).

Although a principal applicant may not live near the sponsor, he/she may be living in a Designated Area. Ostensibly, the rate of 87 per cent of those sponsoring a principal applicant who lived in a Designated Area at the time of the survey appears high. However, in the case of Victoria, if Melbourne were excluded, 62 per cent of sponsors in Designated Areas were sponsoring principal applicants also living in Designated Areas (2005b:11).

The DIMIA survey involved interviews with principal SDAS applicants who, at the time of the survey, had been in Australia for between one and four years (2005b:4). It was found that 16 per cent of SDAS migrants residing in Australia for more than three years were living in non-Designated Areas such as Sydney, Brisbane and Perth (this includes most of the ten per cent mentioned above). (DIMIA 2005b:10). Such an outcome indicates that the intended retention of migrants in Designated Areas (regions) has indeed not been fully successful so far.

Melbourne dominance and relocation to other capital cities means that SDAS - the top contributor category to the rising numbers - is generally failing to predominantly support the intended population growth and dispersal benefits into regions. As shown in Chapter One, the Victorian government intends to achieve regional population growth of 1.25 per cent by 2006, bringing the population of regional Victoria to 1.75m. The natural suggestion to exclude Melbourne from the Designated Areas to improve regional dispersal would only work though if the settlement restrictions were part of the visa conditions. The April 2005 introduction of a temporary residency requirement in the Designated Areas for SDAS migrants from mid-2006 may partially improve the
trends, as so far there has been no mechanism guaranteeing the intended settlement outcome. On the other hand, the decision regarding Melbourne can only be made by the Victorian government.

The drift away from the regional areas indicates the following. First, some migrants contribute to the population growth in metropolitan areas, where their arrival is having a much smaller relative effect, and their location there may indeed be, at least as per the policy principle, not desirable, since they were expected to live elsewhere. Second, the dispersal of migrants into regional areas is not materialising at the preferred scale, either as a result of initial or secondary (relocation) settlement choices. Third, the drift influences retention rates, which are not wholly favourable for the regional (non-capital cities) areas. This confirms the magnet of large urban areas. It also strongly suggests that retention in regions is fundamental to the policy success and should be monitored over the next few years. Fourth, Victoria, and Melbourne in particular, are benefiting most from SDAS visas. The overarching impression is that the population-related benefits may be predominantly only temporary for some targeted regional areas, as people tend to move away to non-Designated Areas.

The second most popular regional category - the RSMS - is subject to a temporary settlement restriction and current arrangements provide for visa cancellation should the migrant not complete the two-year employment contract. The RSMS survey performed prior to the introduction of the visa cancellation provisions (Cully and Goodes 2000) found a noticeable degree of separation from the nominating employer prior to the contract termination (see next paragraph). To assess whether the RSMS visa holders contributed to the population increase in the targeted areas would require information about their total numbers settling in their destination communities and the population size of these communities. That was not provided, but it was indicated though that migrants resided both in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas, in the proportion of two thirds living in the former and one third living in regional towns or rural areas (Cully and Goodes 2000:32). The latter indicated the degree of initial dispersal. RSMS migrants, like SDAS migrants, preferred metropolitan areas. For example, in South

---

4 In this study for all states 'metropolitan' was taken to denominate all cities with 100,000 or more people. For the Northern Territory this threshold was lowered to 50,000 or more people and in consequence it incorporated Darwin but not Alice Springs (Cully and Goodes 2000 (note 20):32).
Australia 88 per cent of the RSMS visa holders settled in Adelaide (Parliament of Australia 2001(note 31):78).

According to the survey, a minimum of 30 per cent of surveyed migrants left within the two-year period. Looking for, or taking up, another job was a prominent reason (Cully and Goodes 2000:34,49). Overall, the percentages of those who stayed in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas, and those who left were roughly two-thirds staying and one-third leaving in each case (2000:30). About a quarter of those surveyed who left moved out of their city or region but their new settlement choice (metropolitan or non-metropolitan area) was not revealed (2000:41). Such data do not permit a full assessment of the retention outcomes and it can only be concluded that the overall retention rate was around 70 per cent (jointly for metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas). By comparison, in South Australia half of the RSMS visa holders who had left their employer remained in the state. At the national average scale though, this proportion was lower. DIMA estimated that one-third of those who left remained in the same city or region (Parliament of Australia 2001:52–3).

Given the choice, 61 per cent of surveyed migrants preferred to stay where they were, 27 per cent would like to move elsewhere pointing to Perth and Brisbane as preferred destinations and 12 per cent did not know. There was no significant difference between residents of metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas (Cully and Goodes 2000:41). Even allowing for some changes in actual decisions, it would be reasonable to accept that a 100 per cent success rate will be difficult to achieve and around one-third of these visa holders will eventually move away.

The most recent RSMS survey took place after the visa cancellation provisions had been introduced. The outcomes were published by DIMIA (2005a). That survey covered both principal applicants who had fulfilled their two-year contracts and those who had not (2005a:2), which has implications for their settlement choices. As in the first survey (Cully and Goodes 2000), detailed information about the migrants’ particular destinations and the numbers settling there was not included, inhibiting an evaluation of their contribution to population growth (this is a major criterion, correspondingly, of program management in this area). The dispersal principle was better addressed though, which is likely related to the visa cancellation provisions: 91
per cent of the principal applicants resided in the Designated Areas and 9 per cent moved to non-Designated Areas (DIMIA 2005a:12). This is a better outcome than the 70 per cent retention rate established earlier (Cully and Goodes 2000). The most recent survey also revealed that a higher proportion of migrants in Designated Areas (86 per cent) intended to continue living there over the next 12 months (note that movement intentions and movement preferences were two separate items in the survey) (DIMIA 2005a:14). By comparison, in the preceding survey (Cully and Goodes 2000) a smaller 61 per cent preferred to remain where they were.

The recent research has further shown that the 91 per cent retention rate dropped to slightly less than 85 per cent past the two-year period; that is, people who have met their visa obligations were slightly less likely to continue living in Designated Areas. That trend was also identifiable in terms of movement preferences. A higher proportion of residents in the Designated Areas (32 per cent), preferred to live in another part of Australia. The same was true for only a quarter of residents of the non-Designated Areas (DIMIA 2005a:12,13). While this percentage is not fully comparable to the 27 per cent of those who would like to live elsewhere as measured by Cully and Goodes (2000), because the groups tested were not fully comparable, this supports the observation that a close to 100 per cent success rate from the scheme is difficult to meet.

Both surveys suggest that to some extent the population-related benefits are short term. Although retention has recently improved, and this seems to have resulted from the temporary restriction on settlement, there is still movement from Designated Areas to non-Designated Areas by those who have served the two-year contracts imposed by their visas. One-third of residents of the Designated Areas prefer to move. If they relocate to metropolitan areas that are non-Designated Areas, (for example Perth or Brisbane), this would have an adverse population effect, from the one formally intended as it would diminish the dispersal efforts. At the same time, their relocation would only have a minor relative impact on the cities’ population growth.

---

5 The DIMIA survey (2005a) uses term ‘Designated Areas’ in reference to regional or low population growth areas being the formal name for areas eligible for these migrants’ settlement (see Table 2.1 in Chapter Two). The term adopted by DIMIA (2005a) is used in the discussion in the text.
This implies that the restriction on initial settlement alone may be a strong short-term strategy and a helpful mid-term strategy at least in terms of retention. Although a better regional impact could probably be achieved by introducing a tighter retention provision, it raises questions about a reasonable and acceptable period of such administratively extended retention and a potential negative impact on the interest in the schemes. This suggests that genuine, longer-term attraction may be better capable of addressing the objective of retention in regional areas. The longer-term employment opportunities and other settlement factors must necessarily be considered. Pre-arrival information is also crucial as it assists in making an informed settlement choice, which is all the more important given the restrictions. The Victorian local immigration initiatives commenced in 2004 and similar considerations by two other jurisdictions mentioned in Chapter Two, demonstrate that the relevant efforts have been undertaken and their effects should be positive (results from Victoria are not yet available). They could provide models for consideration for other jurisdictions. Such initiatives could lower the percentage of migrants moving away or wanting to move away, and thus improve the overall scheme’s outcomes (see also Manitoba experience in ‘Canada’ below).

Data on dispersal and retention of the STNI/SMV migrants are limited. Their settlement is not restricted to non-metropolitan areas. Dispersal is assisted by determination which occupations are in high demand in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas but detailed results of such an approach are typically the governments’ internal knowledge. For example, it is known that in Victoria around 13 per cent of STNI migrants settle in regions (actual figure is not provided), which is a much higher percentage than less than 5 per cent under other skilled migration programs (Campaign News VIC 2004b:2). Although a positive trend, it seems still too low to improve seriously the dispersal outcomes.

In 2002, South Australia reported (as a result of a survey) a 100 per cent retention rate of its STNI migrants (47 people in total) whose applications were processed between August 2000–August 2001 (Parliament of Australia 2002:4). The retention rate is a sign of success of the policy, but the numbers were very low and the migrants would have only recently arrived. Lack of other data does not allow any further comments on the extent of the STNI/SMV dispersal and retention rates. If STNI/SMV migrants prefer
metropolitan areas, as illustrated above in Victoria, their dispersal may be minimal. On the other hand, the visa condition guarantees retention in the nominating jurisdiction for a two-year period.

Data regarding the dispersal of business migrants, who represent a minor group among the regional migrants, are not comprehensive but it may be anticipated at this stage that their dispersal is minimal. Further comments are offered in Subsection 4.2.2. That group seems unlikely to substantially assist in meeting the policy’s population dispersal objective. On the other hand, wherever they settle, their provisional visa guarantees initial retention.

It may be concluded that the governments’ efforts have paid off in terms of growing the overall numbers of regional migrants. Yet, any meaningful relative effects on the number of annual settler arrivals, permanent additions and the annual population growth figures were observed only for South Australia and Victoria. Otherwise, the policy has not been very successful in regional dispersal and retention; the single example of improved RSMS retention in regions is insufficient to claim success of the whole policy. This leads to a conclusion that the population policy objective of encouraging a more balanced settlement of Australia’s skilled migrant intake has not been fully met. In turn, that enables confirming one of the proposed hypotheses: that to date these regional initiatives have been very modest overall in adjusting the population flows to regions. Both a sustained or growing program level plus enhanced retention in genuinely regional areas would be needed for the dispersal objectives to be met, assuming that this means more than reducing Sydney concentration of migrants and more than limiting direct migrants’ contribution to Queensland and Western Australia population growth.

Measuring retention over the next few years in regional areas is particularly important to assess the policy success. It remains to be seen how much and in what ways the state and local governments will get involved in supporting the communities in attracting and retaining the migrants. Some communities have already initiated such efforts and these will need to be considered, too.
4.1.2 Canada

The Canadian provincial and federal statistics determine the type of assessment that can be undertaken. Table 4.11 presents the distribution of PNs (skilled and business nominees and their families combined, see, for example, CIC 2005b:1) by the province of landing. Contrary to Australia, the Canadian statistics show the actual landings rather than visa grants, which better mirrors the reality. Unlike in Australia, a detailed breakdown of the number of PNs into different skilled and business provincial streams is not provided, but, in the majority of cases, the statistics regard the employer-recommended nominees. Provincial responsibility for the programs determines that the analysis is organised immediately around results from provinces rather than, as in Australia, first around aggregate outcomes.

Table 4.11 Landings of PNs by province in Canada 1999–200440.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>11,172</td>
<td>70.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>477</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,253</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,274</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,127</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,418</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,248</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,797</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) Only Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia had provincial policies prior to 1999 but relevant landing figures could not be located. For the whole period covered by this table, the PNs landings in the Yukon Territory are not reported at all.

b) Landings of PNs in provinces without PNP policies are attributed to coding errors. It is likely that these records represent initial landings (for example PNs may be visiting family members) and migrants subsequently travel to their nominating province.

c) Figures from years 2000 and 2001 found in CIC 2002c are minimally different from figures found in CIC 2005b. The former are used because they also show distribution of nominees across provinces, which CIC 2005b does not provide. The latter is used though to report ‘Total economic class landings’ and includes reallocation of backlog cases.

Table 4.11 shows that, as in Australia, there has been an increase in the number of total landings each year under the provincial programs. In 2004, there were more than 6,000 landings. The nominees’ landings have also been increasing (except year 2001) as a proportion of the economic class migrants’ landings. Between 1999–2004 they increased more than ten times in percentage points but the proportion they represented in 2004 (4.67 per cent) was lower than the proportion of SSRM visa grants in the skill stream visa grants in 2003–04 in Australia. Since the commencement of the provincial programs there have been 15,797 landings in Canada.

While in Australia the SSRM visa grants (2003–04) constituted 11.12 per cent of the Migration Program, in Canada, in 2004, PNs landings represented 2.64 per cent of landings of permanent residents (these involve the family migrants, economic immigrants, refugees and other immigrants). If the reference group were limited to family and economic migrants to reflect closer the reference group against which the SSRMS visa grants were considered, that proportion would increase to 3.18 per cent (calculations based on CIC 2005b:11).

Table 4.11 shows that across the whole period Manitoba has been the top nominating province that has started off a high base in 1999 and has seen a gradual increase in landings (except year 2001) exceeding 4,000 in 2004. Consequently, Manitoba’s share in the nominees ‘market’ was in 2004 the highest at Canada’s scale (70.72 per cent). Manitoba’s success arises chiefly from offering a broad range of skilled migration options of which not all require pre-arranged employment, enabling people from all skill levels to apply. Other factors that contribute to Manitoba’s success is the thriving cooperation with regional and Winnipeg communities and international promotion.

A huge gap in the number of nominees landing every year may be observed between Manitoba and other provinces. British Columbia is a distant second. Its numbers started growing considerably from 2002 and across the whole period almost 1,300 nominees landed. British Columbia’s approach is restricted in comparison to Manitoba, which explains the lower numbers. There are a limited number of skilled migration options and a selective approach to the nominees’ skills. Also, the community initiatives are

---

6 Effects of Québec’s immigration policy are discussed below, based on accurate CIC statistics.
more recent than in Manitoba, having commenced only in 2004. International promotion is being undertaken, although as noted earlier, in none of the provinces can its impact be assessed beyond the statement that whenever governments report their outcomes, it must be assumed that this promotion is bringing positive results, in the absence of data to the contrary.

Alberta and Saskatchewan have welcomed an identical total number of nominees and they both take the third position for recipients. Their selective approach to nominees’ skills and limited number of migration options in comparison to Manitoba explain their position. As above, international promotion is pursued. New Brunswick has been a leading nominating province among the Atlantic provinces, and its total number of landings is not much lower than that of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Yet, in general, the Western provinces have been more successful in attracting nominees than the Atlantic ones. The overall low number of nominees in the latter seems to replicate the low popularity of the region among other immigrants.

The Québec immigration program involves higher annual figures of permanent resident landings than under any PNP. This results from Québec’s selection powers extending beyond the skilled and business migrants. According to the 1991 Canada-Québec Accord, Québec selects refugees from abroad and participates in administration of the family migration and migration of assisted relatives to the province. It does not select refugees granted permanent status in Canada (MRCI QC 2000:3–4). These considerable selection powers and the resultant higher numbers of immigrant landings are embedded in two explicit objectives in the Accord. First, provincial immigration policy responds to the objective of preserving Québec’s demographic importance within Canada. The second objective relates to the integration of immigrants in Québec in a way that respects the distinct identity of the province (2000:2).

---

7 Preserving Québec’s demographic importance within Canada means that “Québec undertakes to pursue an immigration policy that has as an objective the reception by Québec of a percentage of the total number of immigrants received in Canada equal to the percentage of Québec’s population compared with the population of Canada”. To facilitate this, “Canada undertakes to pursue a policy with respect to immigration levels that will allow Québec to receive, out of the annual total established for the country as a whole, the percentage of immigrants referred to in section 7 [see first phrase], with Québec having the right to exceed this figure by five per cent of the Canadian total for demographic reasons” (MRCI 2000:2).
Accordingly, Québec determines the number of immigrants it wishes to receive, as well as is responsible for their selection, reception and integration (2000:2).

To facilitate a comparison with the earlier discussion, the landings of Québec economic migrants, reported by CIC (2005b), are shown in Table 4.12. They are also presented as a percentage of total economic immigration to Canada. Economic immigration figures encompass skilled and business migrants, PNs and live-in-caregivers (2005b:11). Given that economic immigration constitutes a component of all admissions into the province, these total admissions are also presented as a proportion of all admissions into Canada.

Table 4.12 Québec migration relative to all Canada 1999–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Québec/Canada</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Québec economic immigration</td>
<td>14 012</td>
<td>16 363</td>
<td>21 930</td>
<td>23 050</td>
<td>23 555</td>
<td>26 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec all admissions</td>
<td>29 160</td>
<td>32 501</td>
<td>37 593</td>
<td>37 585</td>
<td>39 556</td>
<td>44 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada economic immigration</td>
<td>109 261</td>
<td>136 299</td>
<td>155 719</td>
<td>137 860</td>
<td>121 050</td>
<td>133 746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada all admissions</td>
<td>189 966</td>
<td>227 465</td>
<td>250 638</td>
<td>229 040</td>
<td>221 355</td>
<td>235 824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec economic immigration as % of</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>19.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada economic immigration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec all admission as % of</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada all admissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a) That figure is shown in the document. Author’s calculation shows that it should read 155,720, as shown in Table 4.11.

Source: Author’s calculations based on CIC 2005b.

Table 4.12 shows that in the majority of cases economic immigration and total admissions into Québec have constituted considerable and growing proportions of all economic immigration and all admissions into Canada. In 2004, both proportions were high, nearing one-fifth of all economic immigration and all admissions into Canada, respectively.

To maintain comparability of terms with Australia and the PNs, Québec economic migration can also be considered as a proportion of economic and family migrant landings in Canada (see explanation below Table 4.11). In 2004, it represented 13.6 per cent of these two categories (calculations based on CIC 2005b:11,40). These outcomes, in addition to being driven by the two aforementioned objectives, are assisted by a number of contributory factors. First, Montréal, as a thriving economic and multicultural centre, is a strong magnet for immigrants. Second, a number of skilled and business migration options are offered, including without pre-arranged
employment. Family migrants and refugees in Québec represent comparable annual figures in the period covered by Table 4.12, in most cases around 7,000–8,000 annually in each one category (CIC 2005b:40).

International promotion is important for Québec but for the same reasons as in other provinces, its success could not be established. As noted in Chapter Three, international promotion in Québec was focused on the French language speakers and ‘francisable’ groups, which fits into the second objective of the provincial immigration policy. Finally, the political support for Québec distinctiveness, most unique at Canada’s scale, enables the continuation of that policy. Political support for the PNP’s demonstrating responsiveness and care about the provincial and community needs and prospects is also demonstrated in other provinces.

Overall, different factors have contributed to the results achieved by the Canadian provinces. First, as Manitoba and Québec demonstrate, offering the widest possible number of migration options (as South Australia and Victoria in Australia) is conducive to higher numbers. Second, the liberal and selective approaches to skill levels influence the results, as illustrated by Manitoba and the remaining Western provinces, respectively. Third, as in Australia, geographical location, which may to some extent disadvantage the Atlantic provinces, seems to be another factor. Fourth, the overall economic conditions, despite the pre-arranged jobs, are essential. Migrants, as with the local residents, are not interested in staying in economically depressed areas and the overall economic conditions in the Atlantic provinces, in comparison to the rest of Canada, have been the least attractive (see Subsections I.3.2 and I.5.3 in Appendix I). The pre-existing economic opportunities are therefore a common determinant of success with Australia. By contrast, landings in Québec are partially driven by the actual or perceived opportunities available in Montréal. Hence, as in Australia, the eligibility of large cities, is conducive to higher numbers.

Furthermore, cooperation with regional communities, as in Manitoba, and international promotion (the impact of which, as in Australia, could not be precisely assessed), condition the provinces’ success. As in Australia, commitment to PNP’s is a political decision indicating that the governments care about the prosperity of their respective provinces and respond to the communities’ needs. In Québec, that political
commitment is additionally driven by linguistic and associated sociocultural considerations. All in all, some factors similar to those identified in Australia have determined the Canadian provinces’ success in attracting nominees.

Having discussed the PNs numbers and the unique position of Québec, it is now possible to show what proportions these migrants represent in total permanent resident landings in the provinces. Table 4.13 shows the annual landing figures for the provinces. Using outcomes from Table 4.11, Table 4.14 shows the percentage contribution of PNs to the total permanent resident landings in the provinces. Considering that the PNs in Canada may, as in Australia, become permanent residents onshore, and that no relevant explanation of the figures presented in Table 4.13 could be located, it is taken that these landings comprise nominees who successfully applied for permanent status from within Canada. Since the number of PN landings in Québec reflects errors in recording, their contribution to the total permanent residents’ landings in Québec is not calculated. Instead, contribution of Québec-selected migrants to the total permanent resident landings is discussed separately in the text. Percentage contribution of PNs to the provincial permanent resident landings shown in Table 4.14 should be seen as broadly indicative because some of these nominees were initially recorded in Québec and Ontario.

Table 4.13 Permanent resident landings by province in Canada 1999–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>29,160</td>
<td>32,501</td>
<td>37,593</td>
<td>37,585</td>
<td>39,556</td>
<td>44,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>104,169</td>
<td>133,510</td>
<td>148,647</td>
<td>133,596</td>
<td>119,723</td>
<td>125,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>4,636</td>
<td>4,596</td>
<td>4,619</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>7,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>12,086</td>
<td>14,361</td>
<td>16,405</td>
<td>14,757</td>
<td>15,834</td>
<td>16,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>36,129</td>
<td>37,430</td>
<td>38,464</td>
<td>34,055</td>
<td>35,237</td>
<td>37,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total[a]</td>
<td>189,966</td>
<td>227,465</td>
<td>250,638</td>
<td>229,040</td>
<td>221,355</td>
<td>235,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a) Total represents also landings in the Yukon Territory, the Northwest Territories, Nunavut and ‘Not stated’ and therefore cells do not up add to the total figures.

Source: CIC 2005b.
Table 4.14 Percentage of PNs in permanent resident landings in Canadian provinces 1999–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>29.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>45.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC$^{(c)}$</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON$^{(c)}$</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>47.78</td>
<td>54.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>16.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In cells other than Québec (QC) and ON (Ontario) this reflects no records of PNs landings in the provinces.

Source: Author’s calculations based on Tables 4.11 and 4.13.

Table 4.14 shows that PNs have consistently represented a high and growing proportion of the total permanent residents’ landings in Manitoba (except 2001). In the six-year period examined here, their proportion has grown almost five-fold between 1999 and 2004, reaching more than 50 per cent in 2004. This indicates a high impact of the PNP on migrant landings in Manitoba. British Columbia and Alberta that have recorded much higher absolute numbers of landings than Manitoba (Table 4.13), the increasing numbers of PNs, even in 2004, when they have considerably grown in comparison to the earlier years, still represent only a minimal contribution to the annual landing levels.

Saskatchewan, which had in each year the lowest annual landing figures of all Western provinces, has seen a considerable growth in the PNs’ contribution to these figures, by around six percentage points in each year, starting from 2002. From 2003 onwards, when the annual landings of nominees exceeded 100, under low absolute landing figures, the former have come to represent their considerable proportion. This contrasts with the situation in Alberta, where in 2003 and 2004 comparable numbers of nominees have contributed much less to the landings than in Saskatchewan. If the contemplated family-linked stream and more accessible criteria for business nominees are introduced in Saskatchewan, they may help elevate the number of nominees’ landings.

Unlike in the West, the patterns of PNs contribution to the annual landing’ figures in the Atlantic provinces have shown less consistency in growth. Their contribution has been characterised by considerable annual differences in real percentage points,
especially in Prince Edward Island, and in 2003 and 2004 in Newfoundland and Labrador. Nova Scotia had a two-year gap in recording PNs landings. Only in New Brunswick has the growing number of nominees represented a more steadily growing proportion (especially over 2000–03) of the fluctuating permanent residents’ landings. Due to low annual landing figures in the Atlantic provinces, the nominees have typically represented high proportions of these figures, indicating how essential the PNP s are to these provinces. Despite at times representing as much as 45 per cent (Prince Edward Island in 2004), the absolute number of annual landings of nominees in the Atlantic provinces from 2003 onwards have lagged behind those of the Western provinces.

In Québec, the proportion of Québec-selected migrants among all admissions has been higher than under any PNP. In 1999, of the total admissions (29,214), Québec selected 16,470 (MRCI QC 2001b:24). That figure equalled 56.37 per cent. That proportion minimally rose in 2000 to 57.94 per cent (18,832 Québec-selected migrants among 32,502) (2002b:23,27). In 2001, of 37,537 admitted migrants, 24,276 were selected by the province (2003:11,16).\(^8\) They represented 64.67 per cent of the total admissions. Skilled and business migrants selected by Québec dominate the provincial selection. In 2001, they represented 90 per cent of that selection (with skilled migrants being in majority) and refugees 10 per cent (MRCI QC 2002b:23,27).

The proportion of Québec-selected migrants in the total admissions has continued to increase in the recent years. It rose to 66.75 per cent in 2002: there were 25,121 Québec-selected migrants in the total admissions of 37,629 (MRCI QC 2004d:16,21). In 2003, 39,593 migrants were admitted. The Québec-selected migrants were reported to have represented 67 per cent of that figure (MICC QC 2005l:19). Preliminary data for 2004 indicate that the trend of high proportion of Québec-selected migrants has been maintained. Of the total admissions (44,226), Québec selected 29,568 (2005l:19). That translates into 66.85 per cent. Such high proportions of provincially selected migrants, reaching almost 70 per cent, put Québec ahead of Manitoba at Canada’s scale. On the other hand, without similar selection powers, Manitoba has managed to considerably influence its annual landing figures.

\(^8\) Note small differences in numbers reported here by Québec provincial sources and reported in Table 4.12, based on CIC (2005b) data.
As in Australia, the contribution of the number of PN landings to the provincial population growth can be evaluated. For that purpose, PNs landings presented in Table 4.11, and figures of Québec-selected migrants (see above) are compared with figures of provincial population growth (Table 4.15). Results are shown in Table 4.16. Since immigration data are presented as annual intake (based on calendar year) and Statistics Canada providing the provincial population growth statistics uses the 1 July–30 June basis, an assumption is made that the 1999 landings are represented in the 1998–99 population growth figures, the 2000 landings are included in the 1999–2000 population growth figures and so on. For that reason, the outcomes are only rough estimates of the migrants’ contribution to population growth. Table 4.15 shows that in some cases provinces have had negative population growth. Corresponding cells in Table 4.16, marked with a note, illustrate the percentage value of the reduction of that population decline resulting from migrant landings.

---

9 Landings (admissions) of Québec-selected migrants are provided by Québec, as opposed to landings of PNs provided by CIC (2005b). Results reported for Québec in Table 4.16 are based on provincial (immigration) and federal (population growth) data, which, given the observed differences between total admissions reported above by Québec and CIC (2005b), may make the results in Table 4.16 less precise than for other provinces, where only federal data are used.
Table 4.15 Total population growth by Canadian provinces 1998–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>-6523</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>-5366</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>-6057</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1492</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-93</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-628</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>27335</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>33721</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>39961</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>139341</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>179021</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>212267</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>4976</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4882</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>3912</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>-2799</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-6940</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-7633</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>53833</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>51685</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>51799</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>28265</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>27856</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>39249</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Canada$^{b)}$</td>
<td>246796</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>285157</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>332216</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) To provide statistics on the population growth rates in format comparable to Australia, original rates (per 1,000) reported by Statistics Canada (2005a: various Tables) are recalculated.

b) Figures for ‘Total Canada’ include the Territories not presented in the Table. Therefore, cells do not add up to the total figure. The Yukon Territory growth is not presented because there are no PN landing data to compare it to. See Table 4.11.

Table 4.16 Percentage contribution of provincially selected migrants to population growth in Canadian provinces 1998–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.59 a</td>
<td>1.45 a</td>
<td>3.36 a</td>
<td>12.92 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>23.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.73 a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23.65 a</td>
<td>11.30 a</td>
<td>23.79</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>32.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>55.84</td>
<td>60.74</td>
<td>51.52</td>
<td>56.93</td>
<td>58.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>22.47</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>35.51</td>
<td>52.04</td>
<td>46.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>0.54 a</td>
<td>0.53 a</td>
<td>0.53 a</td>
<td>1.71 a</td>
<td>11.86 a</td>
<td>33.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) The nominees’ landings did not offset the negative population growth but they reduced that decline. The value represents the percentage value of that reduction of the population decline.
b) Ontario does not have a PNP.

-- not applicable. In cells other than ON (Ontario) this reflects no records of PNs landings in the provinces.

Source: Author’s calculations based Tables 4.11 and 4.15 and on Québec-reported statistics on Québec-selected migrants in the total admissions into the province 1999–2004.

Table 4.16 shows that in many cases the impact of provincially-selected migrants on annual population growth has been similar to their impact on the overall permanent resident landings. Despite fluctuations, migrants bring most population growth benefits to Quebec - only once in six years has their contribution fell below 55 per cent. Manitoba benefits the most after Quebec, or is the first province from among the PNP jurisdictions. The PNs have affected its population growth with less consistently growing proportions than they have in terms of the permanent resident landings. Despite that, their level of contribution here stands out from among other PNP provinces. It exceeded 50 per cent in 2002–03 but fell to 46 per cent in 2003–04, despite an increase in the absolute figure of PNs’ landings. That recent fall seems to be the result from a much higher absolute figure of the population growth in comparison to preceding years. The impact of the growing numbers of PNs on the population growth in British Columbia and Alberta generally resembles their impact on the total permanent resident landings in these provinces. The absolute annual population growth in both provinces has been much higher than in Manitoba and the PNs’ impact has therefore been minimal to date.

Unlike the positive impact the nominees had on the number of permanent resident landings in Saskatchewan in 2003 and 2004, for five out of six years (1998-2003) their numbers have been insufficient to reverse the negative population growth (Table 4.16). On the other hand, their contribution was high in 2003–04, when they represented one-third of the provincial population growth.
Negative population growth that has been unable to be reversed by nominees’ landings has been the case in some Atlantic provinces. This has been most evident in Newfoundland and Labrador. In none of the years have the nominees helped to create positive growth levels. By contrast, small numbers of nominees in Prince Edward Island have contributed to the provincial population growth (2003–04), although absolute figures of both the nominees and growth have been low. In 2003–04, the PNs represented almost a quarter of the growth figure. No pattern could be established for Nova Scotia due to a two-year gap; otherwise there has been one contribution (2003–04), while in 2000-01 too few nominees landed to reverse the negative population growth. Following two years of negative population growth in New Brunswick, the nominees started contributing to its population growth from 2001–02 onwards. The recent increase in their contribution to one-third (2003–04) resulted from a lower population growth in comparison to the preceding year (2002–03) rather than from an increase in the number of the nominees. Overall, the nominees’ impact on population growth in the Atlantic provinces has so far represented a mixed picture.

All in all, in relation to the population increase objective, the provincial migration policies have so far most considerably benefited Québec and Manitoba. From among provinces with PNPs, Manitoba’s results stand out. In Québec and Manitoba, the provincially selected migrants represented high proportions in the permanent resident landings and in their respective provincial population growth figures. British Columbia and Alberta have so far seen a minimal positive impact of their nominees on the permanent resident landings figures and on their populations’ growth. In Saskatchewan, despite the recent growing importance of the nominees in the permanent resident landings, the trend of negative population growth indicates no impact of the PNP, except in 2004. In the Atlantic provinces, the nominees’ landings were found to be vital to the permanent resident landings. On the other hand, a number of negative annual population growth cases nullifies any positive impact these programs have, and makes the overall impact of the nominees on the population growth unclear at this stage.

In Canada, entire provinces are considered ‘regions’ to achieve, as noted in Chapter One, “a more balanced distribution of immigrants throughout the country”, and the population policy objective focuses on diminishing the effects of the “outmigration and the size of the population in some of the smaller provinces and Québec”. In that context,
it may be stated that the provincial programs have not yet successfully assisted in meeting that objective. Only Québec and Manitoba have been successful at any serious scale.

The population impact of the Canadian provincial policies has so far been limited to two jurisdictions. Individual agreements between each province and the federal government make it difficult to predict future outcomes of the policies for particular provinces. If, as in Australia, it is assumed that PNPs will continue and that Québec will also continue its policy, three scenarios of total growth in cumulative population impact of these policies can again be proposed to help fix ideas on future possibilities.

The period chosen for these scenarios is comparable to Australia: from 2004 to 2024. The figure of 32,900 is the initial adopted base for all scenarios. This is a rounded sum of the 2004 total PNs landings (Table 4.11) and the 2004 number of Québec-selected economic migrant landings (Table 4.12). As in Australia, the low growth scenario projects a decrease by 1,000 in migrant landings in each year. Under the stable growth scenario, the level of 32,900 landings under the provincial programs is maintained each year. The high growth scenario projects an additional 3,800 landings every year (this is a rounded average of a sum of annual growth in landings under the PNPs and of Québec-selected economic migrants between 2002-04). It is assumed under all scenarios that in 2005 the level of landings stays at 32,900, as in 2004. Table 4.17 shows the results under all scenarios every five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/scenario</th>
<th>Low growth- less 1,000/year</th>
<th>Low growth - cumulative</th>
<th>Stable growth - same value every year</th>
<th>Stable growth - cumulative</th>
<th>High growth - +3,800/year</th>
<th>High growth - cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>32 900</td>
<td>32 900</td>
<td>32 900</td>
<td>32 900</td>
<td>32 900</td>
<td>32 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28 900</td>
<td>187 400</td>
<td>32 900</td>
<td>197 400</td>
<td>48 100</td>
<td>235 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>23 900</td>
<td>316 900</td>
<td>32 900</td>
<td>361 900</td>
<td>67 100</td>
<td>532 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>18 900</td>
<td>421 400</td>
<td>32 900</td>
<td>526 400</td>
<td>86 100</td>
<td>925 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>13 900</td>
<td>500 900</td>
<td>32 900</td>
<td>690 900</td>
<td>105 100</td>
<td>1 412 900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s calculations based on last PNs and Québec-selected economic migrant landings in 2004.

Table 4.17 shows that under the low growth scenario, with gradually decreasing number of migrants, their population would still be growing and would just exceed 0.5m in 2024. Such a scenario, or a similar one with descending numbers, could result from
changes in provincial priorities, where the agreements with the federal government would not be extended in the future or would be terminated soon. If the stable growth scenario occurred, the population of provincially nominated/selected migrants would exceed 0.5m sooner - in 2019. For this to happen the community-driven initiatives would need to be used effectively across all provinces, and international promotion would need to be continued. As in Australia, economic and social circumstances, such as skill shortages and fertility rates would need to continue in order for the provincial policies to be maintained.\textsuperscript{10}

The high growth scenario would require attracting an additional 3,800 provincial migrants annually. In this scenario, total population levels would grow to above 0.5m in 2014 and to more than 1.4m in 2024. This could result from an expansion of the programs (adding new categories, for example), increasing numbers of international students using the programs to become permanent residents and the Atlantic provinces attracting more nominees. A number of economic and social circumstances would need to continue to exist to justify such growing figures. As in Australia, adding around 1.4m new residents over the next two decades would need careful planning to accommodate them whilst paying attention to sustainability issues. Even if that growth slowed down at some point, the cumulative impact of these residents would likely remain considerable.

In the past, the projected numbers of nominees and Québec-selected migrants have been decided in a political process, where provincial governments and the federal government agree on proposed levels on provincial migrants. Their future levels will be decided in a similar manner, based on provincial needs and priorities that will likely incorporate those anticipated by communities. In comparison to Australia, the impact of provincial migration in absolute terms would be greater than that of SSRM visa grants under each scenario.

So far the trends and the cumulative effects of the provincial policies have been discussed. Dispersal and retention outcomes constitute another type of analysis, which follows below. To use comparable terms with the Australian outcomes, the intraprovincial dispersal outcomes are highlighted, as migrants’ settlement in large cities other than Vancouver and Montréal remain in line with the regionalisation

\textsuperscript{10}The Canadian total fertility rate has recently minimally grown. In 2000 was 1.49. It increased to 1.50 in 2002 and further to 1.53 in 2003 (Statistics Canada 2005b:2).
objective. That dispersal is managed by the provincial governments using 'soft measures' (for example, employment offers) and community-driven initiatives, and, unlike some visas in Australia, it is not based on settlement restrictions. The provincial publications are chiefly used. As in Australia, only a broad evaluation of these efforts may be offered due to incomplete data.

In British Columbia (2002–03), 22 per cent of the employer nominations were from regional areas. The actual number of these nominations was not reported (MCAWS BC 2003:27). It was not specified whether that percentage represented nominations or actual landings. From the provincial publications from two following years it may be understood that actual landings were considered. The dispersal rate was maintained in 2003–04 (20 per cent or 49 landings) and moved closer to a quarter in 2004–05 (24 per cent or 94 landings) (2004a:47; 2005a:61). Yet, this is a moderate outcome, as around 76–80 per cent of nominees would head to Vancouver, where their relative numerical impact on the population would be negligible. A dispersal map available from the provincial program website shows that regional areas receive around 5 nominees per location, which is numerically insignificant for the dispersal purposes. None of the documents quoted here refers to the community-driven initiatives in regions discussed in Chapter Two, which suggests that these outcomes were achieved prior to implementing them. There is limited information regarding the dispersal of business nominees away from Vancouver. Between October 2003 and November 2004 there were 36 regional applicants approved (Zehr 2004:n.p.) but no further details could be located.

According to a senior Albertan government official, most PNs were working in Calgary and Edmonton - the two metropolitan areas in the province - and at the same time the largest provincial cities. Around 40 per cent were working in such regional centres like Red Deer, Madison Hut, Fort McMurray or Grande Prairie. More recently, that rate was reported to be around 45 per cent, however the regional destinations were not disclosed (Huynh 2004:7). Although the 40 (45) per cent dispersal rate is higher than in British Columbia, even if it is maintained for the latest landings from 2004.

---

11 Two exceptions are formal regional business migration options offered by British Columbia and Newfoundland and Labrador.
12 Interviewed on 22 March 2003.
(425), it still does not provide any boosting effect for the population in regional areas, while the majority of nominees settling in Calgary and Edmonton would be numerically insignificant for their populations. In Canada, settlement in Calgary and Edmonton fits into the regionalisation objective, whilst in Australia its equivalent often does not.

In Saskatchewan, the dispersal rate into rural areas was 40 per cent (Huynh 2004:7). It can be surmised that the community initiatives have a played role, although this has not been specifically reported. If it is assumed that 40 per cent of the nominees who landed in 2004 (323 persons) settle in rural Saskatchewan, this can not be expected to increase the population in regional areas in any considerable way, as in British Columbia and Alberta. On the other hand, the settlement of the remaining 60 per cent in Regina and Saskatoon is in line with the policy, but under the current numbers their relative numerical impact on their populations is negligible.

In Manitoba, the expected dispersal of nominees, noted by an early program evaluation (ProLogica Research Inc. 2001), places the province, with around 34 per cent of nominees settling outside Winnipeg (2001:14), among rates achieved by British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta. It is further noted in that evaluation that there is little difference in destinations between the total approved population of the nominees and those who have landed. That rate refers only to skilled nominees because at the time of the survey no business nominees had yet landed (2001:8). In recent years, dispersal in Manitoba has continued at similar rates. In 2002, 2003 and 2004 around one-third of all nominees were settling in regions (MLI 2003b:8; 2004b:10; 2005a:13). The percentages fluctuated slightly. For example, in 2003 it was 32 per cent and 28.4 per cent in 2004 (2004b:10; 2005a:13). While the overall dispersal rate is modest and indicates that around two-thirds of the nominees head to Winnipeg, Manitoba has had some regional town-specific success.

According to ProLogica Research Inc. (2001:14), two towns stood out as prime destinations for regionally bound nominees - Winkler and Steinbach. Together, they have absorbed 21.6 per cent of all nominees. A similar percentage (22.4 per cent) of landed nominees, recruited through community initiatives (2001:14,15), suggests a link between the two. Indeed, both towns have signed formal CSAs with the government to secure the nominees (see Subsection 2.6.1 in Chapter Two). As noted by an interviewed
Manitoba government official, population growth in these towns has also benefited from the activity of immigration consultants.13

The ProLogica Research Inc. document (2001:22) cited the example of Winkler, where these consultants commenced the initiative, which resulted in a broad community stakeholders’ and residents’ effort. This shows that an integrated effort and commitment is necessary for successful settlement in regional areas. In practice, the external stakeholders’ engagement in Winkler meant that employers guaranteed employment, the chamber of commerce hired additional staff to assist during the settlement phase and local families volunteered to introduce the newcomers to town and its facilities. The chamber also formed a committee comprising employers and churches, among others, to coordinate this undertaking (2001:22). Steinbach, which has a population of about 10,000 has accepted about 2,000 nominees since the inception of the program. This is a considerable proportion both in terms of the population dispersal and the town’s population increase (WebImmigration.Com 2004a:1).

Another example of dispersal comes from Russell. It has a population of about 1,500 and was reported to be expecting 100 nominees (20 approved families) in 2004. This is 6.6 per cent of the whole town’s population and indicates a significant increase. This increase was most welcome, given that the whole district had recently seen its population starting to slip (WebImmigration.Com 2004b:1,2). Cooperation with other external stakeholders took the form of CSAs signed with the Jewish Federation of Winnipeg and the Argentinean Manitoban Association (MLI 2003a:48-9).

From among other provinces, the dispersal results in Manitoba stand out. They may provide an example to the Australian jurisdictions interested in successful dispersal of immigrants. Dedicated, community-driven initiatives, formalised through agreements with the provincial government, have paid off. As illustrated, concerted efforts of various local stakeholders in creating authentic attraction and looking beyond it to assist in retention have resulted in considerable number of new residents providing an immediate population boost. The understanding of ‘region’ in Canada, where the retention rates are reported for the entire provinces, does not allow showing the

---

13 Interview took place on 25 March 2003.
retention rates resulting from the community initiatives. As noted in Chapter Two, they were estimated to be excellent for Winkler and Steinbach.

Considering that these permanent residents were not subject to any settlement restrictions, Manitoba’s strategy represents an additional regional dispersal means that could be used in the Australian jurisdictions. Whole-community involvement and genuine attraction may better serve the dispersal principle than relying on settlement restriction or an expectation that migrants will stay in regions in combination with a single anchor - a family link (SDAS) or a guaranteed temporary employment (RSMS). As shown earlier, this approach has resulted in limited lasting dispersal in genuinely regional areas. In Australia, under the settlement restrictions, longer-term attraction created by a concerted community effort should be either considered as a primary or as a strong complementary measure. Therefore, the Canadian-style local immigration initiatives, as well as the earlier mentioned domestic (Victorian) local immigration initiatives, could provide useful inspirations for retention, too.

Québec has also pursued dispersal outcomes. Its outcomes are reported for migrants present in the province (‘presence rate’). The presence rate is a Québec concept comparable to the retention rate. This approach determines that dispersal and retention (presence) outcomes be discussed jointly. Presence rates in the provincial statistics refer to all immigrants admitted into Québec, not only the Québec-selected migrants (MICC QC 2005k). Therefore, in addition to the economic migrants, family class and refugees are also considered. Furthermore, the economic migrants include, beside skilled and business migrants, also assisted relatives (parents aidés), live-in-caregivers (aides familiaux) and others (autres) that encompass deferred removal orders (immigrants visés par une mesure de renvoi) who are failed refugee claimants not removed from Canada, retirees (retraités) and provincial nominees (candidates des provinces) (MICC QC 2005k:30). The latter would have subsequently moved to Québec and stayed there, thus increasing the total stock of immigrants in the province.

Presence rates spanning years 1994-2003 and current at January 2005 were generally encouraging, although they fluctuated (MICC QC 2005k:8). The rate during the whole period was 79.4 per cent. The highest annual rates, in excess of 80 per cent, have been observed from 2000 onwards. In 2003 the presence rate reached 83 per cent (2005k:8).
The presence rate of economic migrants during the 1994–2003 period was 73.9 per cent. Inside that group, skilled migrants had a rate of 83.7 per cent (MICC QC 2005k:9). High, albeit fluctuating presence rates for skilled migrants have been recorded since 1997. Typically above 80 per cent, they are linked to the introduction of a new selection system in 1997. This system enables migrants to be selected on the basis of employability and professional mobility potential, meant to facilitate and accelerate their labour market participation. A higher number of those who knew French at the time of admission is also believed to have contributed to increased presence rates (2005k:10,32).

By contrast, business migrants had a total presence rate of 33 per cent. Inside that group there were considerable differences. Investors - the largest group admitted into the province from among business migrants - had the worst total presence rate of 18.4 per cent. Self-employed workers had a 64.1 per cent presence rate (of less than 2,400 admitted) and entrepreneurs had a 49.5 presence rate (MICC QC 2005k:30,32). Québec’s poor results in retaining its business migrants were also noted by an interviewed British Columbia academic, a senior Manitoba government official and by one of the senior Québec government officials, who referred particularly to investors.\(^\text{14}\) The British Columbia academic mentioned Toronto and Vancouver as destination cities for Québec-selected business migrants. Such outcomes show limited success in retaining migrants.\(^\text{15}\)

In recent years dispersal in Québec has occurred thanks to special agreements reached with external (regional and local) stakeholders (discussed in Chapter Two). They integrate immigration into their development plans and design their own immigration strategies. Dispersal outcomes reported for a particular year refer to admissions from the preceding year, based on data available in January of the following year (for example, results from 2002 refer to admissions from 2001 and are calculated on the basis of data available in January 2003).\(^\text{16}\)

\(^\text{14}\) These interviews took place on 18 March 2003, 26 March 2003 and 1 April 2003.

\(^\text{15}\) The above presence rates for business migrants seem to be a continuation of an earlier trend. A CIC study (2000b:35) established that of business migrants destined to Québec between 1980-95 almost 48 per cent resided in other provinces in the 1995 tax year.

\(^\text{16}\) Dispersal outcomes are reported from provincial sources. Wherever annual admission figures are reported, they differ slightly from figures in Table 4.12, based on CIC (2005b) data.
Of migrants admitted in 1998 (26,509), and who were present in the province in 1999, 3,244 were found living in regions (MRCI QC 2003:17,91). During 2000, of the 29,214 migrants admitted in 1999, 3,554 lived in regions (2003:17,91). Of those admissions that took place in 2000 (32,502), around 27,000 migrants remained in the province through 2001 and of them 4,169 settled outside Montréal (2002b:28; 2003:11,17). This growth is attributed to an increase in the number of skilled migrants selected by the province (2003:17).

Of the 37,537 migrants admitted in 2001, 30,756 stayed in Québec through 2002 (reported presence rate of 82.3 per cent). The number of migrants who settled in regions rose to 5,024 and they represented 16.3 per cent of those who were present in the province in 2002 (MRCI QC 2003:11,17). In 2002, 37,629 migrants were admitted. Of them, 31,145 remained in Québec throughout 2003 (reported presence rate of 83.1 per cent) and 4,644 settled in regional areas (14.9 per cent of those who stayed). This decrease is attributed to a lower number of refugees selected by Québec (2004d:16,23).

Finally, 39,583 migrants were admitted in 2003 and 32,721 have remained in the province in 2004 (reported presence rate of 83 per cent). Of those, 5,681 (17.4 per cent) settled in regions (MICC QC 2005:i:18,45,47,48). While the dispersal rates, between 14.9 per cent and 17.4 per cent, are lower than those in British Columbia and Manitoba, the actual number of migrants locating in Québec’s regions is significantly higher. For example, the dispersal rate of 16.3 per cent (5,024) recorded in 2002 would exceed the total number of PNs landed in Manitoba (4,048) in 2004.

Regional destinations of migrants typically overlap with cities and regions that have signed agreements with the provincial government. In line with the policy objective, Québec City is targeted to be the second most popular destination after Montréal. Numbers of migrants settling there have been increasing. In 1999, 866 individuals settled (admissions 1998). In 2001 (admissions 2000), that number rose to 1,055 and

---

17 Precise presence rate could not be located but it may be assumed that it was around 78.7 per cent. That rate was reported by MICC QC (2005k:8).
18 Precise presence rate could not be located but according to MICC QC (2005k:8) it was 80.5 per cent.
19 The figure of 27,000 migrants who remained in the province during 2001 is rounded from 27,055 reported by MRCI QC (2002b:28). That publication also states a minimally higher number of dispersed migrants (4,173) rather than the 4,169 reported by the later publication (2003:17). If the number of migrants who remained in the province throughout 2001 (which is not reported in that later publication) were around 27,000, the number of dispersed migrants in both cases would correspond to 15.4 per cent.
constituted 25 per cent of all dispersed migrants (MRCI QC 2002b:30). In 2002 (admissions 2001), that figure increased again to 1,439, raising at the same time the proportion of migrants settling in Québec City region to 28.6 per cent of all dispersed migrants. That improvement resulted - among other things - from an increase of the overall number of skilled migrants, as well as from the implementation of agreement with Québec City (2003:19). In 2001 (admissions 2000), skilled migrants accounted for 483 of the stream; in 2002 (admissions 2001), their number rose to 565 (2004d:25; 2003:19). That growth remains in line with targeting skilled migrants, as reported by a Québec City city council officer interviewed for this study.\(^{20}\)

As noted in Chapter Two, the agreement was implemented through a city immigration action plan based on three pillars (promotion, integration and improvement of intercultural relations). It was carried out by different municipal units in cooperation with local stakeholders, which to some extent resembles the Manitoba approach. Locally, promotion highlights were advertising Québec City to Montréal-based immigrants and increasing awareness among temporary foreign workers about Québec City. Integration comprised, among other things, increasing awareness among (manufacturing) employers about the capacity of migrants to take up strategic positions, facilitating integration of business people into a local association, work experience with the city council and logistic and financial support for harmonisation of services offered by the immigrant serving agencies. Intercultural relations involved among other actions, promotion of the contribution of migrants through their participation in cultural activities (Ville de Québec n.d:n.p.).

More recently, in 2003 (admissions 2002), the number of migrants choosing Québec City decreased to 1,156. That lowered its share of all dispersed migrants to 24.9 per cent. Nevertheless, the number of skilled migrants locating there increased to 694 (MRCI QC 2004d:25). In 2004 (admissions 2003), 1,379 migrants chose Québec City (MICC QC 2005l:48). In 2004, they represented almost 24.3 per cent of all dispersed migrants (calculation based on MICC QC 2005l:48), proving that the strategies have had some impact. Other significant beneficiaries of earlier regional migration in 2002 (admissions 2001) were Montérégie (15.3 per cent, excluding Longueuil), Estrie (14.6

\(^{20}\) Interview took place on 21 March 2003.
per cent) and Outaouais (13.1 per cent) (2003;18). These proportions were maintained in 2003 (admissions 2002) and 2004 (admissions 2003) (MRCI QC 2004d:23; MICC QC 2005i:48).

The population impact of regional migration can be seen on an example of Estrie. Sherbrooke, the major city of the region, had (as measured by the 2001 Census) 153,811 inhabitants. Of the 5,024 migrants living in regions in 2002 (admissions 2001, see above), Estrie received 14.6 per cent (see above). This translates to 733 persons. If 700 people settled in Sherbrooke, and the remainder dispersed in the region, those 700 individuals added 0.45 per cent of Sherbrooke population. This is not a major contribution. Only if figures were accumulated could the new residents carry some marginal relative weight. In Sherbrooke, cumulated numbers from the 2001, 2002 admissions (14.7 per cent of 4,644 is 682, it is assumed that 600 settle in Sherbrooke) and the 2003 admissions (14.9 per cent of 5,681 is 846, it is assumed that 800 settle in Sherbrooke) result in additional 2,100 new residents.

The Estrie action plan (2005) comprises measures to ensure authentic, long-lasting attraction extending beyond employment, such as cultural diversity training for employers, facilitating employment matches for newly landed (in Montréal) migrants, promoting public service employment to immigrants, using local media to educate the public about immigration in the region, supporting promotion of immigrants' contribution to the development of the region, introducing migrants to services available in Sherbrooke and educating local landlords' associations about needs of immigrants. Stakeholders involved in the plan are for example provincial ministries, regional and local business organisations, ethnic communities, media and immigrant serving agencies (MICC QC 2005e:11,12,17,18).

A longer-term perspective on dispersal reveals that of 249,421 migrants (total number admitted between 1994-2003 and present in the province in January 2005; includes 10,019 whose location could not be determined), Québec dispersed 42,110 migrants into regions and retained them there, at a 16.9 per cent dispersal rate (MICC QC 2005k:39).

---

21 See tables accompanying Statistics Canada (2002a). They are not integrated into the principal document and can be found in http://geodepot.statcan.ca/Diss/Highlights/Tables_e.pdf.
22 14.7 per cent reported in MRCI QC (2004d:23).
23 14.9 per cent calculated on the basis of data in MICC QC (2005i:48).
Montréal had 197,292 migrants settle there (79.1 per cent) (2005k:39). The statistics further reveal that 40.6 per cent of regional migrants were from the economic stream (2005k:22). Given the number of migrants that Québec is managing, it can be concluded that Québec has had a modest success in dispersal and retention. The cooperation with regional and local stakeholders that has contributed to these outcomes so far has now taken a form of regional action plans vesting more power into these stakeholders. That formula, replacing previous dispersal targets, is expected to improve the dispersal outcomes.

No intraprovincial dispersal outcomes for nominees in the Atlantic provinces could be located. However, the Community-Identified Stream in Nova Scotia and community sponsorships being developed in New Brunswick (see Subsection 2.6.1. in Chapter Two) suggests some activity. In 1995-2004, the majority of new permanent residents in Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia have preferred to settle in capital cities (CIC 2005b:38). If PNs displayed similar preferences, any intraprovincial dispersal would be a small-scale phenomenon. Only in New Brunswick have the numbers of permanent residents settling in Fredericton (capital city) been smaller in each year than in the rest of the province (2005b:38). Considering the low numbers of nominees in Atlantic Canada, their intraprovincial dispersal would have a minimal relative effect. This would be also the case of migrants settling in capital cities, remaining in line with the policy principle.

Data on retention rates are limited. In Alberta, according to the earlier quoted government official, retention was 100 per cent. Interestingly, as noted by that official, in early months of Albertan PNP operation, there were 17 landed PNs - none of them nominated by Alberta. This indicates some interprovincial secondary movements of nominees. Retention outcomes in Manitoba measured by the 2001 survey (ProLogica Research Inc. 2001) for skilled nominees revealed an overall rate of 90 per cent (2001:39). Retention rates beyond that survey could not be located and destinations of the nominees, whom Manitoba did not retain, could not be located either.

Retention levels in Newfoundland and Labrador are concerning. According to the provincial government’s estimates, less than half of landed nominees (281 in 1999-2004) are believed to still reside in the province (between 50 to 60 individuals) (Goss
Gilroy Inc. 2005:20). This could indicate the largest out-migration of nominees at Canada's scale. Atlantic Canada has had the lowest retention rates for migrants in Canada. In 1996, only 51 per cent of migrants who landed in Atlantic Canada during 1991-95 remained there (CIC 2001f:19). From 1991 to 2001, the average retention rate for these provinces was 47.25 per cent (calculation based on Goss Gilroy Inc. 2005:19). Individually, New Brunswick had a higher retention rate (62 per cent) than the worst performing province elsewhere - Saskatchewan with a 57 per cent retention rate. For other provinces the overall retention rates from 1991 to 2001 were 36 per cent for Newfoundland and Labrador; 40 per cent for Nova Scotia and 51 per cent for Prince Edward Island (2005:19).

If the PNs have displayed similar retention rates, then considering their overall low numbers, they have not boosted the stagnated provincial populations. Concrete targets have been envisaged in provincial immigration strategies to increase retention and this extends beyond the PNPs. For example, in Nova Scotia, the target is not only to increase the number of migrants but also to retain 70 per cent of them (Province of Nova Scotia 2005:7).

The above evidence leads to similar conclusions to those reached in the Australian case. The Canadian provincial governments’ efforts have yielded growing numbers of provincial migrants. Their impact has been most noticeable (and considerable at Canada scale) in annual permanent resident landings and annual population growth figures only in Québec and Manitoba. Yet, given special selection powers of Québec, Manitoba has achieved the best results from among the provinces with PNPs. Despite single positive examples of regional dispersal in Manitoba and Québec, overall the provinces have not been very successful in intraprovincial regional dispersal. On the other hand, the remaining migrants’ settlement in largest provincial cities, aligning generally with the policy objective, was not yet having any major relative effect on the populations concerned. That outcome bore resemblance to the Australian results, yet in the latter metropolitan settlement of these migrants sometimes contravened the policy objectives. The retention rates were very good in Manitoba and Alberta, but seemingly less so in the Eastern provinces and especially in the case of business migrants in Québec. Such outcomes support one of the proposed hypotheses that to date the policies have had only a modest effect overall in adjusting the population flows to regions.
Such conclusions notwithstanding, it has to be emphasised that the community-motivated immigration strategies adopted in Manitoba and Québec not only represent a form of, and illustrate practice of community-driven regional development based on the principles proposed by the community-driven regional development concepts. Importantly, the modest (at Canada scale) yet positive results that these strategies have brought for regional localities in Manitoba and Québec demonstrate that these concepts have been embraced there for purposes of regional development and proven working. Their results further suggest that these concepts may offer a useful framework for successfully using local initiatives in immigration to support regional development elsewhere, too. The Québec practice of a broad-based community and business cooperation and (a formal agreement) financially supported by the provincial government provides a classic example of a community-driven regional development strategy. What may be a particularly useful tactic in using the community/regional immigration strategies to bolster regions is their formal incorporation into broader regional development plans, as practiced by Québec (and preferred by British Columbia). This could potentially offer regions the benefit of a coordinated development planning, inclusive of the role of immigration. The Australian federal government also perceives regional migration schemes as one of the measures of regional development (see Section 1.3 in Chapter One), but so far similar community-driven immigration strategies have only been enabled in one Australian state.

4.2 The economic impacts of regional migration policies

Economic benefits from the Australian and Canadian regional migration policies particularly relate to filling the skill shortages and developing economies of the jurisdictions through business migration. The Australian and Canadian programs for skilled migrants are part of the state/territory and provincial labour market development strategies. Therefore, the economic impact resulting from employing a skilled migrant can be seen from several perspectives taken into account in the subsection on skilled streams. The perspective is different from the macro scale of a state/territory/provincial labour market and from a single local employer’s point of view. The economic impact of business migration is also considered from two perspectives. The macro scale perspective considers the migrants’ contribution to investment and employment creation in the jurisdictions, while the other perspective is that of an individual job seeker, who
will benefit from new business hiring of workers. As noted at the beginning of this chapter, evaluation of the economic impact of the policies hinges upon the availability and detail of data. In the future, it would be valuable to compare the economic participation of the regional migrants with that of all other migrants. At this stage, lack of consistent, complete data from Australia and Canada on the regional migrants’ participation prevents such a comparison.\(^{24}\)

### 4.2.1 Skilled streams

The assessment of the Australian and Canadian regional policies’ economic outcomes from skilled migration is based on selected visa or arrival statistics, presented in the Subsection above, as well as on the SDAS and RSMS surveys’ outcomes (Australia) referred to earlier. The evaluation of the Canadian programs is also based on the provincial publications. Although in Canada it is typically impossible to discuss the economic effects of the employment of skilled nominees migrating under different provincial streams, some insights regarding the non-employer sponsored ones could be gained from Manitoba.

Economic benefits of skilled migration are evaluated in Australia and Canada first in the context of the macro scale effects and then from an individual employer’s point of view. The macro scale perspective comprises evaluating the migrants’ contribution to the labour force growth in states, territories and provinces, as well as their impact on improving the age structure of the employed population (Australia) and provincial labour forces (Canada). From an employer’s point of view, the quality of a migrant’s performance depends on the core eligibility factors. Some of these factors are able to be evaluated: skill levels (qualifications), nominated occupation and the pre-arranged employment offer in Canada. The impact of the English/French language eligibility factors is based on incomplete data. The economic impact of another core eligibility factor - work experience - and the retention factors can only be discussed to a limited extent.

**Australia.** Jurisdictional distribution of the total visa grants for skilled and business migrants and their families (Table 4.2), enables a broad evaluation of these migrants’

\(^{24}\)Furthermore, comparing the countries of origin of regional migrants with the countries of origin of other migrants could prove to be of policy importance.
contribution to the labour force growth in Australian jurisdictions. Table 4.18 shows the total labour force figures in each state and territory. Table 4.19 shows the contribution of regional migrants to the labour force growth in each state and territory. Results in Table 4.19 offer an indicative, rather than a precise illustration of the policy impact on the labour market, due to imperfect comparability of data.

If it is assumed that the state/territory sponsored business migrants become employed in their businesses, the distortion comes chiefly from the presence of principal migrants’ family members. While spouses may soon become employed, the labour force status of children and whether their age enables qualifying them as members of the labour force cannot be determined. The Canadian provincial statistics suggest that each principal applicant typically brings a spouse and a child. If the same were the case in Australia, the initial visa grants’ figures should be divided by three (at least initially; the spouse may find employment later) to represent better the number of individuals who will become employed immediately (or at least, are expected to).

For simplicity, and because the numbers of migrants joining the labour force cannot be precisely established, it is assumed that all visaed migrants arrive in the same year as their visa was issued and are represented in the labour force figures in the same year. The most recent period of the policy operation is considered (from 1999-2000) because this is where the numbers have become numerically significant, and complete and original DIMIA statistics are available (visa grants’ distribution in Table 4.2 for 1998-99 has been built on assumptions). Table 4.19 shows that there have been cases of negative annual labour force growth. There, the SSRM migrants’ contribution shown in that Table represents the percentage value of the reduction in annual labour force decline, resulting from migrants joining the labour force.

25 Labour force in Australia is defined as the civilian population aged 15 years and over that is employed and unemployed but not inactive (not in the labour force). See ABS 2005b:163 and reference on that page for details on criteria used to classify persons into these categories. Although the discussion here is formally placed under the title “skilled streams”, the incorporation of the state/territory sponsored business migrants in the consideration of the migrants’ impact on the labour force growth is justified not only by the character of the DIMIA data available. These business migrants are required, as per visa criteria, to become active owners and/or managers of their businesses and therefore, employed labour force. See diagram 6.1 in ABS 2005b:162.

26 Statistics on nominees’ landings in Manitoba illustrate that. In 2002, 420 principal applicants (skilled streams) landed, along with 935 dependants. In 2003, 872 principal applicants (skilled streams) landed, along with 1,913 dependants and in 2004 1,227 principal applicants (skilled streams) landed bringing 2,531 dependants (MLI 2005a:10). This shows that there are slightly more than two dependants per one principal applicant.
Table 4.18 Total labour force by states and territories in Australia 1998–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>3.112</td>
<td>3.179</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>3.276</td>
<td>3.336</td>
<td>3.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>2.351</td>
<td>2.387</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>2.489</td>
<td>2.530</td>
<td>2.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>1.772</td>
<td>1.805</td>
<td>1.843</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>1.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a) Only full thousands are presented.

Table 4.19 Percentage contribution of SSRM migrants to labour force growth in states and territories in Australia 1999–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFG b)</td>
<td>SSRM contri bution to LFG %</td>
<td>LFG</td>
<td>SSRM contribution to LFG %</td>
<td>LFG</td>
<td>SSRM contribution to LFG %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>67 000</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>52 000</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>45 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>36 000</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>68 000</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>34 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>33 000</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>38 000</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>32 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>12 000</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>-2 000</td>
<td>37.50b)</td>
<td>6 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>22 000</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>17 000</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>12 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>-3 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>-1 000</td>
<td>6.50b)</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>7 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>7 000</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>-1 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
a) LFG - Labour Force Growth.
b) Migrants joining the labour force did not offset the negative annual labour force growth but they reduced its decline. The value represents the percentage value of that reduction of the negative annual labour force growth.
Sources: Author’s calculations based on Tables 4.2 and 4.18.

Table 4.19 shows that the contribution of SSRM migrants to the labour force growth has recently fluctuated. Unlike their presence in settler arrivals and their contribution to the population growth in states and territories, where notable volatility has been the case only for Tasmania and the two Territories, here this has also been the case for other jurisdictions. Such outcomes result from considerable differences in absolute figures of labour force growth including some rather dramatic annual changes in that growth (compare for example periods 2002–03 and 2003–04 to see negative labour force growth in Victoria and Western Australia in Table 4.19).28

27 One of the reasons for that volatility may be the fact that the labour force figures are annual survey averages as opposed to census-derived population estimates showing figures at a specific date.
28 The extraordinarily high contribution of migrants to reducing the annual labour force decline in Western Australia in 2003–04 reflects the assumption made about the participation in the labour force of the entire number of vissed migrants. That contribution would need to be revised in reality.
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Except for New South Wales and Queensland, all other jurisdictions experienced negative labour force growth and the increasing visa grants (considered actual arrivals) were insufficient to offset that decline. Victoria may be used as an example. In 2003-04, it suffered a negative labour force growth and arrival of more than 6,000 regional migrants did not offset it. The Northern Territory experienced negative labour force growth most often across Australia and it was also the least popular destination among regional migrants. In New South Wales and Queensland, regional migrants constituted generally a gradually increasing proportion of the annual labour force changes but only in 2002-03 have they exceeded 1 per cent and otherwise remain low. Victoria and South Australia have so far benefited most in terms of the population impact of the policy, but the economic impact, as illustrated by fluctuations in Table 4.19, indicates that the latter has not yet become consistently beneficial for them in terms of the labour force growth objective.

Fluctuations in the annual growth figures and the migrants' volatile contribution, as shown in Table 4.19, suggest that at the macro scale regional migrants have not so far had any consistent, considerable economic impact on the states' and territories' annual labour force growth. So far, in none of the jurisdictions has their annual contribution exceeded 15 per cent, although South Australia and the Australian Capital Territory are drawing close.

An important policy motivation is that regional migrants are of working age and it is assumed that they will become quickly employed in the states and territories, in their Designated Areas, or in the 'regional or low population growth areas'. Demographic realities in regional and low population growth areas in Australia form some of the motivation behind the policy (DIMIA 2004n:37). Admitting younger (no older than 45 years), skilled migrants is not only intended to add to the workforce younger people who will stay employed for longer. Their tax paying capacity is also an important economic consideration.

Research into the SDAS and RSMS categories has confirmed that these migrants are typically young. According to the earlier mentioned SDAS survey, the principal applicants were on average 36-37 years old (DIMIA 2005b:6). The first RSMS survey found that at the time of the survey 65 per cent of principal applicants were aged...
between 30-45, 21 per cent were aged above 45 and 14 per cent were less than 30 years old (Cully and Goodes 2000:30,31). The most recent RSMS survey (DIMIA 2005a) established slightly different proportions: 46 per cent of principal applicants were 40 years old or over; and 13 per cent were aged less than 30 (2005a:4). Therefore, primary applicants aged 30-39 represented 41 per cent. No similar information is available at the moment for the STNJ/SMV migrants, who are subject to a standard age limit of 45 years. Also, no age structure of the state/territory sponsored business migrants could be located, inhibiting any assessment of their contribution. Hence, the basis for assessment is restricted.

In 2003-04, the Australian employed population was approximately in 33 per cent composed of mature age workers (45-64 years old), around 1.6 per cent were people aged above 65, and approximately 65 per cent were individuals aged 15-44 (calculations based on ABS 2005b:170).²⁹ It can be surmised that the age structure of migrants is better suited to promoting economic growth: 79 per cent of RSMS migrants (Cully and Goodes 2000) were aged less than 45, and in the most recent RSMS survey (DIMIA 2005a) 71 per cent were aged less than 40. That said, the absolute numbers of regional migrants have so far been too low to have a major impact on the population structure, including also the employed labour force.

While migration overall is recognised to either moderate or assist transitionally in slowing down the demographic ageing process, its impact is modest.³⁰ On the other

²⁹ Age distribution of the labour force in 2003-04 could not be located.
³⁰ Impact of immigration on the population structure is debated. Studies have come up with differing conclusions on the role of migration in influencing the population ageing. For example Withers (2002b) supported a view that changes in immigrants’ composition or increase in immigration levels could transitionally impact on the ageing process of the population by reducing the aged-dependency ratios and should not be dismissed. Additionally, he argued that even small changes in demographic percentages (that could be considered ‘unimportant’ in the demography domain) might have multiplied fiscal consequences, providing additional means to support the older Australians (2002b:106,107,108-9,110-11). McDonald and Kippen (1999) opined that changes in immigrant composition (for example increasing the proportion of younger migrants under 30 years of age) would only have a minimal positive effect on the population ageing and were unlikely to be worthwhile. They also believed, at that time, that increasing the immigration levels beyond 80,000 per year would become ineffective and inefficient in slowing the ageing process (1999:17,21). Methodological approaches may also yield different results as to the impact of immigration on the population ageing. Withers (2002a) argued that if impact of immigration on the population ageing were considered in rates rather than constant absolute net inflows (levels), its capacity to influence the population ageing would not be diminishing over time (as it is concluded to be the case in imposing a constant absolute net inflow on a growing population base). A rate approach would also show that immigration may lessen, in a long run, the pressures on public budgets resulting from ageing (2002a:84; compare Withers 2002b above). Withers’s (2002a) was a policy paper with McDonald’s and Kippen’s (2002) and both contained more detailed discussion on methodology and net migration rates. For a recent, extensive study on economic consequences of ageing in Australia see Productivity Commission 2005.
hand, if sustained flows of regional migrants in their thirties continued arriving and, especially, increased over a significant time period, and they would become employed, that could have some positive fiscal impact\textsuperscript{31}, and provide a transitional relief in a situation when older workers will be moving into retirement or semi-retirement. All in all, there has been neither a consistent nor a considerable impact of regional migrants on the labour force annual growth and no major impact on the employed population’s age distribution. This means that so far regional migration has had at best a marginal macro scale economic impact on the states and territories via labour force effects.

The essential component of the migration assessment is the employability of an individual ensured by the core eligibility factors: the skill levels (qualifications) and nominated occupation where an employment offer is not required, and additionally by an employment offer under RSMS. In the case of SDAS migrants, who do not require an employment offer as a visa condition, the surveyed principal applicants had an 89 per cent participation rate in the labour market. An indication that the qualifications eligibility factor is bringing the economic benefits may be illustrated by the fact that 71 per cent of them reported ‘very often’ and ‘often’ use of their qualifications in the job. An identical proportion of respondents were very positive about their job (DIMIA 2005b:21,22). This demonstrates that employers are benefiting from the application of skills gained overseas.

The nominated occupation eligibility factor seems also to be yielding preferred economic benefits. The SDAS principal applicants indicated employment in similar occupations as prior to migration. The highest proportion of continued careers was observed in tradespersons (two-thirds of tradespersons continued their careers in Australia); by comparison, 53 per cent of managers and administrators were in a similar field in Australia. Overall, 70 per cent of employed respondents were in their preferred occupations. Those who were not in their preferred occupation quoted non-recognition of qualifications and experience, lack of jobs/highly competitive environment and lack of local experience (see also language issues below) (DIMIA 2005b:24–5).

\textsuperscript{31} DIMIA (2005f:87) reports outcomes of an Access Economics study (2002) that immigration has a greater positive impact on the Commonwealth rather than the state/territory budgets. This is because revenues of the state/territory budgets are less directly related to increases in income, which on the other hand benefit directly the Commonwealth budget. Therefore, it is likely that regional migrants would only have a minimal positive fiscal impact.
Wherever SDAS migrants are employed, they mostly deliver the expected economic benefits, as illustrated above. That effect is largely felt by individual employers, regardless of location. This is a positive, yet a small scale effect. Since SDAS migrants gravitate towards large cities, the positive impact of their employment in their preferred occupations and application of skills seem to have had marginal or negligible effects on the overall shortages there to date. Their employment in Designated Areas, at lower levels than intended due to other settlement preferences, is likely to be ineffective in seriously addressing skills shortages there and is likely to have had a minimal impact on regional economic prosperity.

According to the recent survey of RSMS migrants (DIMIA 2005a), only 6 per cent of the primary applicants reported unemployment (usually short term) and the participation rate was impressive (only one person out of more than 500 surveyed was not in the labour force). Unlike the SDAS primary applicants, non-recognition of qualifications was not quoted as a reason for being unemployed. Of the individuals surveyed, 92 per cent used their qualifications ‘very often’ in their current job, and 80 per cent ‘liked what they were doing’ (2005a:19-20). This indicates that their overseas-gained skills are put to good use in Australia and that the qualifications eligibility factor is yielding the preferred economic benefits. Most RSMS principal applicants also worked in jobs at a similar level to those they had left overseas; the highest proportion was found among professionals. The survey further established that 95 per cent of the principal applicants also worked in their preferred occupations (2005a:21). Such an outcome implies that the migrants were working in their nominated occupations, thus confirming the positive role of the nominated occupation eligibility factor. All these indicators permit the conclusion that the scheme fulfils its objectives and benefits the nominating employers by providing them with suitably skilled migrants for their identified shortages. Indeed, over 80 per cent of surveyed employers rated their satisfaction with the scheme high (2005a:10). The confirmation for the scheme’s success comes also from the trend of onshore status conversions (see Chapter Two).

That survey also established that 83 per cent of principal applicants have continued working for the nominating employer (it is not specified what proportion was still fulfilling the initial contract and what proportion stayed voluntarily) and a slightly lower proportion (78 per cent) was working for the employer and living in a Designated
Area. Of the 17 per cent that left their employers, around two-thirds remained in the Designated Areas (DIMIA 2005a:14). Securing a better job or the intention to do so, and a lack of satisfaction with a current job were two principal reasons for having left the sponsoring employer or intending to do so (2005a:15).

The pre-visa cancellation RSMS survey (Cully and Goodes 2000) found that around one-third of RSMS migrants left prior to the two-year contract expiry date. This indicates that some of the economic benefits coming from their employment in the regions may have been lost. It also established that 25 per cent of those who left (including those who left post-contract expiry date) moved out of their city or region. On the other hand, 31 per cent of surveyed employers expressed the opinion that migrants have exceeded their expectations, and 56 per cent felt that their expectations were met. There was a positive correlation between a migrant staying on the position and the employer’s expectations being exceeded (2000:21).

Migrants’ job performance was rated highly, with 81 per cent of employers giving high ratings, and employing a migrant under the scheme also positively impacted on the organisation, according to 80 per cent of employers (Cully and Goodes 2000:24). Only in 11 per cent of cases did employers not think that there was a skills transfer to their employees (2000:23). As in the most recent RSMS survey, here the majority of migrants worked in managerial, administrative and professional jobs corresponding to their qualifications (2000:35). This provides further evidence for the positive role of the qualifications and the nominated occupation’ eligibility factors. All in all, that survey also established that the scheme was delivering targeted economic benefits to employers.

The SDAS and the RSMS surveys’ outcomes indicate that the application of the eligibility factors enables responding to the economic policy objective of filling skills shortages and delivering quality results, such as migrants using their qualifications in jobs similar or at similar level to those prior to migration. These quality benefits have so far been delivered at a small scale; that is, to individual employers, and by still relatively small numbers of people in each jurisdiction. This is not to say that SDAS or RSMS migrants, subject to their company’s location, type of services it provides and the

32 The term ‘Designated Area’ is used by this DIMIA survey (2005a) to refer to the ‘regional or low population growth area’ and the former is used in the text to present this survey’s outcomes.
area(s) it serves, do not improve the services’ delivery to the adjacent areas, thus resulting in a more far-reaching impact in comparison to serving only the immediate resident population. Future case studies could establish the extent of such an impact.

While the benefits are reaped by the individual employers, the discussed settlement preferences of regional migrants may not always benefit strictly regional employers. Such preferences do not allow for any serious responses as intended by the policy, to the skills shortages in regions. This contrasts with the stated (in Chapter One) “special circumstances of rural and regional areas” that justify the flexible entry criteria intended to “help deliver young, skilled, English speaking migrants to areas of Australia where they are most needed”. In addition, the numbers of migrants in the jurisdictions delivering these benefits are still modest. This leads to a conclusion that the policy has so far had a minimal impact on the regional economic prosperity, and has not yet fully addressed its economic objective.

The fact that the positive economic impact is restricted to individual employers, in combination with these migrants’ inconsistent impact on the annual labour force growth and no major impact on the age structure of the employed labour force, implies that the economic impact of the policy at the macro scale of the states and territories has been minimal. On the basis of such experience, a hypothesis proposing that the flows that have taken place have not yet had any powerful impact on the states’ and territories’ economic prosperity and sustainability may be confirmed by these criteria.

There is no sufficiently specific information to assess the economic impact of the STNI and Skill Matching schemes and no information as yet is available on the SIR visa. At the time of the interviews three states were using STNI. In Tasmania, none of the 17 nominated STNI migrants had arrived by the time of the interview and no comments regarding their employment experience could yet be offered.\textsuperscript{33} In Victoria, 20 STNI migrants have settled in regional areas and have stayed there.\textsuperscript{34} This may suggest that they were successful in obtaining employment. In South Australia, as a senior state government official indicated, it would take STNI migrants about six to eight weeks to find a job in their nominated professions.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{33} As noted by a senior Tasmanian government official on 5 November 2003.
\textsuperscript{34} As revealed by one Victorian senior government official on 28 October 2003.
\textsuperscript{35} Interview took place on 12 November 2003.
Where STNI migrants find employment consistent with their skills and experience, like SDAS and RSMS visa holders, there is likely an immediate benefit to employer. If STNI dispersal rates as in Victoria (see Subsection 4.1.1) prevail in other states, it means that employers in capital cities benefit at the cost of those located in regions. Even the highest numbers recorded (Victoria 1,003 nominations, and South Australia 566 in 2003-04; figures include dependants) are insufficient to support in any noticeable way the regional economic prosperity.

English language ability is an important eligibility factor in the context of the labour market participation. The SDAS survey (DIMIA 2005b:29) found that 27 per cent of principal applicants were non-native speakers who attended or planned to attend English classes. 80 per cent of non-native speakers who were not attending the classes claimed that their English was at an acceptable standard. Since the participation rate in the labour market for the principal applicants was 89 per cent (2005b:18) and language issues were reported by 6 per cent of those employed as a reason why they were not working in their preferred occupation (2005b:24-5), it may be understood that language difficulties have only a minimally negative impact on the otherwise positive policy outcome (high labour market participation rate). The survey does not report what proportion of principal applicants initially had only a functional English level. It is not known whether upgrading language skills delays employment or pushes an individual into an initially less skilled job.

One in ten surveyed employers of the RSMS migrants commented that the migrants’ skills were no better than ‘fair’, but they were roughly equally split in stating that the relatively poor English language skills had either no impact or some impact on migrants’ ability to do the job. Generally, employers thought that fewer skills were being transferred where the migrant was not fluent in English (Cully and Goodes 2001:23). Overall, a low proportion of employers who noted the language issue suggested that this had a minimal negative impact on the scheme’s capacity to deliver the economic benefits. In the latest RSMS survey (DIMIA 2005a), language issues were not discussed in the context of migrants’ employment at all. There was no information regarding the impact of language abilities of STNI, SIR and Skill Matched migrants on their job performance (the latter may qualify with functional English level). All in all, it
seems that difficulties with English did not have a major negative impact on the economic benefits delivered through the regional schemes to employers.

There is little information to assess economic benefits resulting from the application of other eligibility factors. This is the case of the work experience factor. High labour market participation rate of the SDAS migrants (DIMIA 2005b), and the fact that most were working in occupations at a similar skill level to prior to migration, and the average age of migrants (36-37 years old), suggest that the experience of SDAS migrants was typically longer than the minimum required six or twelve months (Table 2.3 in Chapter Two). Yet, it is not possible to establish at this stage how that period of work experience was reflected in the employers’ economic benefits. In the recent RSMS survey (DIMIA 2005a), employers were happy with the scheme and the reported earlier high percentage of principal applicants who used their qualifications in the job may suggest sufficient periods of that experience to deliver benefits expected by employers.

The economic impact of the retention factors may only be assessed to a limited extent. The significant proportion of SDAS migrants not staying in Designated Areas (Melbourne excepted) where their sponsoring family member lived indicates that the promoted family connection is not helping to support the economic development in regional areas. Although the survey (DIMIA 2005b) reveals that almost 90 per cent of principal applicants lived with their sponsors or lived in the same city/town at some point, the majority stayed for three months or less (56 per cent) and 20 per cent stayed between four and six months. In line with the concept of the scheme, 91 per cent of principal applicants reported assistance from their sponsors and 81 per cent of them rated it as very helpful (2005b:13). Despite the family presence and initial help, these were insufficient to retain some of those migrants in the Designated Areas and, in consequence, regional employers benefited much less than they could have had from settlement of these migrants.

Retention factors, such as the location of earlier established family members are formally less important in RSMS as the restricted settlement, guaranteed employment and visa cancellation provisions ensure economic benefits to employers. However, according to the first RSMS survey, migrants with relatives near by were more likely to intend to stay in their location rather than move (Cully and Goodes 2000:43). This
indicates that the family links may support retention and indirectly contribute to
delivery of economic benefits to employers in the 'regional or low population growth
areas'. In the latest survey (DIMIA 2005a:6), though the family connection was not a
prominent reason for the RSMS migrants to live in their current area/town (it may be
expected that the restrictions on settlement were). Contrasting evidence from the SDAS
and RSMS schemes does not imply any universally conclusive comments.

There were other retention factors in addition to family connections. The voluntary
assistance offered by employers to their RSMS migrants at the initial stage of settlement
was reported by 90 per cent of the surveyed principal applicants, and these respondents
reflected positively on this (DIMIA 2005a:8). Contrary to the Canadian provinces,
where such assistance is an essential retention instrument and is considered in the PN
nominations, the RSMS in Australia is governed by the visa cancellation provisions, and
hence its role is auxiliary.

In STNI, the range of retention factors is the broadest of all categories (see Subsection
2.5.1 in Chapter Two). However, two issues make evaluation of their impact
impossible. First, as noted, at the time of the interviews, limited information could only
have been obtained. Second, information from the regular STNI migrants' surveys (see
Subsection 2.5.3 in Chapter Two) remains the in-house knowledge of the sponsoring
governments. Considering that the STNI numbers are growing, it would be now useful
to know what factors, beside the occupation in demand in the relevant state and other
standard DIMIA requirements, play important roles in supporting the delivery of
economic benefits to employers and how they influence the migrants value in the
employers' eyes (for example previous employment or studies in Australia).

Canada. As in Australia, the impact of the nominee landings (Table 4.11) on the
provincial labour force growth is evaluated first. Table 4.20 features the total labour
force figures in the provinces and Table 4.21, using data from Tables 4.11 and 4.20,
shows the contribution of nominees to the provincial labour force growth. The imperfect
comparability of data makes the nominees' contribution indicative, rather than precise.

The Canadian landing data better illustrate the actual inflows of nominees than the visa
grants in Australia. Despite the general character of that data (concealing skilled and
business nominees and their dependants), it is preferred over fragmented provincial statistics. The dominance of the pre-arranged employment offer in the Canadian provinces makes the assumption that the nominees become employed immediately, in the year of landing, more credible.

For the purposes of the evaluation, it is assumed that the annual provincial inflows of nominees are entirely considered labour force. In reality, this assumption would need to be adjusted to account for the nominees’ children, if they are younger than the minimal labour force age and if the spouses do not join the labour force on landing. The contribution of the nominees to the labour force growth is considered from 2000 on, as this was the first year that landings were recorded for a number of provinces (five out of eight; Québec and Ontario landings are not included due to errors in records noted earlier). As in Australia, the nominees’ contribution to reducing the negative annual labour force growth is marked (Table 4.21).

Table 4.20 Total labour force by Canadian provinces 1999–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>1999 '000 b)</th>
<th>2000 '000</th>
<th>2001 '000</th>
<th>2002 '000</th>
<th>2003 '000</th>
<th>2004 '000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>3 663</td>
<td>3 717</td>
<td>3 772</td>
<td>3 907</td>
<td>3 990</td>
<td>4 027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>6 015</td>
<td>6 169</td>
<td>6 326</td>
<td>6 498</td>
<td>6 672</td>
<td>6 775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1 636</td>
<td>1 666</td>
<td>1 709</td>
<td>1 764</td>
<td>1 810</td>
<td>1 843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>2 064</td>
<td>2 079</td>
<td>2 082</td>
<td>2 143</td>
<td>2 190</td>
<td>2 219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a) Only full thousands are presented.
Source: Department of Finance Nova Scotia (DF NS) 2005.

36 Labour force in Canada is defined as civilian non-institutional population aged 15 and over that is employed or unemployed (Statistics Canada 2004c:11). Although the discussion here is formally placed under the title “skilled streams”, the inclusion of business nominees in the consideration of the nominees’ impact on the labour force growth is justified not only by the character of the data available. Business nominees are required under the provincial criteria to become active owners and/or managers of their businesses, while senior executives/managers must undertake duties of the positions they have been nominated for. Therefore, they are expected to become employed labour force. See definitions of ‘working owners’ in Statistics Canada (2004c:14). Not in the labour force are those who are neither employed nor unemployed (2004c:5).
Table 4.21 Percentage contribution of PNs to labour force growth in Canadian provinces 2000–2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>LFG a)</th>
<th>PNs contributio n to LFG</th>
<th>LFG</th>
<th>PNs contributio n to LFG</th>
<th>LFG</th>
<th>PNs contributio n to LFG</th>
<th>LFG</th>
<th>PNs contributio n to LFG</th>
<th>LFG</th>
<th>PNs contributio n to LFG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>-4 000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>17.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8 000</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>7 000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>7 000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>54 000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>55 000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>135 000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>83 000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>37 000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>154 000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>157 000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>172 000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>174 000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>103 000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>8 000</td>
<td>13.71%</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>32.40%</td>
<td>14 000</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>103.53%</td>
<td>8 000</td>
<td>50.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>-2 000</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>-11 000</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>8 000</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>7 000</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>8.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>30 000</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>43 000</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>55 000</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>46 000</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>33 000</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>15 000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>47 000</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>29 000</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) LFG - Labour Force Growth.
b) -- not applicable. In cells other than Québec (QC) and ON (Ontario) this reflects no contribution of PNs to the labour force growth due to no landings’ records. Despite PNs landings recorded in Québec and Ontario in all years presented here, they reflect errors in landing data and these nominees’ contribution to the labour force growth in these two provinces is not calculated. Contribution of Québec-selected migrants to the provincial labour force growth is discussed in the text below. c) Nominees joining the labour force did not offset the negative annual labour force growth but they reduced its decline. The value represents the percentage value of that reduction of the negative annual labour force growth.

Sources: Author’s calculations based on Tables 4.11 and 4.20.

Table 4.21 shows that in almost half of the cases (15) where PNs landed in the province (discussed are all provinces except Québec and Ontario), their contribution to the provincial labour force growth was below 1 per cent. In the remaining 17 cases, their contribution exceeded 1 per cent, but within that number, in eight cases the nominees’ contribution was below 5 per cent. If all cases with less than 1 per cent and below 5 per cent contribution were considered jointly, in 71.87 per cent of cases the nominees’ contribution would be lower than 5 per cent. This has been the case most often in the Atlantic provinces, Alberta and British Columbia. That level of contribution has not yet been sufficient to have any major impact on the levels of labour forces in these provinces.

These two Western provinces (with exception of British Columbia in 2001) have not seen lower absolute labour growth figures than 15,000, and the PNs seem to have only a marginal positive economic effect (mostly below 1 per cent). By contrast, in the
Atlantic provinces these absolute figures have been lower. If these provinces have been unable themselves to generate higher growth in their labour forces, considerably larger numbers of PNs could assist, provided that they are successfully retained in the province. The provincial labour force growth fluctuated in absolute levels, but only in Saskatchewan this involved negative labour force growth, where the nominees did not offset it.

The PNP, as in supporting the population growth, has proven to be most beneficial for Manitoba’s labour force, with nominees representing high percentages of its annual growth. Years 2003 and 2004 illustrate that care has to be taken due to the imperfect comparability of data, and that outcomes are an indicative, rather than precise, illustration of the nominees’ contribution. Under the low (3,000) annual labour force growth in 2003, and with the 2003 landings exceeding that figure, the nominees’ contribution exceeds 100 per cent. It is the second highest (50.6 per cent) in 2004 when the labour force growth jumped to 8,000 and more than 4,000 nominees landed.

In Québec, the labour force growth peaked in absolute terms in 2002 and since then has been decreasing. The contribution of the Québec-selected skilled and business migrants to the provincial labour force growth may be considered on the basis of their presence figures. The immigration data allow only to discuss the migrants’ contribution up to 2003, as the 2004 data could not be located in that format. Unlike when the population impact was discussed, here it is assumed that migrants who are present in a given year have landed and joined the labour force in that same year. This assumption aligns with the approach taken to other provinces discussed above. As earlier, that labour force participation may not be the case for all children or spouses.

37 The total labour force growth figures in Table 4.20 are reported from a provincial source using Statistics Canada data (available only on a fee basis). It may be expected that the figures represent, as in Australia, annual survey averages. This would explain the volatility of that growth.

38 Thanks to Manitoba’s precise statistics, it is possible to adjust these high contributions of nominees to the labour force growth. The adjustments are still based on assumptions but seem to better reflect the nominees’ role. In 2003, Manitoba welcomed 872 principal applicants (skilled), 1,913 of their dependants, 86 principal applicants (business) and 235 of their dependants (MLI 2005a:10). If all principal applicants were classified as labour force and so were 50 per cent of the skilled and business principal applicants’ dependants, that would result in a figure of 2,031. Under the 2003 labour force growth of 3,000, the nominees in that figure would represent 67.7 per cent, which would be still a considerable proportion. In 2004, 1,227 principal applicants (skilled) and 2,531 of their dependants landed in the province. Further, 86 principal applicants (business) and 204 of their dependants landed (2005a:10). The total figure calculated under the same assumptions as above is 2,680. Therefore, so adjusted nominees’ contribution to the 8,000 labour force growth would be 33.5 per cent.
There were 11,322 skilled and business migrants selected by Québec who landed in 2000 and were present in Québec during that year (calculations based on Table 3a in MICC QC 2005k:31). The labour force growth in 2000 was 54,000 (Table 4.21), hence these migrants represented 20.96 per cent of that growth. In the following year there were 15,769 migrants (calculations as above) and the labour force growth was 55,000. Therefore, these migrants contributed 28.67 per cent to growth levels.

In 2002, the labour force growth in 2002 was at its highest (135,000), and 17,968 migrants who landed in that year remained in the province (calculations as above). Although their number was only slightly higher than in the preceding year, the high labour force growth reduced their contribution to 13.30 per cent. That labour force growth decreased to 83,000 in 2003, while the number of present migrants rose to 18,681 (calculations as above). Consequently, migrants’ contribution to the labour force growth in 2003 returned to a higher 22.5 per cent. In each of these years that contribution came overwhelmingly from skilled migrants. The business migrants never represented more than 8 per cent of the migrants’ figures taken to represent their contribution to the labour force growth. Such outcomes show that the migration program has economically benefited Québec in similar ways to the PNP in Manitoba, but with more consistent patterns of contribution - often at around 20 per cent and higher.

It may be concluded that the economic impact of the provincial programs has so far been minimal for the majority of the Canadian provinces that is the Atlantic and the Western ones (except Manitoba). In Australia, fluctuations in the migrants’ contribution to the labour force growth, resulting from volatility of the absolute labour force growth figures (including frequent negative growth figures) were reasons why the migrants have not had any consistent and considerable economic impact or these figures to date. In Canada, it seems that the reason for the minimal economic impact has been less attributable to annual fluctuations in the absolute provincial labour growth figures than to the lower absolute numbers of the nominees, in comparison to the figures recorded by Australia. The contribution of less than 5 per cent in more than 70 per cent of cases suggests that the nominees’ role in supporting the annual labour force growth at the macro scale of the provinces has so far been marginal.
Manitoba and Québec constitute exceptions. In Québec, where these migrants have represented usually above 20 per cent of the annual growth, these individuals have had a consistent and considerable impact. In Manitoba, that impact has been also considerable, but the nominees’ contribution has been somewhat less consistent.

The demographic realities of the provincial economies (such as fiscal concerns or inability to replace the retiring workforce) illustrated by quotations from the selected Canadian provincial immigration strategies/discussion papers (see Section 1.7 in Chapter One), are among the motivation behind the immigration policies. The longer-term economic benefits may be obtained if the skilled nominees are young and therefore able to stay employed and pay taxes for longer. On the other hand, the pre-arranged employment offer guarantees that even the oldest nominees join the employed labour force and begin to contribute immediately.

Relevant information comes from only from a few provinces but it nonetheless indicates that the majority of the nominees are indeed young. A senior Albertan government official noted that many nominees had children of school age. This suggests that they should be in the demographic profile that is best able to meet the economic objective of the policy. On the other hand, their recent numbers in Alberta (178 in 2003 and 425 in 2005) are too low to have any noticeable impact on the age structure of the labour force, which in each of these years had more than 1.8m people (DF NS 2005:n.p.). According to the 2001 Census (Statistics Canada 2002b:16), Alberta has experienced (1996-2001) strong economic expansion and a growing labour market, which has attracted the largest net interprovincial inflow of migrants. More than one-third of them were aged 15-29 (87,700). Even if the nominees’ figures rise but the young interprovincial migration continues at a similar level, it seems more capable to influence the provincial labour force age structure, rather than the nominees.

From early days of the PNP in Manitoba, the nominees were predominantly young: 41.9 per cent were 25-44 years old, 12.2 per cent were aged 15-24 (these two age groups represented 54.1 per cent) while children aged less than 15 years represented 42.2 per

---

39 Interview took place on 22 March 2003.
40 Driven by existing and expected skill shortages, Alberta’s immigration policy involves indeed increasing the number of nominees, as one of the measures to increase the total number of migrants landing in the province (Government of Alberta 2005:3-4,8).
cent. PNs aged 45-64 represented only 3.8 per cent and no nominees older than 65 were shown (ProLogica Research Inc. 2001:18). In 2003 and 2004, the nominees continued to display a younger demographic profile and many had young families (MLI 2004b:19; 2005a:23). If similar age distribution continued under the growing annual landings from 2002 to 2004, and if it was assumed, for simplicity, that all these individuals joined the labour force in the year of landing, and retention were 100 per cent, they would represent 20.88 per cent of the total labour force growth between 2001 and 2004 (a change of 24,500). The assumption regarding the participation of the entire cohort of nominees may need to be revised to account for spouses not joining the labour force immediately. Furthermore, the 2001 Census reports that a high proportion of older individuals participated in the provincial labour force (see Subsection I.3.3 in Appendix I). It seems that a much higher proportion of nominees aged 25-44 in each annual cohort would be required to influence the age structure of the provincial labour force (counting 608,200 in 2004, DF NS 2005:n.p.).

All immigrants admitted into Québec between 1994 and 2003, and who were present in the province in 2005, displayed favourable demographic profile. Table 4.22 compares their age distribution (migrants aged 15 and over at the time of landing) with the age distribution of the Québec’s labour force during the same period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.22 Migrant and Québec local labour force percentage age distribution 1994–2003.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants % distribution&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec local population % distribution&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

b) Calculations are based on annual average percentage distribution of individuals by age group, in 1994-2003, reported by Institut de la Statistique Québec (IS QC) 2005.
Sources: Institut de la Statistique Québec (IS QC) 2005; MICC QC 2005k.

Table 4.22 shows a generally favourable age distribution among migrants in comparison to Québec’s own labour force. It may be observed that there was a much higher proportion of individuals aged 25-34 among migrants than among the Québec local

<sup>41</sup> An assumption is made that in each annual cohort around 40 per cent would be aged 25-44 to the result of around 850 in 2002; 1,767 in 2003 and 2,499 in 2004. Their accumulated figure from these years would be 5,116 (calculations based on MLI 2005a:10).
<sup>42</sup> Calculations based on DF NS 2005:n.p.
<sup>43</sup> Outcomes reported are indicative only due to the fact that migrants in each of these years would normally be calculated into the provincial labour force.
labour force. That means that migrants may potentially expand the 25-34 year olds group. Yet, Québec demographic realities such as highest median age at Canada’s scale and a high average age of the labour force make it a difficult task (see Subsection I.3.3 in Appendix I). Québec immigration policy’s objectives for 2005-07 contain an increase in total numbers of admissions as well as an increase in numbers and proportion of young people [that will participate in the labour market] and young families (MRCI QC 2004c:2). These objectives indicate that the migrants’ contribution to improving the age structure of the provincial labour force continues to be targeted.

Details of the age distribution of nominees were unavailable from other provinces. The above discussion was based (except Québec) only on skilled streams. Although this is a restricted basis for assessment, it may be reasonably expected that the low relative numbers of nominees in general so far have not had any major impact on the age structure of the provincial labour forces. It may be also expected, for the same reasons as in Australia, that the fiscal effects of the provincial programs would have a lesser effect on the provincial budgets than on the federal budget.

In sum, at the macro level of the provinces, so far the favourable age profile of provincial migrants seems to be insufficient or minimal at best, to affect the age distribution of their labour forces. Reasons involved low numbers of nominees versus young age of considerable volumes of interprovincial migrants or joining labour forces with considerable proportions of older individuals. This brings the Canadian provincial outcomes close to the impact of the regional migrants in Australia, claimed insufficient to influence in any major way the employed labour force age structure.

The dominant core eligibility factor under the PNPs is the pre-arranged employment aiming at guaranteeing similar results to the eligibility factors in Australia. From the employer/organisation’s perspective, the PNPs are meeting their economic objectives by bringing individuals who are employed in their nominated occupations, where the employers have identified a skilled shortage. This is the policies’ success. Due to the fact that the recorded number of landings include dependants (Table 4.11), at best, around one-third of the nominees become immediately employed. That means that this success is achieved (initially) at a small scale. A nominee filling a skilled shortage has an immediate and positive impact on the employing organisation. Depending on the
business type and services provided (for example, health services), such impact may be felt in the adjacent area.

Some illustrations of the small-scale economic effects of the provincial programs are found in “success stories” published on programs’ websites. For example, a medical technologist whose qualifications and presence were much needed in a regional location in British Columbia, was assisted in pursuing the onshore status conversion to a nominee by a keen employer who was unable to find a suitably skilled person from within the country to ensure continued services delivery (see link from MCAWS BC n.d.g). This illustrates how qualifications were employed in a nominated occupation. The benefit of getting an experienced professional with specialised skills in demand was augmented by the fact that this occurred in a regional area, which altogether is a quality result.

That program operates on the basis of annual targets. In 2003-04, that target (250 positions) was narrowly missed (MCAWS BC 2004a:47) and in 2004-05 (300 positions) - exceeded (2005a:61). In both years, surveyed employers and nominees exceeded anticipated levels of satisfaction with the program (as per annual evaluation surveys) (2004a:47; 2005a:61,62). This is good evidence that the program delivers on its objectives. Industry sectors, where nominees obtained employment included aerospace, education and high technology (2005a:47). This suggests that the program’s aim of delivering substantial gains to the economy and the preferred skills transfers to the provincial workforce (MCAWS BC n.d.o:1) are occurring, particularly in these industries. Since British Columbia is one of the most demanding provinces in terms of the nominees’ economic contribution (see Table 2.4 in Chapter Two), it may be reasonably expected that these nominees use their qualifications in the most relevant occupational settings; that is, they work in their nominated occupations.

Another illustration of an economic benefit, where nominees are employed in specialised positions for which workers were unavailable in Canada, comes from Saskatchewan. This example comes from an exporting company, which suggests that the nominees’ employment may contribute to some larger-scale operation (DGR SK 2005g:6-7). Furthermore, in line with the targeted industries such as health, agricultural trades and manufacturing trades (DGRAA SK 2004a:22), individuals (principal
applicants) in such occupations were nominated by Saskatchewan in 2003-04. Yet, numbers were low ranging in trades occupations (from 3-15), 34 in onshore status changes and 69 nominations in health professions (see link from DGRAA SK 2004b). These nominees will meet the employers’ immediate needs by bringing their specialised skills to the nominated positions, but given their numbers, their economic impact will likely remain at a small scale. Since early 2005, greater economic benefits have been targeted by Saskatchewan, which has considerably expanded the number of jobs for which nominations can be made (DGR SK 2005g:2-3).

The survey of the Manitoba nominees (ProLogica Research Inc. 2001) found that overall they had almost an identical employment rate to the Manitoba population aged 15-64 (71.5 per cent - Manitoba and 71.0 per cent - nominees). Moreover, 70 per cent of nominees were qualified to work in high demand occupations (at that time Manitoba maintained a list of specific occupations in high demand), and at least 59 per cent of principal applicants were indeed working in such occupations (2001:28,41). This confirms that the program has been largely successful in bringing people who had good employment rates and whose qualifications were being applied in positions requiring these skills and in high demand. In other words, the policy has delivered quality results. Yet, as in other provinces, the impact of nominees filling skilled shortages would be felt mostly by the employers, and hence on a small scale.44 Recent statistics indicate that under the current arrangements, Manitoba receives principal applicants in managerial, professional, trades and lower-skilled (transport and processing and manufacturing) occupations (MLI 2005a:21). This reflects its open approach to determining the skill levels, as discussed in Chapter Two (Subsection 2.3.2).

Given Québec’s dispersal efforts, their economic benefits may be considered in a regional context. As noted earlier, Estrie region receives between 14.6 - 14.9 per cent of migrants settling outside Montréal. Adding up the earlier calculated figures of migrants settling in Estrie from 2001, 2002 and 2003 admissions (see Subsection 4.1.2) gives a total figure of 2,261. On the other hand, among migrants who settled in Estrie between 1994-2003 and were living there in January 2005, were 2,768 refugees, 843 family-

44 It is likely that the employment of health professionals recruited under the programs in Manitoba and Québec, reported to be working in regions (see Subsection 3.5.2 in Chapter Three), had an immediate effect on the employing organisations. Their employment may positively influence the services’ delivery to the adjacent areas, yet at the macro level of the provinces the overall economic impact may be limited.
linked migrants and 1,611 economic migrants (MICC QC 2005k:40). Clearly, the latter are less visible than the former two groups taken together. If in the recent inflow of 2,261 skilled migrants are also in minority and they obtain employment, its economic effect will be positive for the company but this will likely not have any major economic effect at a regional scale. It is estimated that there will be around 26,500 positions available in Estrie between 2003-07 (MICC QC 2005e:10).

It may be concluded that the Canadian programs respond to the employers’ skills shortages like the Australian schemes do, and that the pre-arranged employment offer eligibility factor similarly enables addressing to the economic objective of their respective policies. That positive policies’ impact has so far only been felt on a small scale that is by employers. That small scale effect of the policies, as in Australia, is one of quality. The pre-arranged employment offer approach ensures that the provincial employers benefit from the application of the nominees’ qualifications in the positions they had had difficulty filling. The nominated individuals fill in critical shortages and skills transfers have likely occurred. It may also be expected that the employment rates are high. Yet, the overall small numbers of nominees, as in Australia, contain these economic benefits to the organisations/companies involved.

Overall, at the macro level of the provinces, the nominees’ contribution to their annual labour force growth (except Québec), and their impact on the provincial labour forces’ age distribution has been minimal to date. In combination with the small scale, quality economic impact contained to the enterprises concerned, these outcomes suggest that the economic motivation of the regionalisation policy noted in Chapter One (Section 1.7), focusing “on the size and quality of the labour force as a prerequisite for economic development”, has not yet been successfully assisted by the provincial programs. Hence, the Canadian evidence supports one of the proposed hypotheses that the flows that have taken place have not yet had any powerful impact on the provincial economic prosperity and sustainability.

There is limited information allowing for an assessment of the English/French language ability of the provincial migrants on the economic benefits. Typically, the employer determines the language level that the nominee should have to work in their position. Since governments report no issues in that regard, it may be assumed that they are
minor or non-existent, and may be solved without hampering the economic benefits brought by the nominees. Some issues may exist though for individuals who are accepted as independent provincial migrants.

Language barriers may delay the filling in of gaps in skilled areas. For example, a community-sponsored couple of Manitoba nominees was intending to take courses to improve their workplace English and they were looking for work (WebImmigration.Com 2004c:1,2). The ProLogica Research Inc. (2001) survey, which revealed high employment rates, found nonetheless that lack of reading/writing and verbal English skills were perceived by the nominees as barriers to finding employment (2001:32). These difficulties were not equal to being unemployed and were believed by the survey’s authors represent dissatisfaction with current employment positions, rather than inability to find employment (2001:34,35). More than 80 per cent of nominees who have lived in Manitoba for longer than a year have taken English classes, but there was a high correlation between reporting difficulties in finding employment and reporting unemployment and taking language classes. The authors suggested that this could be a result of the employment search experience, as well as an indication that the unemployed were taking advantage of the opportunity to improve their language skills (2001:44-5).

There was no uniform explanation of the fact that the community-recommended nominees (almost all lived in regions at the time of the survey) reported more employment difficulties than others (ProLogica Research Inc. 2001:34), and that those least likely to be proficient in English were more likely to be community-linked (2001:45). While a vast majority of principal applicants recommended by communities was employed (2001:33), the language issues suggest that they may slow down the labour market integration, or perhaps result in initial employment below one’s qualifications. On the other hand, the community stakeholders’ support proved very valuable in the initial adjustment phase. Only 3 per cent of community-recommended nominees reported any adjustment problems, compared to 37 per cent who were not community-recommended (2001:48).

These examples illustrate how crucial the language ability is to meeting the policies’ economic objectives. Provincial programs intended to deliver immediate economic
benefits through an employment offer may not differ from the mainstream Canadian federal economic stream in that some of their skilled migrants may only be able to meet fully the economic expectations once the necessary language training has been completed. Hence, the observed quality economic impact on employers may need to be considered with more care. More detailed and multi-year data would be necessary to evaluate the initial ‘depreciation’ of the economic benefits resulting from poorer command of English/French.

In Australia, situations where language issues were preventing the SDAS migrants from working in their preferred occupations were incidental and understood to have only a minimally negative effect. This suggests that language issues pose fewer problems in Australia than in some Canadian provinces. On the other hand, the SDAS survey (DIMIA 2005b) did not include the proportion of migrants who arrived with functional English and upgraded it after arrival. In combination with the employment outcomes, that would help understand whether there was an ‘initial’ depreciation of the economic benefit. That could provide a platform for a comparison of outcomes with the Canadian provinces.

As in Australia, the economic impact of some eligibility factors could only evaluated to a limited extent. This is the case of the nominees’ work experience. Two contrasting, yet in no way conclusive, examples may be quoted. According to the quoted senior Albertan government official, the nominees were highly educated and possessed unique skills. They were earning more than the average Albertans, but no more than Albertans with similar skills and in similar positions. In Manitoba, the majority of principal applicants had four or more years of experience in their intended occupations, and the majority had post-secondary/university education (ProLogica Research Inc. 2001:15). Yet, despite their overall high employment rate, likely due to a lack of immediate and full recognition of skills, around one-third of nominees who have lived in the province for more than a year have undertaken additional training (2001:43-4). A study looking at the correlation among the work experience period, skills recognition and the character of the economic impact on the companies could address that knowledge gap.

Except for the evidence on the valuable role of the community stakeholders’ in easing the nominees’ adjustment in Manitoba under the community-driven immigration
initiatives, there are no other data that allow for an assessment of the impact of other retention factors. These are applied under all provincial streams and assessment of their impact would enhance an understanding of the programs' outcomes and would inform future policies' development. In Australia, where a comparable range of factors is considered under STNI, it is similarly not known at this stage how they affect the benefits obtained by employers.

Moreover, such Canadian-specific solutions as the support expected from individual employers, including retention and benefits plans and support provided by communities (see Subsection 2.5.1 in Chapter Two) could not be evaluated in terms of enhancing the retention, and, in consequence, the retention of skills. It is assumed that the governments deem that assistance to be beneficial to the nominees and supportive of the population and economic policies' objectives. The external stakeholders' engagement guaranteeing employment to community-nominated migrants was observed in Manitoba. In Québec, the engagement of such stakeholders to integrate migrants into the labour market was illustrated by Québec City and Estrie region, although no concrete examples of migrants taking up such employment were available (see Subsection 4.1.2).

In Chapter Two it was observed that the skills and work experience eligibility factors illustrated how regions were assisted to participate in the knowledge-based economy by broadening their access to learning and innovation – as per principles of the 'learning region' concept. It proposes that learning and innovation enable regions to become more competitive and better integrated into the modern knowledge-based economy. This subsection has confirmed that the Australian policy results in knowledge/practices transfer to local employees and that the employment of immigrants has a positive impact on the companies (both in RSMS in Australia). Such a transfer likely occurs also in British Columbia, where the satisfaction levels with the PNP performance exceeds expectations of employers and employees. This province also provides an example of a nominee enabling a continued service delivery in a regional location. Another example allowing speculations that nominees' employment may be enabling a company to be better internationally integrated comes from an exporting Saskatchewan firm.
While these eligibility factors seem indeed capable of supporting the learning and innovation processes, this evidence is yet insufficient to declare that the Australian and Canadian provincial policies have had a substantial or a major role in their regions becoming ‘learning regions’ (more competitive) and better internationally integrated. First, the overall evidence for these eligibility factors bringing results along the lines of the ‘learning region’ concept is scant in Australia and Canada. Second, as yet there are no decisive, comparative Australian and Canadian data on the impact of the work experience factor. Third, especially in Australia, these economic benefits are not always delivered in genuinely regional areas – a result of settlement preferences of some regional migrants.

To claim that the policies have rendered regions more competitive and have improved their integration into the modern knowledge-based economy, there would need to be strong and broad-based supporting evidence from several regions (and visa subclasses in Australia) in both countries. The Australian and Canadian policies have so far delivered these quality results to individual employers and by relatively small numbers of migrants - that is at a small scale.

It may be concluded that the ‘learning region’ concept provides a useful theoretical framework guiding regional development in which the regional migration policies may no doubt play a part. However, it is too early to declare that they represent powerful measures supporting the ‘learning regions’ and that they have delivered substantial results along the principles of this theoretical proposition. Better dispersal, other future adjustments of the policies delivering improved outcomes for regions, and their cumulative effects over a period of time may change that conclusion and deliver a fuller alignment of these schemes with this proposition. Future research could involve more surveys (including of other visa subclasses in Australia than RSMS and SDAS) looking at whether the regional migration policies assist, in which ways, and to what degree, in internationalisation of practices and markets of regional firms envisaged by the ‘learning region’ concept as the ultimate dimension of regional development. This would help understand and better plan for the role of regional migration policies in future regional development in Australia and Canada.
4.2.2 Business streams

State/territory sponsored business migration in Australia and business provincial migration in Canada numerically constitute minor components of the Australian and the Canadian dispersal schemes. This is illustrated by Table 4.1 in Australia. The Canadian federal statistics in Table 4.11 resist a detanglement of the precise number of business migrants, and, therefore, where available, the provincial data are used.

The discussion focuses on two principal categories: state/territory sponsored business owners and senior executives in Australia, as well as provincially nominated entrepreneurs in the Canadian provinces, since information on the BT and REBA migrants, state/territory sponsored investors, and Québec investors is lacking. Individuals in the two categories are expected to create a new business or purchase an existing firm and perform at a required level therein. That business performance is guaranteed by two core eligibility factors: a new capital investment (in Australia this is covered by the business and personal assets for the conduct/establishment of business)equity investment and the level of employment creation.45 These migrants’ economic contribution is considered from two perspectives in Australia and Canada. The macro perspective involves looking at their capital/equity investment in business as a proportion of the local capital investment, foreign (direct) investment and their contribution to the labour market through employment creation in states, territories and provinces (economic development through business migration). The other perspective is that of an individual job seeker, who is potentially benefited by new employment possibilities.

An evaluation of the economic impact of these eligibility factors and of the English/French language ability is determined by the availability and quality of data. Outcomes of application of the specific types of the economic contribution representing additional core eligibility factors may be better evaluated in Australia than in Canada. In the latter, only limited information about the manager/senior executive category could be located. On the other hand, regional dispersal and retention outcomes of business migrants is able to be discussed.

45 As in the preceding chapter, whenever the term ‘capital investment’ is used, it is in relation to Australia, while the term ‘equity investment’ refers to the Canadian provincial programs.
**Australia.** In 2003-04, 85 per cent of all provisional business migrants were sponsored by the states and territories (DIMIA 2004d:36). Available DIMIA data characterise the business migrants in general, but given the above proportion, it is assumed for the purposes of the evaluation here that DIMIA also characterises these sponsored migrants. Information obtained from interviews and found in state governments’ publications is also used. Available data permits a discussion on core eligibility factors: the average level of the capital investment, (either made, when migrants have engaged in business, or the expected level) as well as the observed level of employment creation. In reality, some adjustments would likely need to be made for the state/territory sponsored migrants, which is why the figures below should be seen as an indicative, rather than a precise, illustration of economic benefits. Eligibility factors such as business and personal assets for the conduct/establishment of business (for capital investment) and employment creation were noted in Chapter Three to be indications that the governments were operating the business schemes to increase the small business activities in their jurisdictions.

As one senior government official from Victoria mentioned, the DIMIA survey of business migrants (2001) who have been in Australia for three years revealed that on average they have brought in about AUD$ 677,000 and employed or created new positions for 4.3 individuals.46 According to a Western Australia departmental annual report referring to the same survey, the average business investment was AUD$ 370,000 (SBDC WA 2003:18). Commenting on the capital investment and employment levels, the official assumed that about 20 per cent of business migrants were responsible for 80 per cent of those outcomes. There would be a small number of migrants employing a large number of people and bringing in large amounts of money. In other words, he was suggesting that those figures may have been inflated by top performers. He surmised that a substantial investment into a sound commercial business proposition, bringing tangible economic outcome for the community, would come probably from about 20 per cent of the businesses.

DIMIA annual reports show similar capital investment and employment levels in the previous years, suggesting a longer-term trend. For example, results of a three-year survey reported by the 1996-97 edition (DIMIA 2004a) revealed that cumulative funds

---

46 Interview took place on 28 October 2003.
transferred by principal applicants averaged at AUD$ 1.5m and the average investment was AUD$ 510,000. Only 30 per cent of businesses had an annual turnover of AUD$ 1m or more. In 1997-98, the average investment in business was reported at AUD$ 730,000 and each new business (75 per cent of surveyed migrants established new businesses) employed on average five people. A recent figure provided by New South Wales, based on business plans submitted for sponsorship, indicates a lower level of fixed business investment - on average AUD$ 100,000 per migrant (DSRD NSW 2004a:99).

Higher turnovers achieved by only one-third of business migrants were highlighted in an assessment from late 1990s. Birrell (1998:7), who commented on the evaluation of the contribution of business migrants (arrived mostly 1994-95) prepared by Access Economics (which was commissioned by the Department), observed that the average annual turnover of AUD$ 545,000 comprised 42 per cent of those, whose turnover was below the AUD$ 100,000 mark, 16 per cent of those in the AUD$ 100,000-250,000 bracket, 12 per cent whose turnover was between AUD$ 250,000-500,000, and 31 per cent who had annual turnover of above AUD$ 500,000. It is likely that under the current state/territory sponsored migration high turnovers are also achieved by a small proportion of businesses.

The differences shown between the amounts of money brought in and invested in business inhibit a precise statement of what the outcomes would be for state/territory sponsored business migrants. If they bring with them between AUD$ 677,000-1.5m and invest in business between AUD$ 370,000 (100,000) -730,000 (lower figures come from the most recent records, which may suggest that business migrants now bring and invest less than in previous years), that leads to a conclusion that they satisfy the applied eligibility factors, which, in turn, addresses the governments’ objective of expanding the small business operations.

The observed level of employment creation may be corrected. That business migrants were often getting into small business was noted in interviews. The senior Victorian
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47 See Part 2, Program 2, Sub-program 2.1 in DIMIA 2004a.
48 See Part 2, Program 1, Sub-program 1.3 in DIMIA 2004b.
49 This was observed by the senior Victorian official on 6 November 2003 and a DIMIA officer on 18 November 2003.
government official referred to previously and another state government official mentioned a lower level of employment creation than the 4.3 jobs established in the DIMIA 2001 survey. They referred to one to two jobs being created, which would suggest that migrants would be just satisfying the one employee eligibility factor applied to the sponsored residence visa applicants. New South Wales estimated that each sponsored business migrant created 3.5 new full-time jobs (DSRD NSW 2004a:99). This may suggest that the 4.3 figure of employment creation reported by DIMIA may include the migrants themselves. The Victorian government official noted that the term ‘small business’ denominates a commercial operation employing fewer than 200 people and so employing the quoted numbers was actually a microbusiness. Regardless of the name, and assuming that numbers lie somewhere between one and four employees, this supports the observation about the small scale business operations.

Most recently, in 2002-03 and 2003-04, Western Australia has been the top destination for the sponsored business migrants (Table 4.5). Data on the level of these migrants’ capital investment that benefits states and territories are fragmented. Some indicative figures of investment expected by the states from these migrants are available from state governments’ annual reports. Up to June 2003, Western Australia reported 38 approved sponsorships and estimated that these applicants could inject around AUD$ 48.3m into the state economy over two years, provided visas were taken up (SBDC WA 2003:18). As a result of 306 reported sponsorships in 2003-04, Western Australia expected a capital inflow of more than AUD$ 390m into the economy over the next three years. Total investment in business was expected to be more than AUD$ 177m, more than 1,100 new jobs were expected and regional economy was expected to benefit from AUD$ 60m worth of investment (it may be understood that all these benefits were also expected over the course of three years) (SBDC WA 2004:15). New South Wales expected to sponsor 200 business migrants over 2004-05 and benefit from AUD$ 20m in business fixed investment and the generation of 700 new jobs (DSRD NSW 2004a:99). Differences in investment capital levels’ reported by these states suggest that the economic impact of sponsored business migration varies among jurisdictions.

50 Senior official from the Queensland government on 12 December 2003.
51 To maintain consistency with the Canadian provincial business migration outcomes reported later, it is assumed that the figures of investment in business reported in Australia denominate investment financed by migrants themselves (equity investment). Once migrants arrive, they may seek a business loan, but this is nowhere separately talked about.
To see the magnitude of the state/territory sponsored business migrants’ contribution to investment expansion at the macro level of a jurisdiction, the level of their aggregate investment may be compared with the level of (local) investment in the states. It is assumed that as a result of the 2003-04 sponsorships Western Australia sees one-third of the expected AUD$ 177m invested in business (it is assumed that in each one of the three years the same proportion of the total sum is invested - AUD$ 59m) and New South Wales benefits from the AUD$ 20m fixed business investment (expected to be generated as a result of the 2004-05 sponsorships).

Such annual outcomes seem low in comparison to the 2003-04 new capital expenditure in each of these states. According to ABS (data on request in DSRD NSW n.d.a), in Western Australia that expenditure totalled AUD$ 8.917b and in New South Wales AUD$ 14.371b. Thus, the AUD$ 59m invested in business on an annual basis in Western Australia would represent 0.66 per cent of the new capital expenditure in the state, assuming that it stays at that level in each one of these next three years. Since the migrants’ capital investment in business may not be evenly distributed across that period and the new capital expenditure at the state level may vary in reality, that result only broadly indicates the migrants’ contribution to the investment expansion. Under identical assumption, in New South Wales the expected AUD$ 20m in fixed business investment would represent 0.13 per cent of the local capital expenditure.

Investment in business made by the sponsored business migrants may also be presented as a share of foreign direct investment flowing into Australian jurisdictions. Two assumptions need to be made. If Western Australia is taken as an example, firstly, it is assumed that the AUD$ 59m is invested in business on an annual basis (as earlier, the total sum of AUD$ 177m that the state expects to benefit from over the course of three years is taken to be equally distributed among all three years). Secondly, it is assumed that the level of foreign direct investment in that state reported for 2003-04 to be at AUD$ 10.82b (Foreign Investment Review Board (FIRB) 2005:28) continues unchanged for each one of the next three years. Under such circumstances, the migrants’ investment in business would represent only a 0.54 per cent share of the foreign direct investment. In reality, that outcome may need to be revised as both the annual level of migrants’ investment in business and the annual inflow of foreign direct investment may change over the three-year period.
Under similar assumptions in New South Wales, if the 2004-05 sponsorship round results, as expected, in AUD$ 20m in fixed business investment (assumed here to materialise in 2005-06) and the foreign direct investment, which in 2003-04 was AUD$ 11.39b (FIRB 2005:28) stays at that level during 2005-06, that would mean a 0.17 per cent contribution of state sponsored business migrants. The values from Western Australia and New South Wales indicate a minimal impact of the investment made by state/territory sponsored business migrants in the context of the foreign direct investment at the macro scale of a jurisdiction.

Employment creation is another core eligibility factor that the business migrants must satisfy, as per DIMIA criteria. It is considered in the context of the total labour force in the Australian jurisdictions. The number of jobs expected to be created are available from Western Australia and New South Wales. This is a limited basis for showing the magnitude of these migrants’ contribution and the conclusion may only be broad as the actual outcomes from other jurisdictions could be slightly different.

Western Australia’s total labour force was 1.0317m in 2003-04 (ABS 2005b:166). As a result of the 2003-04 sponsorships, that state was expecting 1,100 new jobs. If that total figure is evenly distributed across the three-year reference period, that translates into approximately 366 jobs annually. Discussed fluctuations in the labour force growth do not allow determining with precision what that labour force size would be in Western Australia in each one of these three years. If it remains around the level at 2003-04, the 366 new positions created every year would constitute approximately 0.03 per cent of it. If unemployment stayed at the 2003-04 level (59,000 in 2003-04; 2005b:166), the 366 new positions would improve it by around 0.62 per cent annually. None of these proportions represent a major contribution to the labour market at the state level.

Based on similar assumptions as above, the expected creation of 700 jobs in New South Wales following the 2004-05 sponsorship round would constitute annually a tiny 0.02 per cent of the state’s total labour force counting in 2003-04 3.3556m people (ABS 2005b:166). The 700 new positions would improve the unemployment level (186,500 in 2003-04; ABS 2005b:166) by 0.37 per cent annually. None of these contributions are going to have a major impact on the labour market at the state level. At the same time these created positions in any jurisdiction matter for the local job seekers. Thus,
business migrants would be contributing to improving the situation at a small scale; that is, for the individuals who would secure such jobs. Beyond that positive small scale economic effect, at the macro level of the states and territories, the migrants' capacity to boost local capital investment, contribute to foreign direct investment, and support employment creation has overall been minimal.

The six specific types of the economic contribution represented additional core eligibility factors. Their economic impact may be characterised to a limited extent. Interviews have revealed that in many cases business migrants were engaged in services or small-scale production. Two business operations mentioned most often by the interviewed government officials Australia-wide were running a restaurant and/or a coffee shop.\footnote{These officials were: a senior Tasmanian government official on 5 November 2003; the senior Victorian government official on 6 November 2003; a Western Australia government official on 13 November 2003; a DIMIA officer on 18 November 2003 and a Queensland government official on 20 November 2003.} Other mentioned operations included farming, tourism services and production combined with trading (for example, garden or building products; production of health products; food producing business; aromatherapy production based on local teatree oil; honey manufacturing and export; toys manufacturing and export; and wood processing plant and export). Such examples provided by the interviewees support the observation made in Chapter Three (Subsection 3.3.3) about the universal (in comparison to Canada) character of the expected economic benefits.

Activities where export is involved (it is one of the specific types of economic contribution) may potentially deliver some economic benefits, especially if migrants use local materials and establish or strengthen links with the overseas markets. Export activities were in fact the only ones mentioned often enough to expect that this form of contribution was often delivered. Export activities were also mentioned by Western Australia and New South Wales as expected benefits from sponsoring business migrants. Western Australia expected one-third of its sponsored migrants (of 356 granted sponsorship in 2004) to become engaged in export (SBDC WA 2005:1,2). New South Wales hoped to see (as per its Annual Report 2003-04), over a five-year period, AUD$ 116m generated by the 200 migrants it expected to sponsor in 2004-05. This translates into an average AUD$ 580,000 per each business migrant (DSRD NSW 2004a:99). Export activities were highlighted by two quoted DIMIA (DIMA) annual reports. The 1996-97 edition reported that 76 per cent of business migrants at the end of
their three-year period were exporting; that share dropped to 63 per cent as shown in the 1997-98 edition. On the other hand, the business migrants’ small firms were reported to have a better rate of exporting than the Australian firms of similar size (Chapman and Withers 2001:260).

That evidence on export activity, services and various types of small-scale production does not mean that the sponsored business migrants do not run larger operations employing more people, offer products not previously available, use new technologies or serve a considerable market, but at no occasion were they mentioned by the interviewees. The lack of data does not allow to comment on the extent of other types of expected economic contribution, such as use of innovative technologies or improving competitiveness of the Australian economy sectors.

There is limited information to assess the economic consequences of the English language ability eligibility factor. As noted in Chapter Three (Subsection 3.3.1), there seemed to be a perception that a sponsored business migrant could afford to hire a local resident with native language skills. The language ability is generally given less weight under the business schemes in comparison to the programs’ requirements for skilled migrants but more specific data that would permit discussion on the economic impact of such lower English language skills is lacking.

The second type of analysis involves assessing - data permitting - the success in addressing the dispersal and retention policy objective Chapter One (Section 1.7) notes that the policy intends to “attract overseas business people to establish new or joint ventures in their [states’ and territories’] regions”. In other words,

State/Territory government sponsorship is available for each visa category, so that states and territories can attract the kinds of business people they are seeking to assist in the economic development of specific areas. In particular, Australia is actively encouraging Business Skills entrants to set up businesses in regional, rural or low growth areas of Australia (DIMIA 2004n:41).

The interviews paint a picture of poor dispersal rates. Chapter Three (Subsection 3.3.3) notes that regional business location or additional criteria for capital city business location were a customised type of specific economic contribution targeted by some

53 See Part 2, Program 2, Sub-program 2.1 in DIMIA 2004a (1996-97) and Part 2, Program 1, Sub program 1.3 in 2004b (1997-98).
jurisdictions, in line with the policy principle. There was however only encouragement to settle in regions. The consequences were the following. In Western Australia, it was estimated that less than ten percent of applicants relocating to the state were deciding upon a non-capital city location.54 In Victoria, the few exceptions were farmers locating in regions.55 In Queensland, the majority of business people were noted to be going to large cities not regions.56 Only in Tasmania the sponsored business migrants were located across the state.57 The non-regional settlement diminishes the targeted economic development of the regions.

In the opinion of two quoted state governments officials, such low dispersal levels resulted from a lack of genuine business opportunities and infrastructure in regions, as well as from a lack of critical mass to support most business ventures. In consequence, as one of them noted, the economic impact of the state/territory sponsored business migration on the regional labour market was going to be minimal. A similar opinion of a small impact of regional business migration on regional labour market was expressed by another quoted senior government official.

Such settlement preferences of business migrants indicate three things. First, the customised criteria applicable to settlement and establishing of businesses in capital cities seem generally easy to meet, while at the same time other concessional criteria apply. Second, the majority of sponsored migrants are no different from other groups in heading to capital cities. The infrastructure, the business opportunities and the critical mass to support their businesses are likely the decisive factors. Third, their business, although it diversifies the local economy, may only have a marginal relative economic effect on capital cities, while at the same time the regional, rural and low growth areas - the preferred settlement destinations - seem to often benefit less. The observed poor dispersal outcomes fail to sufficiently address the policy objective recalled above.

In other words, the bulk of the capital investment and employment creation benefits cities like Perth or Melbourne rather than regions. It seems that only Tasmania is

54 As noted by a senior Western Australia government official on 4 December 2003. More recently, 20 per cent of approved migrants for sponsorship intended to locate in regions (SBDC WA 2005:2).
55 Observed by the senior Victorian government official on 28 October 2003.
56 Noted by the senior Queensland government official on 12 December 2003.
57 According to the senior Tasmanian government official on 5 November 2003 and on 13 January 2004.
somewhat different with migrants tending to disperse across the island, and thus also dispersing the investment and other benefits. Large numbers of such migrants would be needed for a major economic impact to occur.

On the other hand, the retention rates of those who had established businesses in regional Western Australia in the four years leading to 2003 were reported by the senior state government official to be 100 per cent; most of these migrants also intended to retire there. In general, it is likely that the retention rates under the 2003 two-stage visa arrangements are high. After all, if state/territory sponsored migrants prefer capital cities, retention should not be a problem.

It can be argued that the new two-stage visa arrangements and active state sponsorship including dispersal measures and support services have only been around for two years, and that this period is too short to deliver results. While this is true, there is an underlying challenge more difficult to overcome in successful dispersal: the observed lack of genuine business opportunities, infrastructure and critical population mass in regions. If dispersal of business migrants is a serious policy objective then the infrastructure should be improved. This may encourage general population retention and/or increase and expand the serviceable market, which in turn could present some opportunities for the targeted business migrants. Under currently limited business opportunities, only those genuinely longer-term and viable should be communicated to potential business migrants. Information about seasonal cycles affecting the business (if applicable), market size, particular needs of a regional population to be served by a migrant’s business (if relevant), and available government support services should be included to help the migrants make an informed choice. Exploratory visits, assisted if possible, should be also promoted.

In sum, the state/territory sponsored business migration has been characterised by low numbers of migrants who have so far minimally dispersed. At the macro level of states/territories, their economic impact has been minimal, and the positive effect of their business activities has been a small scale phenomenon, confined to individual job seekers who would obtain positions with them. That confirms one of the proposed hypotheses that the flows that have taken place have not yet had a powerful impact on the economic prosperity and sustainability of the Australian jurisdictions.
Canada. As in Australia, the Canadian data regarding impact of the business provincial streams on the economic prosperity and sustainability are incomplete, which compromises a full evaluation of that impact. The economic outcomes of the entrepreneur provincial streams may be discussed to a greater extent than those of the senior executive/manager category. Evaluation of the entrepreneur streams involves looking first at two core eligibility factors: the level of equity investment in business and the employment creation/maintenance of employment. This evaluation uses examples of Manitoba and Prince Edward Island. Relevant data from some other provinces could not be located, they may not be complete, or some criteria (minimum equity investment) are not determined by the governments, as in Saskatchewan and New Brunswick. The examples used allow in turn a discussion of the impact of the entrepreneurs’ contribution at the macro level of the provinces. Equity investment level criteria, where determined by the governments, and required levels of employment creation (see Table 3.5) are broadly similar to the Australian requirements (there is no annual business turnover requirement, which in Australia is one of the qualifying criteria for a residence visa that the Canadian nominees obtain in the first place). These eligibility factors were noted in Chapter Three (Subsection 3.3.2) as signs of the provincial governments’ interest in supporting their small business sectors through the business schemes.

In Manitoba the total expected initial cash investment and the expected level of employment has been on the rise. At 31 December 2002 there were 137 approvals and 403 new, full-time jobs were expected to be created. The initial cash investment into Manitoba’s economy amounted to CAD$ 44.21m (MLI 2003a:49). That means that on average each applicant would create approximately 2.9 new jobs for local residents and the individual cash investment would be around CAD$ 322,700. In the following year ending a: 31 March 2004, there were 392 approved applications, the candidates represented CAD$ 131,294,150 in initial cash investment and were expected to create 1,090 full-time jobs (2004a:52). Hence, on average each applicant would invest CAD$ 334,934 in cash and create almost 2.8 new jobs. Actual outcomes reported for the whole 2004 show a slightly different contribution: 86 business nominees invested on average CAD$ 366,652 and created 2.18 jobs (2005a:10). That brings their total equity
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58 Regardless whether the term ‘equity investment’ or ‘capital investment’ in business is used, it is taken that it represents the investment financed by migrants.

59 It is assumed that the investment figure represents the average nominees’ equity investment in business.
investment to CAD$ 31,532,072. In Prince Edward Island, in 2002-03, 7 entrepreneurs were nominated (DDT PE 2003:20). They are required to invest at least CAD$ 200,000 in business but the number of jobs to create is not determined.

To see how much the provincial entrepreneurs contribute to the business investment expansion at the macro level of the Canadian provinces, their aggregate investment may be compared to the aggregate local (provincial) investment. As in Australia, some assumptions are necessary because the above data are not perfectly comparable to the reference data. Therefore, the results show approximate and not precise magnitude of the economic contribution of provincial business migrants.

In Manitoba, the 2002 approvals were expected to inject into the provincial economy CAD$ 44.21m. It is assumed that all approved applicants landed in 2003 and the total expected amount was invested. Calculations based on Statistics Canada (2005c) figures showing capital expenditure (construction, machinery and equipment) by sector in Manitoba reveal that in 2003 that investment totalled CAD$ 4.8642b. The CAD$ 44.21m invested by Manitoba nominees (farmers are included, see note below) represents a minimal share of that total local expenditure (0.9 per cent). As shown above, in 2004 the nominees invested CAD$ 31,532,072. Calculations based on the same Statistics Canada document as above, and including the expenditure in agriculture, indicate that the total capital expenditure (construction, machinery and equipment; figures for 2004 are preliminary actual) was CAD$ 5.463875b. Therefore, the investment made by the nominees represents 0.57 per cent of the capital expenditure made locally.

Next, it is assumed that all 7 entrepreneurs (2002-03) nominated by Prince Edward Island landed in 2004 and each of them invested the required minimum of CAD$ 200,000. In aggregate terms their investment represented CAD$ 1.4m. Calculations based on Statistics Canada (2005d) showing the capital expenditure in the province (construction, machinery and equipment; figures for 2004 are preliminary actual and to
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60 For compatibility with similar investment figures reported by ABS in Australia four sectors a) agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting; b) education; c) health care and social assistance and d) public administration) should be excluded. However, it is likely that the nominees' investment in Manitoba includes investment made by farmers (see Table 3.7 in Chapter Three). For that reason, it is assumed that provincial investment in agriculture constitutes 25 per cent of the total investment in agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting and its equivalent in dollars is calculated into the total investment figure used as a reference. The remaining sectors, as in Australia, are excluded from the total reference figure.
maintain compatibility with Australia four sectors are excluded) totalled CAD$ 557.5m. The economic contribution of these entrepreneurs is minimal (0.25 per cent), as in the aforementioned provinces.

The other provincial business category facilitates entry of managers/senior executives (names differ across provinces). Information enabling some limited assessment of the economic impact of that stream could be located for Prince Edward Island. There, the immigrant partner’s function involves investment. That stream may be potentially more beneficial than the entrepreneur stream. In 2002-03, 51 immigrant partners’ applications were approved (DDT PE 2003:20). Under assumption similar to the entrepreneur stream, that all nominees from 2002-03 made the required minimum investment of CAD$ 200,000 (in company shares), this would result in a total sum of CAD$ 10.2m. That is almost ten times higher than the total investment made by the entrepreneurs in the same year (both investments are not used in the same way). There were 103 applications for immigrant partners under consideration in 2002-03 (2003:20) and they would potentially mean at least CAD$ 20.6m in investment (in shares, as above). This may be the Island’s way of economic development and an interesting concept. Rather than risking a new enterprise (and perhaps a nominee getting discouraged and moving elsewhere), it may be perceived that the nominees’ financial means better serve the local economy if they are used to support the development of established local companies.

Although the total amount of equity investment in business may seem impressive in aggregate terms, as in Australia, once compared with the local (provincial) levels of the capital expenditures, that entrepreneurs’ equity investment does not represent any major contribution. Even if in reality the above assumptions needed revision, that contribution is likely to remain small. Therefore, it may be concluded that the nominees’ investment, although positive for the receiving provinces, has been minimal to date at the macro level of the provinces, as in Australia.

In symmetry with the Australia, the entrepreneurs’ equity investment in business may also be considered as a share of foreign investment flowing into the provinces. Best available figures from Canada refer to foreign investment in construction and machinery. Although this does not cover all aspects of foreign investment, it
nonetheless provides an indication of the magnitude of nominees’ share in it. Manitoba and Prince Edward Island are used as examples.

In Manitoba, as earlier assumed, the entire expected (2002) investment of CAD$ 44.21m was made in 2003. According to Statistics Canada (2005e:69), in 2003 the foreign investment in Manitoba totalled at CAD$ 1.2039b. That means that business nominees represented 3.67 per cent of it. In 2004, as calculated earlier on the basis of nominees’ average investment in business, their total investment in business reached CAD$ 31,532,072. In the same year, the total foreign investment in Manitoba dropped to CAD$ 1.0552b (2005e:69). Therefore, the nominees’ contribution represented 2.98 per cent of it. Such outcomes indicate minimal contribution at the macro level of the province.

In Prince Edward Island the absolute investment in business could be much smaller. As earlier assumed, the entrepreneurs’ investment in 2004 totalled CAD$ 1.4m. In the same year, foreign investment in the province reached CAD$ 66.3m (Statistics Canada 2005e:59). Therefore, the nominees’ contribution would represent 2.11 per cent of it. Barring some exceptional results that could not be established due to data limits at the provincial level, the evidence above shows that as in Australia, the business nominees’ investment represents a minimal proportion of the foreign investment at the macro level of the provinces.

Assessment of the economic impact of the employment creation on the Canadian provinces is limited in two ways. Firstly, not all governments determine the minimum level of employment required. Secondly, only Manitoba makes the relevant results available and therefore the discussion rests on the outcomes for that province. As in Australia, the employment creation outcomes are considered in the context of the total provincial labour force.

Manitoba reported that 86 principal business applicants landed in 2004 and each of them created on average 2.18 jobs (MLI 2005a:10). This indicates creation of a total of 187.4 jobs. In 2004 Manitoba’s total labour force stood at 608,200 (DF NS 2005:n.p.). This would make these nominees’ contribution to employment creation approximately a tiny 0.03 per cent of that labour force. In terms of unemployment in the province
(32,200 in 2004; 2005:n.p.), the nominees’ contribution would improve it by about 0.58 per cent. Given that evidence comes only from one province, this is a broad, indicative conclusion.

The level of employment targeted by the Canadian provincial governments ranges between five positions (Business Skills Category in British Columbia) to the employment at least for the principal applicant (New Brunswick). Such levels, and actual outcomes from Manitoba, allow a conclusion that the impact of the nominees’ employment creation is unlikely to deliver any major benefits at the macro level of a province. On the other hand, every new position created by the nominees will benefit the individual job seekers who may secure that employment. Hence, the nominees’ activities will have a positive economic impact at a small scale.

All in all, the fact that the Canadian provincial entrepreneurs do not contribute in any major way to the employment creation at the macro level of the provinces, and that employment they create benefits local job seekers, or in other words has a small scale positive effect, indicates that their economic contribution resembles that of the state/territory sponsored business migrants in Australia. Furthermore, the targeted and achieved employment level, as shown above, and the average level of equity investment made by individual nominees reported by Manitoba indicate that the nominees satisfy the eligibility factors set up. This in turns addresses the noted governments’ objective of developing the small business sector.

The additional core eligibility factors - the specific types of the economic contribution were stricter in the Canadian provinces than in Australia thanks to combining the priority/key industry lists, requirement of value-added activities and in some of them also the Australian-style enumeration of types of economic contribution. Any data available come from Manitoba. An interviewed senior Manitoba government official commented that the value-added business activities in Manitoba were undertaken in such targeted industries like processing (not further specified), information and telecommunication technology and farming (70 per cent).61 The remaining 30 per cent of nominees were engaged in services. No further details comparable to Australia, such as types of nominees’ businesses, were revealed.

61 Interview took place on 26 March 2003.
Although other nominating provinces know the preferences of their entrepreneurs in terms of industry sectors, value-added activities and where required, the Australian-style types of economic contribution, lack of comparable, relevant information from across the provinces prevents assessment and indication of any tendencies. Given the more demanding criteria than in Australia, it would be interesting to know what the outcomes of such approaches have been so far and how the nominees’ activities have benefited the jurisdictions concerned.

As in Australia, there is rather limited information regarding the English language eligibility factor, which compromises assessment of its economic impact. A similar opinion to the one heard in Australia, expressed by one of the provincial government officials, that entrepreneurs could afford hiring a Canadian with fluent language skills for their business, confirms that the language ability is given less weight than under the skilled streams. On the other hand, the Québec experience, although coming from a different category than the entrepreneur, demonstrates that poor language skills may diminish the expected economic benefits of business migration. Québec-selected investors are an example. Their required investment stays in the province but they move elsewhere, thus depriving Québec of other economic gains that would have resulted from their presence on the territory. Québec government recognises that the drift away is partially attributed to their poor French language skills. Rules of the investor category are going to be reviewed to increase the investors’ retention by giving greater importance to their knowledge of the French language (MRCI QC 2004b:29).

While in Australia dispersal of business migrants is an explicit policy objective, in Canada there is a modest push for the intraprovincial dispersal away from the major cities. Regionalisation is administered by the interested provincial governments. Formal dispersal measures built into the eligibility factors are differentiated levels of equity investment in British Columbia and Newfoundland and Labrador. In British Columbia between October 2003 and November 2004 there were 36 regional applicants approved (Zehr 2004:n.p.). It is not known what proportion of the overall business nominees they

---

62 Canadian studies on the Canadian federal business migration (samples drawn from East Asian entrepreneurs in Vancouver) found that most business migrants engaged in business activities not preferred under the program such as for example services or retail. See for example Froschauer (1998), and Ley (2000) and literature review therein.
constituted and how much they proposed to invest. Their number seems unlikely though to be able to have any meaningful economic impact on regional British Columbia.

In other parts of Canada, the majority of the provincial entrepreneurs seemingly preferred major cities to regions. The Manitoban senior government official informed that around 15–20 per cent of the provincially nominated entrepreneurs were settling outside Winnipeg but there was no push for dispersal for fear of people failing. A Québec City city council officer and one senior Québec government official dealing with regional matters noted that business people generally preferred Montréal to other locations in Québec. Presence rates shown earlier indicate what proportion of Québec-selected business migrants eventually move to other provinces, thus potentially depriving the province of the expected economic benefits. It is not known how successful Newfoundland and Labrador has been so far in encouraging its entrepreneurs to use the lower investment threshold to set up businesses in regional areas.

The limited data on settlement preferences of the provincial entrepreneurs nonetheless suggest that as their counterparts in Australia, these migrants prefer capital or largest provincial cities. Detailed reasons were not discussed during the interviews but it is likely that as in Australia, the greater business opportunities in the largest metropolitan areas as opposed to regions, better access to infrastructure and critical population size to make the business viable are behind the flows’ direction. This would suggest that as in Australia the provincial business migration has had a minimal effect on the regional labour markets and has minimally supported its economic development as the bulk of their investment in business goes to large metropolitan areas. Nominees establishing their businesses there benefit the metropolitan populations, but the employment they create and the investment they make may only have a marginal relative economic effect. On the other hand, establishing businesses in such cities, except Vancouver and Montréal, is in accord with the policy understanding of ‘region’. If the Canadian provincial governments became interested in pursuing a more vigorous intraprovincial dispersal of business nominees, probably similar steps as in Australia would need to be taken.

63 They were interviewed on 21 March 2003 and on 1 April 2004, respectively.
The longer-term benefits from provincial business migration may only be delivered if migrants remain in these provinces. Except for the presence rates for the Québec-selected business categories, retention rates for the entrepreneurs elsewhere are not known. It may be expected that they are good in British Columbia that has adopted a two-stage performance linked approach as in Australia. Retention depends on the loyalty of the nominees to the nominating province, but some of them seek to enhance it by requiring a cash deposit. The deposit is released once the business is operational.

Moving from one province to another after being nominated, and in some cases also forfeiting that deposit was considered in Chapter Three (Subsection 3.3.2) a scope for reduced effectiveness of the provincial business schemes. This drift away from the selecting province was shown in Québec, although this province does not require a deposit. As speculated in Chapter Three, the deposit could be used as an easy passage into Canada, for example for the Newfoundland and Labrador's entrepreneurs. Its deposit is fairly low while the required net assets are high in comparison to other provinces. Less than half of nominees who landed in that province were believed to have stayed (Goss Gilroy Inc.2005:20). If provincially nominated entrepreneurs were among them, this could suggest that cash deposits are indeed used as a way to get into Canada. Yet, there is no sufficient evidence to assess the effectiveness of that measure on increasing the economic benefits to the provinces.

All in all, the Canadian provincial business migration shares many characteristics with the corresponding Australian outcomes. The numbers involved have been similarly low and the economic impact of the nominees has also been found to be minimal at the macro level of the provinces. The positive economic impact of the nominees' activities has been found to be similarly a small scale phenomenon involving individual job seekers who would obtain such employment. Although not a specific policy objective, the intraprovincial dispersal has also been low. Therefore, the Canadian experience allows confirming, as in Australia, the hypothesis proposing that the flows that have taken place have not yet had a powerful impact on the economic prosperity and sustainability of the Canadian jurisdictions.

It was noted in Chapter Two that the additional core eligibility factors (specific types of economic contribution) in Australia and the corresponding set of eligibility factors in
the Canadian provinces for business migrants were practical applications of support for economic development in states/territories/provinces and their regions. They were intended to improve/broaden their access to international practices and markets through learning and innovation. These support achieving competitiveness, enabling regions to participate in the modern knowledge-based economy. This is the ultimate dimension of regional development.

Outcomes available for a limited number of schemes (especially in Australia, where outcomes from REBA and BT visas could not be located at the time of writing), yield weak evidence that the specific types of the economic contribution have been delivered. In Australia only one type of that contribution was mentioned frequently enough to claim so – the export activities. In the only Canadian province from which corresponding information was available – Manitoba – that was adding value in activities in some targeted industries. Other types of contribution could not be established at this stage for any country.

While the specific types of economic contribution may deliver some of the benefits proposed by the ‘learning region’ concept, there is insufficient evidence to claim that these contributions have substantially enhanced the regional competitiveness and improved their integration into the modern knowledge-based economy. Given that the majority of regional business migrants in Australia and provincial business nominees in Canada preferred metropolitan rather than genuinely regional locations, it may be assumed that regions have seen only minimal improvements in that regard. Had other specific types of economic contribution been known, migrants’ settlement preferences in combination with their low numbers would not result in considerably enhanced competitiveness and better international integration. Once migrants’ numbers grow enough to provide a reasonably large base for analysis of their economic impact, these other types of contribution may come to be discussed.

A substantially stronger, more detailed and broader supporting evidence would be needed to declare that the policies have contributed to rendering regions more competitive and better integrated into the modern knowledge-based economy. The Australian and Canadian provincial policies have so far benefited individual local job
seekers, who have found employment with low numbers of business migrants – this has been a small scale impact.

The ‘learning region’ concept remains a useful theoretical framework guiding regional development and the support from regional business migrants. Yet, if their numbers remain low, and poor regional dispersal continues to prevail, there is little chance that these schemes will become powerful measures supporting the ‘learning region’ processes and will substantially contribute to regional development along this concept’s lines. Higher numbers of migrants, better dispersal, other future adjustments of the policies delivering better outcomes for regions, and their cumulative effects over a long period of time may change that conclusion and deliver a fuller alignment of these schemes with the ‘learning region’ concept. In the future, information from surveys of business migrants (including of BT and REBA visas in Australia) could improve understanding of whether and how these policies assist in internationalisation of practices and markets of regional firms envisaged by the ‘learning region’ concept as the ultimate dimension of regional development. It would help better plan for the role of regional policies for business migration in future regional development in Australia and Canada.

4.3 Conclusions

This chapter has evaluated the effectiveness of regional migration policies for skilled and business migrants in Australia and Canada in addressing two principal objectives: population and economic. That assessment is the second step in the approach to the public policy evaluation adopted in this thesis and described in Section 1.8 (Chapter One). Under some assumptions required by the imperfect comparability and availability of data, it involved assessing the impact of eligibility factors and patterns of behaviour exhibited by migrants in the context of these objectives. Although the eligibility factors and the policy instruments (the role of the latter could not be assessed at that stage) were found in the preceding chapters to be potentially capable of addressing them, the evidence gathered in this chapter has shown that the policies have not yet become fully successful in that regard. Despite that conclusion, some exchangeable solutions (policy lessons) with a potential to improve the outcomes of the Australian and Canadian regional migration policies were identified in this chapter. They are recalled below and
they complete the approach to public policy evaluation as described in Section 1.8 (Chapter One).

The population impact has been discussed from two perspectives: the trends and the cumulative effects, and the dispersal and retention outcomes. The first perspective focused on the absolute visa grants/landings distribution among the jurisdictions in both countries, and these migrants’ potential contribution to these jurisdictions’ population increases. That involved looking at their proportions in the annual migrants’ inflows and contribution to the population growth figures. Total growth in cumulative population impact of continued policies was also discussed. The dispersal and retention perspective closed examination of the policies’ success in addressing their population objectives.

Examination of the policies’ economic benefits comprised analysis of the skilled migrants’ impacts from a macro level perspective of a state/territory/provincial labour market and from a single employer’s point of view. The first perspective focused on the migrants’ contribution to the annual labour force growth in the jurisdictions as well as their impacts on the age structure of the employed population (Australia) and provincial labour forces (Canada). The business migration was analysed from a macro level perspective of these individuals’ contribution to the total capital/equity investment, foreign direct investment (Australia), foreign investment (Canada) and their employment creation in the Australian and the Canadian jurisdictions. The other perspective was that of an individual job seeker.

Overall, two trends seem to have inhibited policies from being fully successful to date. First, the absolute numbers of regional migrants in Australia and Canada. Although they were shown in both countries to have come to represent growing proportions of the skill stream (Australia) and the economic class (Canada), when distributed among the jurisdictions, they have been insufficient so far to have any broad, major, sustained and relative population and economic impacts on those jurisdictions. Second, the initial and subsequent settlement preferences of the majority of these migrants have contributed to the policies not fully meeting their proposed dispersal and retention objectives and the related, expected economic benefits. In other words, the policies have so far been generally unable to address satisfactorily the long-term trends of the population and the economic activities’ concentration in large metropolitan areas.
Divergent constitutional responsibilities for immigration matters in Australia and Canada have to some extent influenced the course of the analysis. In Australia, it was possible to present the order of the most frequently used regional visas and their top state/territory recipients. These visas were SDAS, RSMS, STNI/SMV and business visas. The growing annual numbers of SDAS, RSMS and STNI/SMV migrants have gone particularly to Victoria and South Australia. Victoria and South Australia have become top destinations for SDAS and STNI/SMV migrants, respectively; South Australia has led in RSMS visa grants, followed by Victoria. Western Australia has recently been (2003-04) the leading nominating state for business migrants. In Canada, it was not possible to discuss outcomes for different provincial streams from a cross-provincial perspective but the findings overwhelmingly reflected the employer-linked streams. The most frequented destinations have been Québec and Manitoba, but considering the special position of Québec, Manitoba has been the top destination from among the provinces with PNPs.

The highest numbers attracted by Victoria, South Australia, Québec and Manitoba have resulted from some similar efforts and solutions. In all four jurisdictions the largest metropolitan areas’ eligibility for migrants’ settlement under the schemes has led to a conclusion that this has been conducive to high numbers. In Australia, unlike in Canada where the mobility rights guarantee the free settlement to all permanent residents, the eligibility of Melbourne and Adelaide seemed to have been especially influential in determining the highest numbers at Australia’s scale, where some other capital cites were ineligible for regional settlement. On the other hand, settlement in Montréal, despite being allowed, was not preferred by the Québec government pursuing dispersal including to the capital, Québec City. Use of the widest possible regional migration options, including STNI/SMV in Australia and independent provincial streams with no employment offers in Manitoba and Quebec, was another factor deemed responsible for the particularly high numbers of migrants, in comparison to other jurisdictions in each country. International promotion was also believed to have contributed to these jurisdictions’ outcomes but that was pursued by all jurisdictions and it was believed to positively impact on all of them.

Manitoba and Québec also owed their outcomes to uniquely Canadian contributing factors: a liberal approach to skill levels in Manitoba (contrasting with the selective
approach in other Western provinces), an already thriving and close cooperation with regional communities in that province (and with regions and cities in Québec), as well as an unique political commitment in Québec and corresponding, linguistically targeted international promotion. The use of only selected visas; geographical location and climate conditions; pre-existing economic conditions and political commitment to seeking regional migrants were other common determinants of the success of the Australian and the Canadian jurisdictions in relative numerical terms.

Apart from these similarities in the efforts and solutions to increase the numbers of migrants by the Australian and the Canadian jurisdictions, this chapter has shown that their intended population and economic policies' impacts have not yet materialised on any major scale. Such outcomes do not necessarily undermine the aforementioned efforts. However, as the policies' impacts result from their relatively short histories, the consequent numbers of migrants, when distributed among the jurisdictions, are still too small relative to existing populations to have any major relative impact.

In the population sphere, an examination of these migrants' contribution to the total annual inflows of migrants (including permanent additions in Australia), and their proportion in the annual population growth figures in the jurisdictions has shown that so far, in terms of the population increase objective, the policies have considerably benefited only two jurisdictions out of the eight participating in Australia and two of the nine in Canada. These were South Australia, Victoria, Québec and Manitoba. Besides these jurisdictions, the policies have had so far a minimal or as yet unclear relative population impact on other jurisdictions in each country.

In Canada, provinces are considered 'regions' for the purposes of achieving, as noted in Chapter One (Section 1.7), "a more balanced distribution of immigrants throughout the country", and the population policy objective focuses on reducing the effects of the "out-migration and the size of the population in some of the smaller provinces and Québec". The population impacts described lead to the conclusion that this more balanced distribution, and the response to the population policy objective have not yet been fully met. Only Québec and Manitoba have been successful on any serious scale.
Such outcomes from Australia and Canada prompted the projection of population levels to see what the potential cumulative impact of the continued policies could be in the future. Should the stable growth scenarios occur, by 2023–24 the accumulated population of regional migrants in Australia would reach 241,000 and almost 700,000 in 2024 in Canada, suggesting some potential considerable aggregate population impact, as would a higher growth scenario render.

The other trend noted to have reduced the policies’ success has been the common problems in the dispersal and the retention in the Australian and Canadian jurisdictions. This trend was observed regardless of the different policy settings used to address settlement issues in large cities in Australia and Canada. The dispersal outcomes in both countries indicated that regional migrants generally preferred large cities. Therefore, they displayed similar preferences to other migrants, and in Australia that was regardless of whether such cities were initially considered eligible under the policy or not. While in Canada in most cases this adhered to the policy principle, it was not always the case in Australia. In sum, either immediately or subsequently, metropolitan settlement preferences of some migrants have reinforced, although marginally, the urbanisation trends rather than have assisted in mitigating their results.

The particular mechanisms behind the diminished dispersal in Australia were highlighted. It partially resulted from the SDAS migrants’ concentration in Melbourne and initial settlement of some SDAS migrants in the non-Designated Areas. The STNI migrants’ dispersal seemed minimal, and the business migrants were not assisting in dispersal, either. Relocations to metropolitan areas of longer-term SDAS migrants have also diminished the dispersal, and, in consequence, the regional retention rates were found to be below 50 per cent in the other Eastern states and 36 per cent in Victoria. Some RSMS migrants were also not staying past their contract expiry date, although the visa cancellation provisions were believed to have contributed to the improved regional retention. Overall, the degree of dispersal was modest, and hence the population policy objective of encouraging a more balanced settlement of Australia’s skilled migrant intake, indicated in Chapter One (Section 1.7), was observed to have not been fully met. Settlement in large cities, such as Sydney or Brisbane, contravened the dispersal principle, but on the other hand, these migrants would have only a minor relative effect on the population growth in these cities.
The relocation trends to the non-Designated Areas and areas not otherwise targeted were believed to have caused the population benefits in some targeted regional areas to be largely only temporary. It was noted that visa restriction on settlement might alone be a strong short-term strategy and a useful mid-term strategy, as illustrated by improved retention rates for RSMS migrants. Under such circumstances, it was proposed that genuine longer-term attraction was essential for maximum sustainable retention in regions.

Although the intraprovincial dispersal and the provincial retention rates in Canada were not drastically better than those in Australia (some excellent levels of retention were reported by Alberta and Manitoba; on the other hand relocation of Québec-selected migrants to Vancouver or Toronto and migration of nominees into Alberta indicated secondary movements, confirming, as in Australia, that retention efforts were not fully successful) some illustrations of how the dispersal and retention could be improved were found in Manitoba and Québec strategies. Their intraprovincial dispersal has relied on genuine attraction created by a combination of efforts undertaken by various local stakeholders, including employment and broader assistance to enhance retention and supported by formalised agreements with the provincial governments. Manitoba has shown how small, regional communities could attract considerable (for their populations) number of nominees. In Québec, thanks to agreements with the provincial government, the dispersal benefited chiefly Québec City, followed by other regions with similar agreements. The precise retention resulting from these community initiatives was not known due to a different understanding of ‘region’ in Canada and Australia but in Manitoba the retention was estimated to be excellent.

It was proposed that if the temporary-to-permanent visa restrictions in Australia were to remain, such genuine, longer-term attraction also could be considered as practised in Canada, as a strong complement. It seems that under the not very successful dispersal and retention outcomes on the whole, the Canadian-style community-driven immigration initiatives, and likely the domestic Victorian community-driven initiatives (outcomes were unavailable at the time of writing) should be used on a broader basis to improve the targeted dispersal and retention outcomes in truly regional areas. It was also noted that if Melbourne was going to be excluded from the Designated Areas to improve regional dispersal, this would only make sense if settlement conditions were
attached to visas. These will be introduced in 2006, which may partially improve the outcomes for regional areas, but no plans have been announced as to the exclusion of Melbourne. It will remain to be seen how successful will these restrictions be in the longer term for regional areas; that is, after the settlement restrictions have lapsed. Any correlation between such results and community-driven initiatives could become a study subject in due time. For similar reasons, the other mentioned option, supporting a more powerful regional impact, and involving a tighter retention provision, raised doubts about the reasonable and acceptable length of restrictions, and how this could impact on the attraction of the schemes to applicants. The temporary residency requirement to be introduced is going to only partially address the ‘Melbourne magnet’.

All in all, despite the noted successes, such as the reported provincial retention rates, the success of the community initiatives, or improved RSMS retention, overall the established population impacts of the policies have provided evidence to support one of the proposed hypotheses that the regional initiatives have been very modest to date in adjusting the population flows to regions. Retention of skilled and business migrants is a fundamental issue to the policies’ success. Its outcomes should be closely monitored in Australia and Canada over the next few years to enable judgement and evidence-based future policy adjustments. Since some cities, towns and rural communities have already initiated retention efforts, perhaps a national watch program in each country could be initiated, with a view to compare individual communities’ retention methods and outcomes, and to identify best working solutions.

In fact, Australia and Canada differ from other immigration nations in that they have sophisticated migration data collection systems and their migration policies and programs are being designed on the basis of research results. Therefore, it may be expected that some sort of monitoring of the retention outcomes in involved communities will be established.

The two trends of low relative numbers of migrants in jurisdictions and their settlement preferences have also affected the economic benefits from the skilled and business schemes. In general, from each macro level perspective, the economic impacts of the skilled and business migrants were found to have been minimal (for example, cumulated investment and contribution to employment creation by business migrants in
both countries), inconsistent (for example, impact on the annual labour forces’ growth in the Australian jurisdictions), or insufficient to be any major contributing force (for example in the context of improving the age distribution of the employed Australian population or as a contributor to the annual labour force growth in the Canadian provinces). Only Québec has seen some fairly consistent positive impact on its labour force growth. These minimal impacts at the macro level lead to the conclusion that the economic motivation of the regionalisation policy in Canada, focusing “on the size and quality of the labour force as a prerequisite for economic development” noted in Chapter One (Section 1.7), has not yet been successfully assisted by the provincial programs.

Further illustrations of these minimal economic impacts at the macro levels have been shown in the analysis of the contribution of the state/territory sponsored and provincial business migrants. Beyond showing that contribution, the qualitative analysis of their economic impact was restricted. It could only be concluded that from among the specific types of the economic contribution expected in Australia, the most prominent one was the export activity but no comparable conclusion could be reached in the case of the Canadian provinces, except noting the value-added activities in some preferred sectors in Manitoba. Their outcomes would be interesting to know since the provincial criteria are stricter than the Australian ones.

On the other hand, the policies have yielded some positive results for the individual employers and for the local job seekers. The benefits under the skilled streams involved such quality outcomes as migrants applying their overseas qualifications to careers in occupations at levels similar to pre-migration, skills transfers and filling critical skills shortages. These results illustrated that the application of the core eligibility factors of skill levels (qualifications), nominated occupations (Australia) and employment offers (Canada) has met the policies’ objectives.

The character of the core eligibility factors for business migrants suggested that the governments in both countries were targeting - within the broader aim of economic development through business migration - the small business development through their programs. The actual levels of satisfying these criteria by migrants in Australia and Canada have led to a conclusion that indeed these factors supported the latter objective.
Although the number of positions created by these migrants represented a minor contribution to the employment creation at a macro level, on the other hand, such employment was deemed valuable for those local job seekers who would obtain it, mirroring the benefits obtained by employers. The character of these economic benefits, provided by still modest numbers of migrants and restricted to individual enterprises and benefiting small numbers of individual job seekers, has led to a conclusion that the economic impact was a small scale phenomenon.

The other noted trend of skilled and business migrants’ settlement preferences for large cities further affected the economic benefits’ delivery. In the case of skilled migrants in Australia that was compromising any serious policy intention of addressing of skills shortages in regions and resulted in a minimal impact on regional economic prosperity. Such an outcome contrasted with the stated (Section 1.7 in Chapter One) “special circumstances of rural and regional areas” that justified the flexible entry criteria intended to “help deliver young, skilled, English-speaking migrants to areas of Australia where they are most needed”. It indicated that the economic policy objective has not been fully met.

Regional dispersal and retention of business migrants was yet another element of the economic contribution and a targeted policy objective in Australia. In Canada, due to a different understanding of ‘region’, there was a modest push for their intraprovincial dispersal. Business migrants’ preferences for large cities in both countries (Tasmania seemed to be an exception – this owes to the fact that unlike the other states, Tasmania does not have a single primate city) were believed to have had similar causes and economic consequences, but different significance for the policies. These preferences were believed to have resulted from such underlying conditions as the lack of genuine business opportunities and infrastructure in regions as well as from a lack of critical mass to support a business venture there. Migrants’ investment and employment creation in large cities were assessed to have had only a marginal, relative economic impact, corresponding to their population impact. Another consequence of the flows’ direction was a minimal effect of the business migration on the regional labour markets. In Australia, the direction of the flows further illustrated how the settlement trends adversely impacted the dispersal policy objective stated as “attract[ing] overseas business people to establish new or joint ventures in their [states’ and territories’]
regions”, noted in Chapter One (Section 1.7). That objective has not been fully met. By contrast, settlement in large Canadian cities, except Vancouver and Montréal, remained in line with the policy objective.

The intended retention of business migrants was expected to be good in Australia and British Columbia, where the two-stage visas were in place. The effectiveness of the Canadian retention measure - a cash deposit - could not be evaluated due to unavailability of relevant outcomes. Unlike in Australia, retention in Canada typically depended on the loyalty to the nominating/sponsoring province.

All in all, the minimal contribution at the macro level of the jurisdictions, the small scale character of the delivered benefits and the limited regional impacts have supported another hypothesis proposing that the flows that have taken place so far have not had any powerful impact on the economic prosperity and sustainability of the Australian and the Canadian jurisdictions.

As in the case of the skills streams, some possibilities were observed from experience as to ways of improving the outcomes seen so far. If Australia wanted to be more successful in the business migrants' dispersal, and if the Canadian provinces became interested in more vigorous intraprovincial dispersal, these underlying conditions were suggested to be improved first, to create longer-term, viable opportunities. Infrastructure was noted to be one of the factors that could assist in population retention and/or increase, which, in turn, could expand the market size and potentially create some opportunities for targeted business migrants. In addition, genuine in-depth information regarding the business opportunities, including information related to seasonal cycles (if applicable), market size and particular needs of a regional population to be served by a migrant’s business (if relevant), information about available government support services should be communicated to migrants to help them make an informed choice. Exploratory visits, assisted if possible, should be also promoted.

The analysis of the economic impacts of the policies has been restricted by the availability and quality of the Australian and the Canadian data. Knowledge gaps have emerged - some partial, some entire. The partial gaps were evident in both countries in the case of the English/French language eligibility factor in skilled migration. The role
of this eligibility factor could not be assessed rigorously due to an almost complete lack of relevant data in business streams. Furthermore, the economic impact of the work experience eligibility factor could not be decisively assessed due to limited and somewhat contrasting evidence from Canada and not detailed information from Australia. Contrasting evidence from SDAS and RSMS in Australia has prevented from reaching any conclusive comments in relation to the impact of the retention eligibility factors. These were of prime importance in the Canadian provinces. Yet, at this stage, only the positive impact of the community stakeholders’ on facilitating adjustment under the community-driven initiatives could be noted.

Assessment of the age limits was also pursued on the basis of limited data but under the current numbers even access to the unavailable data would likely only provide additional evidence but not dramatically change the conclusions. Furthermore, no rigorous assessment of the policies’ impact could be offered for the pre-application business experience and policy instruments, such as the governments’ support services for the skilled and business migrants and domestic and international promotion of the schemes. There were illustrations of the practices of these policy instruments in the preceding chapters, but their rigorous evaluation could not be undertaken at this stage of the policies’ development due to unavailability of more detailed data. In sum, there remain a number of factors the roles of which have not yet been fully researched and understood in the policy context. Therefore, some of them could be included as variables in future research to provide a better understanding of their impact on the policies’ outcomes. Consistent, complete data permitting full understanding and evaluation of the regional migrants’ economic participation would further enable to compare it with the economic participation of all other migrants. This could be taken up by future Australian and Canadian research.

This chapter has evaluated regional migration schemes in light of their support for learning and innovation processes proposed by the ‘learning region’ concept as means of regional development leading to an enhanced competitiveness and a greater integration of regions into the modern knowledge-based economy (see Section 1.3 in Chapter One). Evidence for that support from the Australian and Canadian provincial skilled schemes was scant, information on any role of the work experience factor could not be located, and in Australia the metropolitan settlement preferences of some
migrants meant that genuine regions were not benefiting from their overseas skills and knowledge. Evidence for delivering the specific types of economic contribution by business migrants in both countries was almost non-existent. Mostly metropolitan settlement choices of these individuals in Australia and Canada were believed to have caused regions to benefit only minimally, at best.

Although the skills and work experience eligibility factors in skilled schemes and the specific types of economic contribution in business schemes were designed and indeed seemed capable of supporting the processes of learning and innovation, at this stage the evidence from both skilled and business streams was insufficient to declare that the Australian and Canadian regional migration policies have had a substantial role in their regions becoming ‘learning regions’ (more competitive) and better integrated into the modern knowledge-based economy. It was noted that a broader and substantially stronger (and more detailed in business schemes) supporting evidence from these skilled and business schemes would be needed to claim that the policies have contributed to enhanced regional competitiveness and better regional integration into the knowledge-based economy.

The ‘learning region’ concept remains a useful theoretical framework for guiding regional development in Australia and Canada, in which the skilled and business regional migration schemes may play a part. If they are seriously intended to become meaningful supporters of the proposed learning and innovation, considerable growth in business migrant numbers, better dispersal under both schemes and other future adjustments of the policies delivering improved outcomes for regions seem imperative. Such improved outcomes are likely to be noted over a longer period of time. Understanding whether and how these policies assist in internationalisation of practices and markets of regional firms envisaged by the ‘learning region’ concept as the ultimate dimension of regional development, could be improved with more surveys of regional migrants. They could help to better plan for the role of regional migration policies in future regional development in Australia and Canada.

Positive results yielded by the community-motivated immigration strategies – representing a form of, and illustrating practice of the community-driven regional development concepts (see Section 1.3 in Chapter One) – contrast the above
conclusions. These positive results achieved here by regional communities in Manitoba and Québec demonstrate that the community-driven regional development concepts have been embraced there for purposes of regional development and proven working. The Québec practice of a broad-based community and business cooperation and (a formal agreement) financially supported by the provincial government provides a classic example of a community-driven regional development strategy. The strategies’ success in these two provinces suggests that these concepts may offer a useful framework for successfully using local initiatives in immigration to support regional development elsewhere and in the future.

It is worth recalling that the Québec practice of formally incorporating community/regional immigration strategies into broader regional development plans was noted to be a useful tactic of using these strategies to bolster development of regions. Under such an approach, regions may potentially benefit from a coordinated development planning, inclusive of the role of immigration. The Australian federal government also perceives regional migration schemes as one of the measures of regional development (see Section 1.3 in Chapter One), but so far similar locally-driven immigration strategies have only been enabled in one Australian state.

Despite the overall picture of the policies not being wholly successful, their experience so far suggests that some implemented solutions could be considered on a broader basis to improve the results achieved so far. Also, if growth in numbers does continue, the cumulated impact could be large in some dimensions. Some dispersal and retention solutions highlighted in this thesis also appear adaptable in the constitutional setting of each country and can be therefore considered as measures potentially enhancing the policies’ outcomes in both countries. They may be considered from the migrants’ attraction perspective, as well as in the context of integration and retention. In some cases certain solutions may be applicable to both contexts.

As noted in this chapter, use of the widest possible number of visas available under the regional schemes has contributed to attracting the highest numbers of migrants to the top performing jurisdictions. A similar open approach could be adopted by other jurisdictions to increase the number of their regional migrants. Also, the population and economic objectives could also better addressed if these visas were made available to a
number of groups of potential migrants. This was illustrated by the onshore conversion of international students and foreign workers in both countries, however Australia also enables for example tourists (WHMs) to become regional migrants. Such an open approach could be considered by the Canadian provinces in view of increasing the numbers of nominees.

Two major solutions, neither of which is straightforward, have been mentioned in this chapter and could be useful in the context of attraction as well as retention. First, the community-driven immigration could create poles of attraction in regional areas, and, as in Manitoba, where support reached beyond employment, dispersal could be successfully implemented, migrants could be better integrated and retention could be achieved. Second, the potential consequences of improved regional infrastructure could perhaps attract and retain more business migrants in these areas.

International promotion that conveys reliable, comprehensive information about opportunities and lifestyle in regions is crucial and could alone constitute an attraction measure but in the case of business people may better work with assisted exploratory visits. The preceding chapter has presented some of the promotional methods, such as recruitment missions, but the list is probably not exhaustive. Personalised mailings to migrants to inform them about opportunities in regions, noted in Chapter Two, could also be used on a broader basis as an attraction measure. Furthermore, the Victorian electronic employment database listing vacancies, mentioned in Chapter Two, would be an attraction measure supporting the economic policy objective. It was proposed that this measure be adopted on a broader basis, especially in Canada, where there was no similarly dedicated level of employment search support, and yet the pre-arranged employment dominates the PNPs.

At the other end, the government support services for skilled and business migrants are equally important to integration and retention. In the Québec community initiatives, the role of the local media was highlighted. They could indirectly assist in creating a conducive atmosphere to increasing immigrants’ intake in regions, and therefore also indirectly contribute to integration and retention. Crucial to the success of all these initiatives are genuine, longer-term opportunities for skilled and business migrants,
access to infrastructure and attractive lifestyle. These are the pre-requisites for successful dispersal and retention.

In sum, with around ten years of history and experience behind the policies in each country, and with commitments to develop them, it appears that the limits to success of the policies in dispersal and retention may be improved in the future. The policies themselves have provided some exchangeable solutions that should be investigated and adopted on a wider basis by other jurisdictions in both countries. That could yield a more powerful numerical (and also relative) population impact, as well as better outcomes for the dispersal and retention and the related economic benefits. This should be complemented by concurrent research, covering also the eligibility factors and policy instruments that either could be evaluated to a limited degree or not at all at this stage and that were marked at the beginning of this chapter as the necessary focus for future research. The issue of retention deserves particular attention. Including these factors will encourage a broader and a more comprehensive policy evaluation. That should lead to a better understanding of the policies, an enhanced ability to predict their future outcomes and an improved ability to influence these outcomes in line with the intended objectives of the Australian and Canadian provincial policies.
Chapter Five
Conclusions

Guided by an interest in exploring the ostensibly similar policies for immigrants’ dispersal away from the large urban areas in Australia and Canada, this thesis has attempted to fill a literature gap by having undertaken a comparative analysis of the nature and practice of these policies. The adopted public policy perspective described in Section 1.8 (Chapter One) stipulated that this analysis served as the first step in these policies’ evaluation. That analysis constituted the first objective of the thesis, and was undertaken in Chapters Two and Three. The next aim involved assessing the success of the policies in addressing their respective stated objectives, and this was pursued in Chapter Four. That assessment represented the second step in the approach adopted for the public policy evaluation, as per Section 1.8. Chapter Four also highlighted some successful and promising solutions identified in the course of analysis and evaluation. Suggestions for the future policies’ development and enhancement were made on that basis for both countries and they completed the said approach to the policy evaluation.

This chapter recapitulates the major findings of the thesis, including the nature and practice of the policies, and their success in meeting their objectives. It notes solutions and arrangements observed during the research and the writing-up stage that may potentially influence the future policies’ practice and outcomes. The promising solutions (policy lessons) that could enhance their results are recalled, and some additional proposals are offered. Finally, future research priorities are noted.

As noted in Chapter One (Section 1.4), pursuing the regional migration policies in Australia and Canada, and their nature and practice, owe, among other factors, to the long-standing interest in regional variation that the two countries share. These regional policies have similar population and economic objectives. They involve addressing the uneven population distribution (improving the dispersal of migrants), supporting the population growth, responding to skill shortages and pursuing economic development by means of business migration.

Two factors determined the nature and practice of the Australian and Canadian policies in responding to these objectives. First, similarly in Australia and Canada there were uneven
population distribution patterns, including a high concentration of immigrants in some areas, and resultant differences in population growth rates, as well as the consequent socioeconomic differences. These factors conditioned the understanding of ‘region’ in each policy context. In Australia the focus was usually on areas outside the capital cities, but in some cases on entire jurisdictions. In Canada ‘regions’ denominated entire jurisdictions including their largest cities, except Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver. The constitutionally guaranteed mobility rights prevented the Canadian provincial governments from geographically restricting the migrants’ settlement, as practised in Australia.

The second factor - the divergent constitutional responsibilities in the matter of immigration - influenced the eligibility criteria for migration. The federal responsibility in Australia resulted in basically uniform eligibility factors being applied to all regional migrants, regardless of their intended settlement destination. Under the state/territory sponsored schemes, the governments were able to set up some of their own criteria. Under the shared responsibility in Canada, the governments established their own eligibility factors independently of each other and of the federal government. The analysis in Chapters Two and Three has illustrated how these underlying conditions have resulted in the policies in Australia and Canada that represent two distinctive management strategies for regional migration.

Despite similarities in generic eligibility factors, these underlying differences have resulted in divergent emphases on some of them. In Australia, the skill levels determined at the federal level, occupations in demand (including those determined by states and territories), geographically restricted settlement and retention guaranteed by means of federal visa conditions were the major features of the skilled schemes. Temporary visas for some skilled and practically all business migrants were intended to improve retention. In Canada, the dominating feature was an employment offer for skilled provincial migrants, as the provincial governments did not have such federal guarantees, as are evident in Australia. The employment offer was a response to the federal skilled migration program not providing a skill match in the context of the labour market needs. Contrasting approaches were further found in the business migration sphere, and the elevated entry criteria related to specific types of the economic contribution in the Canadian provinces, as opposed to Australia, were highlighted.
Chapters Two and Three have optimistically concluded that these eligibility factors, as well as the assisting policy instruments, seemed potentially able to address the targeted policies’ objectives. The analysis has indeed highlighted novel solutions and recent developments, confirming one of the thesis’s hypotheses about Australia and Canada being highly active and innovative in regional migration policies. Arrangements for skilled migrants were further found to respond to the global population movements, which supported another proposed hypothesis of the thesis. The Canadian practice of formal cooperation between the provincial governments and the local and regional stakeholders in intraprovincial dispersal, together with the later commencement of similar approaches in Australia, supported yet another of the thesis’s hypotheses that proposed that the Australian and Canadian responses have adopted new models of stakeholder participation to manage regional migration.

An evaluation of the policies’ actually achieved success to date in addressing their population and economic objectives toned down the optimism. An examination of the population-related outcomes comprised absolute flows of migrants into jurisdictions and contribution to their population increases. The dispersal and retention outcomes in regions were discussed next. The economic perspective involved a study of migrants’ contribution to labour force growth and its age structure, and, in the case of business migration, also its contribution to investment levels and employment creation (macro level perspective). Moreover, the individual perspectives of employers seeking to fill skill shortages, as well as local job seekers who would potentially benefit from positions in firms established by business migrants, were considered.

This evaluation has revealed that two major factors have inhibited full success of the policies so far in meeting these objectives. First, the absolute number of migrants distributed among their destination jurisdictions was found not to have had any broad, major relative population and economic impact on them. Only in two jurisdictions in each country was some considerable population impact observed. The cumulated level of the business migrants’ contribution also indicated a minimal economic impact on the macro level of the jurisdictions. Second, the identified initial and subsequent settlement choices of the majority of regional migrants, with a preference for capital cities in Australia, have not supported the principal national policy objective of dispersal and related expected economic benefits to regional areas, outside the large capital cities. This may partially be
due to the hybrid approach, whereby large capital cities and areas outside them are eligible for some regional skilled and business migration.

In interpreting these outcomes, two issues need discussion. One is whether the observed small absolute numbers of regional migrants in the establishment of these programs were themselves a result of imposed quotas. The other is whether some jurisdictions in Australia indeed were really concerned with dispersal away from capital cities. In the case of the first issue, in both Canada, where some provinces have capped annual or multi-year numbers of migrants that they may nominate, and in Australia, the quotas seem not to be an issue. The Canadian provinces can adjust them by periodical agreements with the Canadian federal government, or can agree on them annually, or have no cap on numbers (see Table 1.2 in Chapter One). In Australia regional migration is officially a policy priority and the allocated annual numbers may be adjusted. For example, cancelled business skills visas are returned to the migration program in the same year. The overall annual migration program is expressed in a range rather than a fixed number of visas (see for example DIMIA 2004n:21). This allows flexibility should a need for more regional visas in Australia arise. Therefore, the quotas of regional migrants have not restricted their numbers.

In the case of the second issue, it is true that there is some ambiguity over the ultimate policy commitment to full dispersion in all jurisdictions. While this may be understandable in Tasmania or sparsely populated Northern Territory, there seems to be no such explanation for not strictly pursuing dispersal in jurisdictions like Victoria, where, through a policy decision, Melbourne has been made an eligible regional location under some categories. Furthermore, in the case of state/territory sponsored business migration, New South Wales has no formal measures, such as additional requirements for a business location in Sydney, that could make some potential applicants consider a location outside Sydney - the largest urban area and capital city in the country (though this state has dispersal provisions for skilled migrants).

On the other hand, the evaluation has revealed that the policies have been successful at a small scale, benefiting employers able to fill their skilled shortages and local job seekers, who could obtain employment with the business migrants’ firms. There were some also encouraging examples of the Canadian provincial nominees’ dispersal to small
communities. Generally though, the policies have not yet satisfactorily responded to the longer-term trends of population and economic activity concentration in the largest urban areas in both countries. Such conclusions enabled confirming two final hypotheses of the thesis concerning the modest impact of the policies in adjusting population flows to regions and that no powerful impact of the flows on the economic prosperity and sustainability of those regions could be supported.

Such outcomes point back to the underlying trends that motivate the regional and non-regional migrants alike. It may be a misinterpretation of the policies’ potential to suggest that they will support the population dispersal and assist in development of these areas alone. Many regional migrants gravitate towards the largest cities attracted by perceived or existing opportunities. As illustrated particularly in the context of business migration, the pre-existing longer-term opportunities and broadly understood infrastructure able to meet migrants’ activities and expectations must be in place prior to their arrival to retain them in such non-traditional destinations.

Within the framework of these policies, the community-driven initiatives represent one means of identifying such longer-term opportunities, which may support the retention in non-traditional migrant destinations and, in turn, address the population and economic policies’ objectives. Such initiatives should be implemented on a broader basis in both countries to support dispersal and retention.

However, even the best regional migration policy solutions alone may not suffice for dispersion; that is, principally or only to low density locations, in significant numbers. Although the only very recent introduction of the policies is one of the reasons behind their minimal success in meeting the dispersal and economic objectives at any considerable scale, the underlying question of pre-existing opportunities and particularly facilities and services able to cater to new arrivals remains. These policies may only deliver on their objectives if reasonable conditions for settlement and retention are satisfied before they arrive. Government support programs and longer-term strategies aimed at improving the conditions for the local populations in the first place are necessary to ensure that some satisfactory quality and range of facilities are available. Previous attempts to institute regional migration development plans at government direction have not been notably successful in the past in Australia and Canada. But some European,
regional policies (notably Ireland) and reports that propose alternative regional self-help approaches (McKinsey and Company 1994) indicate that this may still be an open question.

The EU regional development policy has proven to be particularly successful in Ireland. This country has been benefiting from the EU funds to reduce regional economic and social disparities (by the Bloc standards). This policy is largely decentralised and based on the initiative and responsibility of all regional development actors. The resources come through the Structural Funds and are used to address a number of objectives. At national level they include, for example, modernisation of the national road network; waste water treatment and water distribution infrastructures; enhancing employment, and capability of human resources; and support for research, development and innovation. At regional level, the development assistance in Ireland is used towards local infrastructures such as roads, water conveyance or internet; for agriculture and rural development; and to enhance social integration. The Cohesion Fund, which Ireland was receiving until 2003, covered environmental infrastructure projects and transport. In total, during the 2000–06 period, Ireland benefited from €4.311b provided through the structural aid (European Commission n.d.). Outcomes of the earlier assistance to Ireland provided through the Structural Funds are summarised by Beer, Maude and Pritchard (2003:29–30).

These authors doubt whether Australia would ever embark on such a substantial regional development policy comparable to the European one due to her limited resources for economic development. Under such circumstances, they propose that only the most effective techniques and tools be employed in Australia (Beer, Maude and Pritchard 2003:8). Such wide-spanning regional development strategies as such are not a focus of this thesis, but it may be proposed that regional migrants in Australia and Canada could be encouraged to settle in areas where reasonable economic and social conditions already exist (or have recently been improved through such strategies). These comprise employment options and business opportunities, reasonable infrastructure such as health care facilities, educational opportunities including at tertiary level (for example regional university campuses), transport and communication infrastructure, as well as recreation and entertainment options. In smaller localities it may be advisable to perform an audit of existing facilities considering the impact of expected population increase and plan for their future use and/or expansion. A survey of the town/community businesses and their
skill shortages (if any) may also be a valuable planning tool. On the other hand, lifestyle qualities, such as slower pace of life as compared to largest cities (capital cities in Australia), less congestion and cleaner air could be promoted as incentives. The Canadian pragmatic approach to promoting settlement in second and third-tier cities could be considered by the Australian governments if they are seriously interested in population dispersal. In some cases perhaps this could mean going beyond the strategy of demonstrating to the regional voters and regional authorities that they do care about their prosperity, which in reality may serve their continued presence in the office.

While some 'regional' cities in Canada, for example Edmonton (nearing 1m inhabitants) or Winnipeg (nearing 0.7m inhabitants), may offer an unparalleled choice of options for immigrants in comparison to 'regional' cities in Australia, in pursuing dispersal the concept of promoting smaller centres is worth considering, as opposed to rural areas. Realistically, it may be expected that growth in numbers of regional skilled and business migrants, under effective policies, could occur, particularly in regional cities (especially in Australia, where restrictions on settlement apply and where there is a lack of a similar number of mid-size cities as in Canada) rather than rural communities. It has been shown that the majority of regional migrants in both countries are no different from other migrants and prefer urban lifestyle rather than a genuinely rural one. Going against that trend could be potentially unproductive in large part. Instead, this trend could be diverted to such smaller secondary cities and towns that could be considered for their settlement. One advantage of such an approach could be the urban lifestyle that most migrants seemingly seek, and that may be expected to satisfy and retain them, yet in locations other than the largest urban areas in both countries dealing with pressures on their services and facilities. Another advantage would be meeting the dispersal principle, while at the same time supporting the population growth objectives in some of such centres, for example in some Prairie cities in Canada.

By contrast, some rural communities may be remote and may require the outback style self-sufficiency skills, including dealing with relative social isolation that skilled and business migrants may not necessarily possess, experience and interest in such lifestyle and skills in dealing with emergency situations where assistance may be miles away. There would probably be a limited number of migrants willing to take such risk only in return to benefit from the associated environmental advantages such as no pollution,
availability of large properties or vast spaces, especially under current visa cancellation provisions in Australia.

Instead, Australian cities such as Canberra, regional cities in Victoria, Bunbury and other growing towns in Western Australia and elsewhere could be internationally promoted to potential skilled and business migrants each on its merits, if there were interest in developing the populations, skills and entrepreneurial base through such means. But chances of rural communities may not be entirely lost either: the community-driven initiatives in Manitoba illustrate that they may be helpful in maintaining populations of such communities that commence to decline. The community-driven initiatives are being trialled in the Victorian regional cities such as Ballarat or Bendigo, and in some other regional towns. A similar approach could be tested elsewhere in the country. This, of course, raises questions related to urban planning, desirable and sustainable population sizes in such centres, and the capacity of the local facilities to support growing populations. This is all the more important in centres located at the Australian coast, where the particular environmental impact of further urbanisation must be considered. The earlier proposed facilities’ audit may also need to be extended to potential ecological impact of increased populations.

The Canadian locally-driven community/regional migration strategies of the type as in Manitoba represent a form of regional development and illustrate practice of community-driven regional development, as per principles proposed by the community-driven regional development concepts (Section 1.3 in Chapter One). The Québec practice of a broad-based community and business cooperation and (a formal agreement) financially supported by the provincial government provides a literature-like example of a community-driven regional development strategy.

Positive results of these strategies achieved by regional communities in Manitoba and Québec demonstrate that these theoretical principles have been embraced there for purposes of regional development and that their implementation can deliver expected results. They suggest that these concepts offer a useful framework for using local initiatives in immigration to support regional development elsewhere and in the future. As noted earlier, regional migration policy is unlikely to support the population dispersal and assist in development of regions alone. Yet, the locally driven community/regional
immigration strategies may provide a strong, auxiliary measure towards these ends. They provide a strong argument that the community-driven regional migration strategies are one way of bolstering regions. Their popularity in Canada and their positive results, as well as their slow take-up in Australia also increase the importance of the community-driven regional development concepts for future regional development strategies.

A particularly useful tactic in using the community/regional immigration strategies to bolster regions is their formal incorporation into broader regional development plans, as practiced by Québec (and preferred by British Columbia). Such an approach seems also to be supported by the Australian federal government that perceives regional migration schemes as one of the measures of regional development (see Section 1.3 in Chapter One). Incorporation of immigration into regional development plans sends a message that the immigration and other regional development policies are intended to intersect and support each other.

There is a much weaker support for another relevant regional development concept – the ‘learning region’ (see Section 1.3 in Chapter One). It proposes that learning and innovation are instruments of regional development enabling regions to become more competitive and thus better integrated into the modern knowledge-based economy. Some eligibility factors, notably the skills and work experience (skilled streams); and specific types of economic contribution in Australia and the corresponding eligibility factors in Canada (business streams) were found to represent means of deliberate economic support to regions, and capable of broadening their access to learning and innovation. That potential to build/boost human capital in regions with overseas-gained knowledge and skills, as well as the potential to expand/enhance the regional business base, its capacity and quality, and render regions more competitive and better internationally integrated in that process did not receive a lot of evidence.

Despite these eligibility factors’ design showing alignment with this concept’s vision of regional development, at this stage the evidence was insufficient to declare that the Australian and Canadian regional migration policies have had a substantial role in their regions becoming ‘learning regions’ (more competitive) and better integrated into the modern knowledge-based economy. A broader and substantially stronger (and more detailed in business schemes) supporting evidence would be needed to claim so.
The ‘learning region’ concept remains a useful guiding framework for regional development in Australia and Canada, in which the skilled and business regional migration schemes may play an auxiliary (to domestic policies) but a more visible role in the future. Although at this stage successful results along its lines remain yet to materialise, the said eligibility factors have nowhere been drastically changed or ‘softened’ (potentially delivering results of worse quality), but instead new groups have been invited to apply for regional migration under the existing requirements, which means that the eligibility factors remain aligned with this concept’s vision. As a consequence, the Australian and Canadian regional migration policies also remain capable of supporting the processes of learning and innovation and delivering outcomes envisaged by this concept. It remains to be seen whether this capability turns into desirable outcomes. It may be worth noting that if this occurs, material for an empirical enquiry from two countries that could be open to scrutiny, would offer the opportunity of better understanding the value and applicability of this fairly new concept (mostly discussed in the second part of the 1990s) to regional development processes.

For such a fuller alignment of the schemes’ outcomes with the ‘learning region’ principles and envisaged benefits, increased numbers of regional business migrants, better dispersal of skilled and business regional migrants, other future adjustments of the policies delivering improved outcomes for regions, and their cumulative effects over a period of time seem necessary.

The policies examined in this thesis represent an evolving aspect of the Australian and the Canadian immigration policies. It may be reasonably expected that they will be continued and enhanced. The population projections in Chapter Four illustrate possible scenarios of their cumulative numerical impact. The progress observed throughout the research process and then the writing-up stage points to possible solutions and arrangements that seem likely to influence the future policies’ practice and outcomes.

First, many Australian state/territory and Canadian provincial governments have released their own immigration/population strategies (with an immigration component), which will further guide the operation of the regional migration policies against intake and retention benchmarks. Second, a number of developments have taken place, such as the introduction of new visas, the opening up regional migration opportunities to new groups
of temporary residents, the implementation of the community-driven initiatives and expanded cooperation with the agents in promoting the regional migration opportunities internationally. They will influence the policies’ practice and impact on their results.

Notwithstanding the minimal positive population and economic impact of the policies so far in both countries, in the context of their policy objectives, some of policy solutions developed in Australia and Canada are fully transferable and are recommended for potential consideration by other jurisdictions in pursuing and improving their intended outcomes. First, a link was established between an exceptionally high number of migrants and the offer of the widest possible range of visas to a number of potential candidate groups. This was found to be true in some jurisdictions in both countries, and a similar approach is believed to be potentially able to benefit other jurisdictions, too. In terms of degrees/types of policy transfer introduced in Section 1.8 (Chapter One), if enlarging the visa range and groups of potentially eligible candidates were to occur, within Canada it could be as simple as copying for example a family-linked provincial migration stream from one province to another. However, it appears likely that the provincial government ‘importing’ the family stream idea and concept from another Canadian jurisdiction would prefer to tailor it to local conditions, which would then represent a case of emulation (adaptation). This could involve for example adaptation of the stream content (who is eligible to migrate/who can sponsor) and some policy instruments (for example evidence of financial support available for migrating family member). Similar emulation would likely occur in case of a cross-national policy transfer.

Second, the aforementioned community-driven initiatives were deemed to be innovative on the basis of the Canadian experience, and are especially recommended for consideration in Australia, where they could constitute a strong complementary retention measure. That would represent emulation (adaptation) of the Canadian initiative to the Australian conditions. However, as noted in Chapter Two, that policy transfer in Australia would not involve transferring the community-linked migration streams being used in some Canadian provinces. Rather, the community-driven immigration strategies are likely to be based on the existing Australian regional visa options. That suggests that ideas and perhaps some policy instruments like getting the local and regional stakeholders to work out a strategy together would be transferred for adaptation to local conditions. These Canadian initiatives were marked as particularly worth monitoring as they may soon
come to represent a new dimension of the regional migration policies. It would be useful to communities interested in commencing such strategies to have access to retention outcomes of similar strategies pursued elsewhere. As proposed in Chapter Four, a national watch program of individual community efforts could be initiated in both countries to identify best working solutions. In order not to publicly undermine efforts of weaker performers, such data could be electronic but password-protected, or available only on request.

Third, the Victorian database of regional employment opportunities is recommended for consideration by the Canadian provinces that overwhelmingly require a pre-arranged employment offer for skilled migrants. In this case, a close emulation (adaptation) of the Australian initiative would take place. That electronic database is the final product and its production and maintenance benefits from regular contacts with employers, which would need to be considered, too. Therefore, not only the idea but perhaps the administrative techniques to create that database would be getting transferred. Fourth, despite lack of available systematic numerical research evidence yet, the continued provision of governmental support services to regional skilled and business migrants, at the current time seemingly based on the governments' internal assessments of their effectiveness, is assumed on the basis of their range, applicability to migrants' situation, highlighting by some interviewees and correspondence to the economic and population policies' objectives, to be important to the policies' success in both countries. Finally, international promotion is deemed to be central to the policies' development and it is likely to be continued and enhanced. Integration of the agents into the policy process represents another evidence for the governments having adopted new models of stakeholder participation, and suggests that the governments will be making extended use of their services in expanding their activities in that sphere. Overall, these solutions represent successful aspects of the policies, and it is expected that they be continued, adopted on a broader basis and expanded.

Given the interest in increasing numbers of regional skilled and business migrants, the Australian states and territories could now consider the Canadian approach and commence marketing in new world regions such as South America or Central and Eastern Europe. The conducive economic conditions to out-migration exist in some of them (and are recognised for example, by Québec and Manitoba promoting in Argentina) and could
be now capitalised on also by Australia. These two Canadian provinces have reported some success in international promotion in South America. If this policy transfer occurred, it would represent another case of emulation (adaptation). The idea of a new market for recruitment would be transferred, but not policy goals or policy instruments. The former are common in both countries and the latter were found in Chapter Three to be already highly convergent.

If there is an ongoing commitment to the policy objectives and a wish to benefit from policy-learning in programs’ implementation, there could be potentially a broader policies’ success, such as higher numbers and better migrants’ dispersal beyond the two jurisdictions in each country, identified in the course of evaluation. Apart from the possible exchange of Australian and Canadian policy solutions, further solutions may be proposed, which could potentially contribute to increased numbers of regional migrants, better dispersal and related economic objectives. First, potentially more candidates could apply in Australia if an additional measure was introduced in relation to state/territory sponsored business migration, where the numbers are lower than in the case of the regional and state/territory sponsored skilled migration. The performance test built into the two-stage visa process could be waived for migrants setting up businesses and relocating to genuine regional areas; that is, those outside the capital cities. On the other hand, such a test would continue to apply to the capital-city bound migrants. Such an approach could potentially encourage some business people to consider regional Australia (for example, smaller cities such as Bendigo, Cairns or Launceston) in line with the dispersal principle, and as in Canada, guarantee permanent residency under conditions where a business venture presents typically more risks and involves more preparation than skilled migration.

Even if a regional business migrant failed, the visa would not be cancelled, provided residence had been maintained for the stipulated period. As a result, there could be at least some potential population benefit to regional areas. Additional economic benefits such as continued consumer spending, local council tax rates, childrens’ enrollment in school could potentially continue too, if a migrant then found some skilled employment locally. The other successful regional migrant businesses, attracted by this new visa provision, could overall justify some such failures. Such an approach could be balanced by less discounted entry criteria, whereby regional state/territory business migrants would need to
satisfy the same English level language requirements as the unsponsored business migrants, for example, or more rigorous testing of their business capabilities at the pre-migration stage could apply. Alternatively, the mainland Australian states could perhaps add a second condition on a capital city business location (where such an approach is already the case) to encourage migrants to choose a less risky option and set up a business in a regional city or town. New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia could consider such an option for business owners and senior executives.

Another solution supporting the increase in regional migrants' numbers in low population growth metropolitan areas could be considered in Australia for regional skilled migrants. Rather than relying on the current approach - stipulating that the areas eligible are those where population growth has been lower than 50 per cent of national average population growth, as measured by the 1996-2001 Census (DIMIA 2004n:41) - instead, eligible areas could be those where the population growth simply falls below the national projected five-year average, as established by ABS projections. Another modification of the definition of 'region' could also be made, involving an increase in the minimal population count of eligible SDs from 200,000 to 350,000. This would make more areas in Australia eligible for some regional visas than is the case now, for example Canberra.

More encouragement to settle in regional areas in Australia could be offered through a further readjustment of the points system for skilled migrants. It could include, for example, a flexible range of points (as with occupations for migration) for a guaranteed employment offer in a regional or low population growth metropolitan area for state/territory sponsored skilled migrants besides the bonus points currently available, where that area meets various threshold tests as to the degree of past employment growth and the local unemployment situation. Another addition could be points awarded for a relationship in a regional or low population growth metropolitan area, if there was a commitment of the skilled migrant to settle there with the Australian partner (if family migration were not an option). Offering these points could potentially make it easier for people who, because of age or other circumstances, might have difficulties in qualifying under the demanding Australian points system for skilled migration but are nonetheless able to offer an economic contribution to these areas.¹

¹ Such a tapered points proposal is also found in an earlier report for the Chifley Centre (Withers and Powall 2003 with assistance from Golebiowska).
Since in the Canadian provinces a similar delineation of areas eligible for the provincial migrants' settlement does not typically apply, the numerical growth of these migrants and intraprovincial dispersal will likely occur through a broader application and further refinement of the community-driven strategies. Given that dispersal in Canada, by virtue of the constitutional guarantees, is based on incentives and not restrictions, the Australian states and territories may potentially gain some ideas as to how attract and retain migrants in non-traditional locations, by monitoring policy development in some provinces, such as Manitoba or Québec.

With hopefully more data becoming available as the policies mature, their phenomenon may be better understood. This thesis has compared responses to the governments' policy objectives and their actual outcomes in both countries. The future policies' development should be also informed by understanding what drives the individuals into regional areas and what drives them out - to the large cities.

Therefore, in addition to institutional representatives interviewed for this study, motivations and opinions of various categories of regional migrants should be considered in future research priorities. Analysis of behaviour and attitudes of individual migrants could enable a better understanding of their motivations, and in turn enable designing policies better equipped to addressing the negative factors causing relocation. With many avenues for an onshore status conversion now open to temporary residents under the Australian and Canadian schemes, one focus of such future studies could be investigating relations between the temporary and permanent migration. Relations between a status change and a change of residence location could provide further evidence for, or against, the success of the dispersal efforts. The reported relocation trends in Australia and the resultant dispersal outcomes currently diminish the policy success. Regional retention is fundamental and should be monitored over the next few years as another research priority. Some communities have already initiated retention efforts and these should be considered, too.

Another future research priority could be investigation of the character, aims and outcomes of cooperation between the migration agents and the state/territory/provincial governments, particularly in relation to business migration. The growing role of the migration industry for that migration suggests that interviewing the agents could provide
valuable insights into that cooperation. This could also improve the knowledge about the types of business activities that governments prefer migrants to undertake and their responses likely influenced by the agents, especially in light of the expected specific types of economic contribution.

Particular future research variables (eligibility factors like for example language ability, or previous work/business experience, and policy instruments such as for example government support services) were highlighted in Chapter Four, where they have restricted the present scope of the evaluation. There is a need to commence in the near future data collection and research on these variables. For example, more specifically, it was noted in that chapter that in the future it would be valuable to compare the economic participation of the regional migrants with that of all other migrants in both countries. Currently, lack of consistent, complete data, including on these eligibility factors prevents such a comparison.

A related proposition made in Chapter Four concerned examining whether, and if so, to what extent the programs’ migrants contribute to integrating regions into the modern knowledge-based economy, proposed by the ‘learning region’ concept as the ultimate dimension of regional development. Such knowledge could help to better plan for the role of regional migration policies in future regional development in Australia and Canada. Almost a decade of policies’ operations in both countries could perhaps make it now easier to obtain credible opinions on regional migration from political parties and/or from the general public (first hand). Institutional representatives interviewed for this thesis were asked about the parties’ and public attitudes (see Table 1.3b in Chapter One) but answers (second-hand opinions) were provided by few and were not deemed credible enough to warrant a discussion in this thesis.

Given many similarities between the Australian and Canadian regional migration schemes, any further study would be all the more valuable, if it maintained this comparative perspective. Findings from an in-depth cross-country analysis could also prove useful for nations elsewhere dealing with migrant concentration in largest urban areas and interested in similar dispersal policies.
Appendix I Population and socioeconomic trends in Australia and Canada

I.1 Introduction

This Appendix provides background information on the recent (1991–2001) population and socioeconomic trends in Australia and Canada. These trends are seen as an influence on the settlement decisions of the recent migrants on the one hand, and on the other hand, as a stimulus to the regional migration policies. This Appendix has five Sections. The Section below presents a general overview of immigration programs in both countries and the contribution of international migration to their population growth. Section I.3 examines the Australian and the Canadian population distribution, as well as identifies areas of population growth and decline in each country. It then discusses the internal migration trends in each country and closes with the population projections for them. Section I.4 compares selected socioeconomic characteristics of the Australian and the Canadian regional areas and looks at characteristics of people moving into and living in regions. It also discusses the employment patterns in regions, which the policies attempt to address. Section I.5 looks at the motivations of migrants who settled in regions in both countries. It next proceeds to the recent settlement trends of migrants in Australia and Canada and closes with internal migration trends of immigrants.

There is no common definition of ‘region’, and the examination of the socioeconomic trends in this Appendix rests on the given frameworks provided by the Australian and Canadian studies. These definitions are provided where necessary. The analytical approaches and the research interests reflected in these studies differ. Although the best comparable studies were sourced, it is impossible to compare these trends in perfectly corresponding terms. Sometimes other information is presented to allow for at least some degree of comparison between the trends in both countries.\(^1\) As explained in Chapter One (Section 1.6), the understanding of ‘region’ in the Australian and the Canadian policy contexts differ. This Appendix enlarges on the factors that have motivated such particular policy understanding of ‘region’ in each country, and it does so using the given.

\(^1\) In the case of the Canadian material, some data were only available on a commercial basis, which idea, after careful consideration, was declined due to costs that would be involved.
definition of frameworks. The examination of the policies in the chapters of this thesis corresponds to the individual policy understandings of 'region' in Australia and Canada.

The most basic understanding of 'region' comes from geographers. In this sense, a region is an area characterised by some particular geophysical features, usually described in geological and geomorphologic terms, differentiating it from other areas. Its landforms and soil on the one hand, and climate on the other, influence the type of human settlement it attracts and its economic activity. They also shape routes for trade and trade centres/towns emerge along these routes. The history of such an area influences the degree of cultural affinity, which, in turn, affects the degree of its social and economic evolution. A distinctive region develops: with certain type of economy, urban and rural settlement pattern, route networks reflecting the realities of trade and characterised by a certain type of climate and landscape (Hall 1970:13). Other definitions exist too. 'Regions' may be understood from a dynamic perspective, where patterns of movements in geographic space, regular or periodic, can be used to draw regional boundaries (1970:15). Such an approach is recognised in the Australian and Canadian literature (Harris and Dixon 1978:5,10; Brewis 1972:46). 'Nodal', 'functional', or 'polarised' regions, as they are called, are based on focal points of economic activity and involve functional relationships (Brewis 1972:46). These relationships may exist in a form of human movement (commuting, business travel) or as flows of goods. A particular feature of such flows is their hierarchic structure: flows from smaller centres merge in bigger ones, and these two can flow into larger centres still (Hall 1970:15-6). Flows, when measured and plotted, point to a number of nodes (central points of greatest attraction) and watersheds (boundaries of equal attraction of different nodes), where nodes are the regional capitals and the watersheds are the regional boundaries (Harris and Dixon 1978:5).

'Regions', inhabited by distinctive ethnic and or/linguistic groups, linked by common history, socioeconomic, cultural and religious heritages that make them different to the neighbouring areas, may be granted an autonomous administrative status, like Catalonia in Spain or Greenland in Denmark. 'Regions', so defined, are the subject of studies in many academic disciplines. Furthermore, this term is also used in the language of international politics and modern reportage, for example 'Southeast Asia region' or 'the
Middle East region’. Discussion on their applications extends beyond the focus of this thesis.

I.2 Immigration and population growth

This Section compares the contribution of international migration to Australian and Canadian population growth. In Australia, in the 2001 Census, 23.1 per cent of the total population (around 19.4m) was born overseas (ABS 2003c:13). In Canada, in the same Census year, 18.4 per cent was foreign-born, or 5.4m of the total population (Statistics Canada 2003a:5). Table I.1 below compares the annual immigration programs operated by Australia and Canada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>112,200</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>216,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>98,900</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>232,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>62,800</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>256,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>224,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>82,500</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>212,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>73,900</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>226,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>67,100</td>
<td>12,060</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>216,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>70,200</td>
<td>9,960</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>189,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>80,610</td>
<td>13,730</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>227,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>93,080</td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>250,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>108,070</td>
<td>12,530</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>229,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>114,360</td>
<td>13,850</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>221,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- a) Figures represent granted visas under skill, family and special eligibility categories. Figures do not include New Zealand citizens from 2000 onwards.
- b) Figures represent visas granted under Humanitarian Program.
- c) In addition to this number, 5,900 Safe Haven visas were granted in 1999-2000.
- d) Figures represent actual landings and include humanitarian entrants.

Sources: Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (DIEA); DIMA 2000, DIMIA 2005i; CIC 2003f; CIC 2005b.

Table I.1 shows that in each year the Canadian immigration program was larger than in Australia. Although, high annual programs in both countries though have greatly contributed to their population growth. In Australia, net overseas migration, which includes permanent residents and long-term residents,2 has been contributing on average

---

2 Net overseas migration apart from including permanent and long-term movements (including also Australian residents) has a third component: category jumping. It is used to adjust net overseas migration figure for people who change the duration of their intended stay in Australia (or departure from Australia)
40.8 per cent to the overall population growth between 1990-2003 (author’s calculation based on DIMIA 2004n:140). The lowest contribution has been recorded in early 1990s. It exceeded 40 per cent (with an exception of 1998) in 1996 and reached 48.6 per cent in 2002. Preliminary counts for 2003 indicated net overseas migration contribution of 52.1 per cent (DIMIA 2004n:140). The annual population growth rates in Australia between the censuses 1991-96 and 1996-2001 were 1.16 per cent and 1.18 per cent respectively (ABS 2003c:20).

One of the reasons for the considerable contribution of migrants to the population growth has been the longer-term trend of falling fertility rates in Australia. In 1961, the total fertility rate was 3.6. It decreased to 1.9 by 1979 and then to 1.73 in 2001, although a small increase to 1.75 was recorded in 2002 (DIMIA 2004n:12). Over the same period, the average life expectancy has been increasing and it reached 77.0 for males and 82.4 for females in 1999-2001 (2004n:13).

In Canada, the contribution of the net international migration to the overall rates of population growth has also been significant. In 1994 it contributed slightly less than 50 per cent (Statistics Canada 1996:9). From 1995-96, the net international migration has been contributing more to the population increase than has the natural increase. In 2002-03, more than 60 per cent of the population growth was due to the net international migration (Statistics Canada 2004a:6). This shows that migrants have been contributing more to the population growth in Canada than in Australia. The recent annual population growth rates in Canada were 1.09 per cent in 2001-02, 0.91 per cent in 2002-03 and 0.9 per cent in 2003-04 (author’s calculations based on Statistics Canada 2004a:3; 2005a:1).

The total fertility rate has been falling in Canada, too - from 3.8 in 1960 (Dolin and Young 2002:note 9) it decreased to 1.58 in 1987 (Statistics Canada 1996:15). In 2000, this rate was 1.50 and it slightly increased in 2003 to 1.53 (2005b:2). Between 1979 and 2002 there was an increase in life expectancy: it improved for men by 5.8 years and for women by 3.3 years. Men who were born in 2002 could expect to live to the age of 77.2

after they had arrived (left) and had declared the initial intention on the passenger card. Category jumping was calculated into net overseas migration since July 1976 to June 1997 inclusive and from July 2001 on. The pause (that is, setting the category jumping to zero) was caused by deficiencies found in the measures applied to calculating category jumping. For additional information see Khoo and McDonald 2000; ABS 2003a; 2003d, and McDonald et al. 2003.
and women to the age of 82.1 years (Statistics Canada 2004b:1), thus comparable to Australia. The trends in Canada and Australia show similarities of falling fertility rates and of improving longevity. Under such circumstances, the international migration has been overwhelmingly contributing to the population growth in both countries.

I.3 Population distribution and internal migration trends

This Section presents patterns of the Australian and the Canadian population distribution. It identifies similarities in the population growth and decline trends in both countries, and points to areas where growth in concentrated. It then discusses the internal migration trends in both countries, followed by population projections. It enables seeing why certain capital cities in Australia are excluded from the regional migrants’ settlement in favour of all other locations in their respective states, and what trends have motivated eligibility of some entire jurisdictions, including their capital cities, for these migrants’ settlement. It also presents the principal reason for the Canadian provincial immigration policies resulting in the divergent policy application of ‘region’ from Australia.

I.3.1 Population distribution and patterns of growth and decline

Australia. Population in Australia is concentrated along two widely separated coasts. The east and southeast coasts (Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania) have altogether a larger population than the southwest coast around Perth. In June 2001, 84.7 per cent of Australia’s population lived within 50 kilometres of the coastline (ABS 2003c:3). In both coastal regions the population is particularly concentrated in capital cities (ABS 2004d:88). Table I.2 presents the Australian population distribution by state and territory in 2001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/territory</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of national population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>6 575 217</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>4 804 726</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>3 628 946</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1 511 728</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1 901 159</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>471 795</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>197 768</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>319 317</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total(^a)</td>
<td>19 413 240</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a) Includes Other Territories.
Source: ABS 2003c.
Table I.2 shows that the most populous Australian states are New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia. Tasmania and the two Territories have considerably smaller populations, and the Northern Territory has the smallest population base of all jurisdictions. According to ABS (2003c:7), in 2001, 63.7 per cent (12.4m) of Australia’s population was living in the capital cities, with 39.1 per cent of the total population living either in Sydney or Melbourne. New South Wales and Victoria had the highest rates of urbanisation from among the states - 89 per cent each. Only the Australian Capital Territory rated higher. Canberra accounted for 99.3 per cent of the Territory's population. By contrast, Tasmania and the Northern Territory had the highest proportion of populations living in the rural balance, which was 20.9 per cent for Tasmania and 16.6 per cent for the Territory (see Box I.1).

Box I.1 Sections of State, Australia.

Sections of State (SOS) represent aggregation of non-contiguous geographical areas of particular urban/rural type. SOS are only defined in Census years and serve for Census collection and production of standard statistical outputs purposes.

Major Urban areas - urban areas with 100,000 or more;

Other Urban areas - urban areas with populations between 1,000-99,000 inhabitants;

Bounded localities - rural areas with population clusters 200-999;

Rural balance - remainder of State/Territory
Migratory - areas composed of off-shore, shipping and migratory Census Collection Districts.

SOS are based upon Urban Centre/Locality (UC/L) Structure. Population counts from last Census are used to define UC/L structure, which means that this classification is only current at time of Census. Urban Centre - population cluster of 1,000 or more people;
Locality - population cluster of 200-999 people.

Inhabitants of Urban Centres are classified as 'urban', while inhabitants of Localities are classified as 'rural'. Statistical Geography Vol.1. Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC) 2001; ABS 2001b.

The population growth in Australia is not evenly distributed. Between 1991–2001 it has occurred along the coastline (particularly in New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia) and in some inland areas in New South Wales and Victoria. The capital cities’ growth in that period was characterised by increases in their outer fringes (ABS 1998b:20,24; 2003c:26). In 1996–2001 moves into inner capital cities’ areas were also noted (2003c:26).
The counter-urbanisation trend in Australia has been observed since the 1970s (Castles et al. 1998:48) although it slowed down in the 1990s in comparison to the previous decade (Hugo 2002:12-3). Coastal population growth has been increasing, especially in regions close to the capital cities (ABS 2004d:96). It has been placing pressure on the natural environment and has been evident in the loss of unique vegetation, the pollution of the marine environment, as well as in growing demand on the physical infrastructure to serve the growing populations (Department of the Environment and Heritage (DEH) 2001:15,32; ABS 2004a:11-2).

Coastal areas are attractive because of their mild climate, more affordable housing, work in the tourism industry (or retiring from work in case of older people) and links with family and friends. Other personal reasons may entice a person, or a family to move to a coastal area. New residents in high growth regional coastal areas in 1996-2001 moved from capital cities (less than one-third of the whole group), 42 per cent moved from a ‘large population centre’ and 27 per cent relocated from country areas. A total of 78 per cent of these new residents moved from within their state or territory. New residents of working age were most likely to come from large population centres while early retirees and retirees were most likely to come from the capital cities (ABS 2004a:11,12).

According to the 1996 Census, about two-thirds of Australia’s population growth occurred in capital cities’ SDs. The most recent Census established that between 1996 and 2001, the capital city SDs population growth accounted for 65 per cent of the overall population growth in the country. At the national level, the proportion of the population living in capital cities’ SDs accounted for around 64 per cent between 1991 and 2001. Both Censuses also established that Sydney experienced the largest increase in population (ABS 1998b:18, 2003c:24).

The recent data for 1997-2002 confirm the trend. Australia’s capital cities accounted for 66 per cent of the nation’s population growth, with Sydney and Melbourne experiencing the largest increases (ABS 2004d:89). However, as Hugo (2004) observed, once

---

3 In this discussion, ‘large population centres’ are Statistical Districts. These are mainly urban areas containing population centres of 25,000 or more and which are not located within a capital city Statistical Division. Country areas are the remaining areas. ABS 2004a:12. Definition of Statistical Division (SD) can be found in note 22 (Section 1.6) in Chapter One.

4 See definition in note 22 (Section 1.6) in Chapter One.
international migration is excluded, regional cities are growing faster than capital cities. Garnaut et al. (2003) have shown population growth patterns for Sydney and Melbourne, other capital cities and the ‘rest of Australia’ between 1981–1996 and 1996–2001. They found that between 1981-96 capital cities other than Sydney and Melbourne grew more rapidly than these two capitals. However, migrants’ settlement during that period was concentrated in Sydney and Melbourne, whereas migrants have contributed a seemingly comparable proportion in other capital cities (considered jointly) but less to the population growth in the ‘rest of Australia’ (see chart 11, p.44). Between 1996–2001, the migrants’ contribution to the population growth in Sydney and Melbourne further increased, at the cost of smaller contributions to the other capital cities and the ‘rest of Australia’. The other capital cities in that period received together an equivalent of around two-thirds of migrants who settled in Sydney and Melbourne, and the ‘rest of Australia’ an equivalent of around a half of them (chart 11, p.44). In that period, these two cities have also recorded the most rapid population growth in comparison to other capitals and the ‘rest of Australia’ (2003:44-8).

This illustrates an exceptional contribution of migrants to the population growth in the two largest cities in Australia and a smaller contribution elsewhere, particularly in the ‘rest of Australia’ that is outside the capital cities. Such exceptional growth of these two cities, and Sydney particularly, is due to a high contribution from migrants, and has been the principal reason behind introducing the regional migration policy. This is reflected in the administrative decisions excluding Sydney, Melbourne (in some cases) and other capital cities such as Brisbane and Perth from settlement of migrants under the schemes (see further Subsection 1.5.2). This channels their settlement to these other areas of their respective states that have had a disproportionately low settlement of migrants. Not only the population distribution concerns but also the economic development considerations for these other areas beyond the capital cities are behind the policy motivations. The policy intention is to enable these other areas to receive some of the economic benefits that the capital cities have been receiving as a result of migrants’ settlement. The next Subsection discusses the particular situation of Melbourne as a location eligible for regional migration.

In addition to the capital cities, population growth in Australia has also been recorded in regions surrounding urban areas in general. These regions remain within commuting
distance to cities and attract people interested in having a more rural lifestyle and are popular among retirees (Bureau of Immigration Multicultural and Population Research 1994:45 in: ABS 2003c:31).

During 1991-96 and 1996-2001, few regional centres outside the coastal and metropolitan areas in Australia experienced high population growth. These were "(...) either major regional cities or parts of these centres, providing goods and services to their surrounding regions". During these two periods, there was also a high population growth in some inland centres, thriving thanks to an increase in employment and services in industry-related opportunities (mining) in their regions (ABS 1998b:26; 2003c:32).

**Box I.2 Definitions of Metropolitan, Australia.**

There is no universally accepted definition of 'metropolitan'. Its meaning depends on the context in which it is used. It may be used in reference to a specific group of areas or more vaguely (Hugo 2002:Introduction). ABS has not defined this term in its terminology, but as it states "(...) it is often interpreted as the Capital City SD in each State/Territory, with ex-metropolitan being the remainder of the State/Territory" (ABS 2004c:9). The paragraph above indicates that ABS indeed uses the term 'metropolitan'.

'Metropolitan' was defined in the Rural, Remote and Metropolitan Areas (RRMA) Classification developed for the (then) Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry and Energy and Human Services and Health in 1994 based on the 1991 Census data. It comprised two metropolitan classes (capital city and other metropolitan centres), three rural classes (large rural centre, small rural centre and other rural area) and two remote classes (remote centre and other remote centre). RRMA has never been an ABS classification (ABS 2004c:9,12). Currently, ABS uses Remoteness Structure to measure remoteness of a point based on the physical road distance to the nearest urban centre. It is based on the Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA). More information can be found in *Statistical Geography Vol.1. Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC) 2001*; ABS 2001b.

This Appendix illustrates different applications of 'metropolitan' ('non-metropolitan'). For example, Hugo (2002) in Subsection I.4.1 defines 'non-metropolitan' as all areas of Australia outside centres with more than 100,000 inhabitants. This corresponds to the Sections of State structure (see Box I.1). This concept also corresponds to the Canadian understanding of 'metropolitan' (see Box I.3), where 'metropolitan' is not linked to administrative functions of a city (capital city). By contrast, Bell and Hugo (2000) in Subsection I.4.2 consider only capital cities as 'metropolitan' to discuss internal migration between these cities and the 'non-metropolitan' areas.

There were also some areas that have suffered population declines - often inland and remote areas. According to the 1996 and 2001 Censuses, population decline occurred in three types of settlement: in some urban areas, in rural areas and due to industry decline (McKenzie 1994 in ABS 1998b:29 and in ABS 2003c:35).

Population decline in rural areas has been occurring for a considerable time (various authors in ABS 2003c:36; ABS 1998b:29). This has been due to the net migration loss, the ageing of the population (also occurring through net migration loss of younger
people, which may lead to further losses through changes in natural increase), as well as
due to the technological and the economic changes in the rural sector that result in fewer
employment opportunities (ABS 1998b:30; 2003c:36). Some of the latter changes
between 1996-2001 were attributed to the consequences of drought (ABS 2003c:36).

Industry-related population decline between 1991-96 and 1996-2001 occurred because of
decline and reduction in employment in regional mining and manufacturing centres,
which was a result of economic restructuring, market fluctuation and resource depletion
(McKenzie 1994 in ABS 1998b:30; 2003c:36). Generally, population decline between
1991-2001 was experienced by northwest New South Wales, southwest Queensland and
central Western Australia (ABS 1998b:21; ABS 2003c:26). It is attributed principally to
the internal migration patterns (ABS 1998b:20).

Canada. The Canadian population predominantly resides in the southern cities. Over 85
per cent of the population lives within 350 km of the U.S.A. border (OECD 2002:34).
Extreme climatic conditions and remoteness make northern Canada much less populated.
Table I.3 presents the distribution of the Canadian population by provinces and
territories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/territory</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of national population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>522 000</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>136 700</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>932 400</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>749 900</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>7 397 000</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>11 897 600</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>1 151 300</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1 000 100</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>3 056 700</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>4 078 400</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YK</td>
<td>30 100</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWT&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>40 800</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28 100</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31 021 300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a) Northwest Territories; b) Nunavut.
Source: Statistics Canada 2004d; Statistics Canada 2004e.

Table I.3 shows that Ontario, Québec, British Columbia and Alberta to be the most
populous provinces. The two remaining Prairie provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan
have population sizes around 1m each. The Eastern provinces other than Québec have
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much smaller populations ranging from almost 750,000 in New Brunswick to almost 137,000 in Prince Edward Island. All the Territories have less than 50,000 inhabitants each.

There was no comparable coastal growth in terms of location in Canada, as it was in Australia, however some other common trends of population growth and decline could be identified. Population growth in Canada occurred in nation’s largest Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs) and in regions surrounding urban areas (see Box I.3). According to the 2001 Census, CMAs situated near the southern border that are based on manufacturing or services and that attract immigrants, have had the biggest population increases (Statistics Canada 2002a:5). There were 27 CMAs in 2001 and 20 of them recorded population growth, including 11 CMAs where growth exceeded the national average. Only 9 CMAs declined (2002a:5). In 2001, just over 64 per cent of the Canadian population lived in the 27 CMAs, up slightly from 63 per cent in 1996. This proportion (64 per cent) is comparable to the proportion of the Australian population living in the capital cities’ SDs (see above).

Box I.3 Definitions of Census Metropolitan Area, Census Agglomeration, Rural Areas and Rural Population, Canada.

| Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) | area consisting of one or more adjacent municipalities situated around a major urban core, which has population of at least 100,000, based on census population counts. To be included in CMA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the central urban area, as measured by commuting flows derived from census place of work data. |
| Census Agglomeration (CA)      | area consisting of one or more adjacent municipalities situated around a major urban core, which has population of at least 10,000, based on census population counts. To be included in CA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the central urban area, as measured by commuting flows derived from census place of work data. |
| Urban Areas                    | have minimum population concentration of 1,000 and population density of at least 400/km², based on current census population counts. Urban population includes all population living in urban cores, secondary urban cores, urban fringes of CMAs and CAs and populations living in urban areas outside CMAs and CA. |
| Rural Areas                    | all territory outside urban areas that remains after their delineation and includes small towns, villages and other populated places with less than 1,000 population; agricultural lands; and remote and wilderness areas. |
| Rural Population               | all population living in rural fringes of CMAs and CAs, as well as population living in rural areas outside CMAs and CAs. 2001 Census Dictionary - Reference, Statistics Canada 2003c. |

Just like in the capital cities in Australia, where the population growth in concentrated, in Canada population growth is concentrated in four large urban regions: Ontario’s extended
Golden Horseshoe (including Toronto, Oshawa, Hamilton, St. Catharines-Niagara, Kitchener, Guelph and Barrie) Montréal and adjacent region (including Salaberry-de-Valleyfield, Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, Saint Hyacinthe, Sorel, Joliette and Lachute), Lower Mainland and southern Vancouver Island (including Vancouver, Abbotsford, Chilliwack, Victoria, Duncan, Nanaimo and Parksville on Vancouver Island) as well as in Calgary-Edmonton corridor (including Leduc, Red Deer and Wetaskiwin). Overall, in 2001 15.3m people lived in these four regions, a 7.3 per cent increase from 1996, compared with 0.5 per cent population gain in the rest of the country. These regions also represented 51 per cent of the population, compared to 49 per cent in 1996 and 41 per cent in 1971 (Statistics Canada 2002a:6,7). Beyond these four regions, CMAs such as Halifax, Ottawa-Hull and Windsor also recorded strong population growth rates (2002a:5). Table I.4 shows intercensal rates of population growth (1996-2001) in the Canadian CMAs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMA</th>
<th>1996-2001 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary AB</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa ON</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto ON</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton AB</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver BC</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener ON</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford BC</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor ON</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa-Hull ON</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton ON</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax NS</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London ON</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon SK</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal QC</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherbrooke QC</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria BC</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston ON</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec City QC</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Catharines-Niagara ON</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg MB</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Sudbury ON</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder Bay ON</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicoutimi-Jonquière QC</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint John NB</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trois-Rivières QC</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s NL</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina SK</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada 2002a and accompanying tables.5

5 These accompanying tables are not integrated into the principal document and can be found in http://geodepot.statcan.ca/Diss/Highlights/Tables_e.pdf.
Table I.4 shows that the strongest growth from among the CMAs was recorded in 1996-2001 by Calgary, followed by Oshawa, Toronto, Edmonton and Vancouver. Hence, among the top performers were two Albertan CMAs and two Ontarian CMAs. The growth of Halifax in Nova Scotia is also worth noting, although its rate was much lower than that of the top performers. As Statistics Canada observes, its growth indicated that this CMA is strengthening its position as the major urban centre in Atlantic Canada. This growth is attributed equally to a natural increase and to international migration (Statistics Canada 2002a:5). On the other hand, population decline can be observed in some CMAs located in the Eastern provinces: Chicoutimi-Jonquière; Trois-Rivières; Saint John and St. John’s. Winnipeg in Manitoba recorded a minimal population growth, while another Prairie CMA (Regina) experienced a minimal population decline.

The extended Golden Horseshoe accounted for 22 per cent of the nation’s population, and almost half of the total population growth between 1996-2001. Its major contributing factor was international migration concentrated predominantly in Toronto. Similarly in Lower Mainland and southern Vancouver Island, the main population growth component was international migration. Montréal did not receive as many immigrants as Toronto and Vancouver: 126,000 immigrants settled there, compared to 445,000 in Toronto and 180,000 in Vancouver. The Calgary-Edmonton corridor growth occurred mostly because of internal migration from other provinces. A second contributor to the population growth was a strong natural increase - a result of a relatively young population. Both Calgary and Edmonton began to attract international migration, but this represented a minor component of the growth in 1996-2001 (Statistics Canada 2002a:6,7).

That immigrant settlement is concentrated particularly in Toronto, Vancouver and Montréal and contributes exceptionally to these largest CMAs’ population growth, as opposed to a much lower population growth elsewhere in the country (excluding Calgary-Edmonton), is the principal reason for introducing the provincial immigration policies in Canada (see Subsection I.5.2). ‘Regions’, under the Canadian policy, denominate all other areas than these three CMAs. Their ‘regionality’ is measured by one common factor: lower settlement of migrants (and the resultant economic consequences). Therefore, although the policy principle is similar to the one in Australia, its application
diverges in practice. Under the policy in Canada, not the areas outside the capital cities in particular, but entire jurisdictions, including their largest CMAs, are eligible for the provincial migrants’ settlement. In fact, CIC states that (2001f):

[i]f Canada wants to achieve a more balanced geographic distribution of immigrants, it should target second-tier cities and other metropolitan areas rather than rural and small town areas. (...) Thus, the most promising alternatives to Toronto, Vancouver and Montréal as destinations for new immigrants are the next largest “second-tier” cities: Calgary and Edmonton, Winnipeg and Québec City, Ottawa and metropolitan areas in southern Ontario. Other, smaller metropolitan areas in Canada may also be able to accommodate a larger number of immigrants (2001f:iv,56).

This shows that the explicit policy objective is the dispersal of migrants away from Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver. Constitutional reasons for enabling regional settlement in all areas of the provinces, as well as general information about how the provinces where Montréal and Vancouver are located manage the migrants’ dispersal, can be found in Chapter One (Section 1.6). The ultimate aim of regionalisation in Canada resembles that of Australia: it consists in sharing the benefits of migration mostly limited to the three largest CMAs (CIC 2004e:2-3,7).

As in Australia, population growth in Canada was observed in the outer fringes of CMAs. This was driven by movement of young families with children, as well as by migration and natural increase. In some CMAs, also comparable to Australia, population growth in the core municipalities occurred (Statistics Canada 2002a:8).

There was also some population growth in Rural and Small Town (RST) areas in Canada (see Box I.4) and it was related to the commuter flows to the urban centres. The character of this growth is similar to the growth observed in Australia. According to the 2001 Census (Statistics Canada 2002a:8), the growth of RSTs depended on the proportion of its residents travelling to work in urban centres. Population of RSTs where more than 30 per cent commuted grew by 3.7 per cent between 1996-2001. Except in the most remote areas, RSTs, where the proportion of commuters represented less than 30 per cent, declined through internal migration (2002a:8).
Box I.4 Definition of Rural and Small Town areas, Canada.

Rural and Small Town areas (RSTs) - populations living outside the commuting zones of larger urban centres - specifically outside CMAs and CAs (see Box I.3 above). RSTs include all municipalities with urban populations of 1,000-9,999 and rural areas, where less than 50 per cent of employed people commute to work in the urban core of CMA/CA. Thus, they represent the non-CMA and non-CA population. Rural and Small Town Canada Analysis Bulletin, vol 3, no. 6, Rothwell et al. 2002; A Profile of the Canadian Population; Where We Live, Statistics Canada 2002a.

Furthermore, some similar lifestyle-driven population growth occurred in Canada, as occurred in Australia. The 1996 and 2001 Censuses indicate that such growth occurred in retirement and regional recreation centres (for example, southern Vancouver Island and Okanagan Valley in British Columbia, around Calgary in Alberta, around Montréal, in the Laurentians north of Montréal in Québec, north of Toronto around the lakes and around Toronto in Ontario) (Mendelson and Bollman 1998:7,8; Statistics Canada 1997:10; 2002a:7,8 and accompanying maps). Moreover, also similarly to Australia, there was some resource-based population growth: communities in northern Alberta grew between 1996-2001. This growth was related to the development of the oil projects (Statistics Canada 2002a:7).

Further symmetry in population trends can be found in areas of population decline in Canada in 1991-96 and 1996-2001. Similarly to Australia, that decline occurred in rural areas and some remote resource-based municipalities. Population in rural regions has been in steady decline since 1981 (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC 2002)). The share of rural population living in rural non-metropolitan adjacent regions (see Box I.5) has been declining. The 2001 Census has shown an absolute decline in total population in these areas. By contrast, the rural metropolitan-adjacent regions have, according to this Census, more than 50 per cent of the predominantly rural population, and this share has been increasing in all Census periods from 1981. The share of population in northern and remote regions has been more or less constant, with a small downward trend (2002:2,3).

---

6 These maps are not integrated into the document and can be found in http://geodepot.statcan.ca/Diss/Highlights/Maps_e.pdf.
Box I.5 Predominantly rural regions, Canada.

Predominantly rural regions - regions where over 50 per cent of population lives in rural communities. In Canada, this includes all Census Divisions (CDs)\(^a\) without a major city. Rural community has density less than 150/km\(^2\) and includes individuals living in countryside, towns and small cities inside and outside of the commuting zones of urban centres.

Predominantly rural regions are divided into:
- rural metro-adjacent regions (contain CDs adjacent to metropolitan regions of 50,000 and more);
- rural non-metro adjacent regions (contain CDs non-adjacent to any metropolitan region);
- rural northern and remote regions (CDs entirely or in major part above the following latitudes by region: Newfoundland and Labrador - 50\(^{th}\); Québec and Ontario - 49\(^{th}\); Manitoba - 53\(^{rd}\); Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia - 54\(^{th}\) and all the Yukon Territory, Northwest Territories and Nunavut).

This is the OECD definition of ‘rural’. Canadian Rural Population Trends, no. 2138/E, AAFC 2002.

Note: a) This term was introduced in Chapter One. See note 21 in Section 1.6.

Between 1996-2001, RSTs recorded an overall population decline of 0.4 per cent. Population levels in these areas declined in every province except Ontario, Manitoba and Alberta (Statistics Canada 2002a:8). Depopulation of RSTs in that period was the most extreme in Newfoundland and Labrador, which posted an 11 per cent decline rate. This had a common cause with depopulation of rural Australia: out-migration of young people. That resulted in significantly raising the median age of the RST population in the province (2002c:11). That scale of out-migration from RSTs in Newfoundland and Labrador was a continuation of the earlier trend. Between 1971-1996 the strongest youth out-migration has been observed in that province, in Prince Edward Island as well as in Saskatchewan (Tremblay 2001:7,8).

Population decline has also occurred in some resource-based municipalities. Several northern, resource-based municipalities as well as one-industry towns suffered population losses in the decade leading to 2001 (Statistics Canada 1997:9; 2002a:9). Industry Canada’s (2004) calculations, based on the 2001 Census, revealed also that population decline was recorded by many CAs with less than 50,000 of inhabitants (many of which have resources-based economies), while those with more than 50,000 of residents grew by 3.2 per cent (2004:44).

Industry Canada (2004) has shown also that the only two provinces that have experienced population growth in CMAs, CAs and non-CMA/CA areas in 1996-2001 were Alberta and Ontario. In all other provinces, with exception of Manitoba, there was a population decline in non-CMA/CA areas. The Manitoba CMA (Winnipeg) and non-CMA/CA areas recorded a comparable rate of growth: 0.6 per cent and 0.5 per cent, respectively. Except

379
Newfoundland and Labrador, where an overall decline was experienced, CMAs generally grew in other provinces, while the population growth in CAs represented a patchy picture across the provinces (2004:29).

In sum, the population decline in the 1990s in Canada has been driven by similar factors that accounted for population decline in Australia: out-migration of rural youth contributing to rapid ageing of population as well as industry decline (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA) 2003:9; Government of Newfoundland and Labrador 2002:8).

I.3.2 Impact of internal migration trends on population growth and decline

This Subsection presents the general population movement trends in both countries, and their causal role in the Australian and the Canadian provincial immigration policies.

Australia. Table I.5 below shows the average annual population growth rates in the states and territories between 1991-2001, and component rates of this growth. This serves to discuss the role of the interstate migration in the total population growth rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/territory</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Natural increase</th>
<th>Net overseas migration</th>
<th>Net interstate migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1991-96</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1996–2001</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABS 2003c.
Table I.5 shows that the interstate migration in both periods has contributed the most to the population growth in Queensland. In both periods that state also recorded the highest overall growth rates on Australia's scale. High overall growth in both periods was also recorded by Western Australia, yet in comparison to Queensland, the contribution of internal migration to that growth was minimal. In 1991-96, with exception of the Australian Capital Territory, all other jurisdictions experienced negative interstate migration. In 1996-2001, all jurisdictions, inclusive of the Australian Capital Territory, had negative interstate migration rates, except Queensland and Western Australia. ABS summarises that the patterns of internal migration in Australia were northward and westward in 1991-96, and northward in 1996-2001 (ABS 1998b:34; 2003c:40). The attraction of Queensland and Western Australia illustrate this point.

The rates of outflows of residents, as shown by the Table, may partially explain the stagnant overall growth rates in Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania in 1991-96. In 1996-2001, while Victoria had experienced a total growth of 1.1 per cent, Tasmania recorded a minimal population decline (-0.1 per cent) to which out-migration has contributed (at a rate highest at Australia's scale). Negative interstate migration rate has also been experienced in that period by South Australia. Its overall average annual growth rate remained positive, but very low (0.5 per cent).

The negative internal migration rates in Tasmania and South Australia, combined with population stagnation in their respective capital cities, suggest the least favourable population trends at Australia's scale. In 1991-2001, growth in Hobart and Adelaide remained as static as their respective states. Hobart had the second lowest average annual growth rate of all capital cities between 1991-96 (0.5 per cent), and the lowest rate of 0.2 per cent in the consecutive period (ABS 2003c:25). There was a continued trend of out-migration from Hobart across both periods and it was interstate. Although in 1991-96 inflows from the rest of the island kept the net migration positive for Hobart, that intrastate migration was insufficient in 1996-2001 and Hobart recorded a net migration loss (1998b:40; 2003c:46).

Adelaide had the lowest average annual growth rate of all capital cities in 1991-96 (0.4 per cent). It only minimally improved in 1996-2001 (0.5 per cent), when Adelaide moved ahead of Hobart and took the second lowest position of all capital cities (ABS 2003c:25).
There was, as in Hobart, a consistent pattern of out-migration from Adelaide and it was also directed interstate. The net internal migration result for that capital was negative in 1991-96 and 1996-2001, although the total loss was heavier in the first part of the decade (ABS 1998b:39; 2003c:46).

Clearly, these two states and their respective capital cities had experienced the least favourable population trends in 1991-2001, thus explaining inclusion of their entire territories as areas eligible for regional migration. In fact, as explained in Section 1.6 (Chapter One), less than 50 per cent of the national average population growth of metropolitan areas qualifies them for regional migration. Hobart and Adelaide are the case in point. Their exclusion from settlement could otherwise have an adverse impact on the regional migration into these states, which, as shown in Table I.2, have smaller populations than other states. Furthermore, in case of Tasmania, its non-central geographical location off the Australian coast, may already contribute to migrants’ overlooking it as a possible settlement choice.

What is also worth noting in Table I.5 are the high average annual growth rates in the Northern Territory. In 1991-96, that rate was the second highest after Queensland, and in the recent period, both jurisdictions recorded the same average annual growth rate of 1.7 - the highest at Australia’s scale. In both periods a natural increase has overwhelmingly contributed to the outcomes of the Northern Territory: in fact, the most on the national scale. On the other hand, in both periods the Territory also recorded negative interstate migration. Similarly to the high average annual growth rate of the Territory, Darwin, being the smallest capital city, recorded the second highest average annual population growth of all capital cities in 1991-96 (2.1 per cent). In 1996-2001, it had the highest average annual population growth rate at the national scale of 2.2 per cent. Brisbane ranked first highest in 1991-96 with a growth rate of 2.3 per cent and in 1996-2001 it took the second position after Darwin, at 1.7 per cent (ABS 2003c:25).

Despite such favourable Territory and Darwin average annual growth rates in 1991-2001, the inclusion of the entire Territory for regional migration is also justified. First, due to its smallest population base (Table I.2) on Australia’s scale. Second, because of the pattern of internal migration flows. In 1991-96 and 1996-2001, the Territory experienced highest population turnovers in absolute terms: 171,700 in the first period and 169,200 in 1996-
2001. Their magnitude makes them almost equal to the total population of the Territory. Such trends suggest that this jurisdiction has been attractive for temporary, short-term interstate moves for employment reasons but not for long-term residence (ABS 1998b:35; 2003c:41). This explains why the Territory is interested in gaining more longer-term residents through regional migration. Exclusion of Darwin, the only settlement of a considerable size, could adversely impact on the attractiveness of settlement in that jurisdiction, pararely to Hobart in Tasmania. Both jurisdictions are located on the fringes of the country, which may already be a disadvantageous factor and therefore eligibility of their capital cities may act as an incentive.

Other capital cities such as Sydney, Melbourne and Perth grew at comparable rates to their respective states. In 1991-96, the average annual growth rate of Sydney was 1.1 per cent and in the consecutive period 1.2 per cent (compare New South Wales growth in Table I.5). Melbourne grew on average 0.8 per cent per year during 1991-96 and in 1996-2001 its average annual growth increased to 1.1 per cent. Finally, Perth grew on average by 1.7 per cent annually in 1991-96. This rate declined to 1.5 per cent in 1996-2001 (ABS 2003c:25). Net internal migration losses were experienced by Sydney in both periods (they were the largest at the national scale in both periods) and in Melbourne only in 1991-96 but the city total net migration gain in 1996-2001 was minimal (ABS 1998b:39; 2003c:45). Eligibility of Melbourne - the second largest city for regional migration appears a bit of a paradox. Yet, it seems that the above trends of low annual average city population growth and net migration losses in 1991-96 (mostly interstate) have underlidy the decision to make Melbourne eligible. Indeed, on the basis of the 1991-96 population trends the policies were being introduced in the mid-decade. As observed in Chapter One, Melbourne is not eligible under all regional skilled visas, and as a result of skills audits, it may only be eligible for settlement of people with certain occupations (see Subsection 2.3.2 in Chapter Two). By contrast, the high annual average growth rates of Sydney, Perth and Brisbane explain their exclusion from further regional overseas migration in favour of the remainder of their states.

Table I.6 Interstate moves in Australia 1991–96.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory of origin</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>256.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>499.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>118.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>375.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>168.7</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>341.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>151.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>136.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>427.5</td>
<td>267.3</td>
<td>542.5</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>148.1</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>1741.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net gain/loss: -71.8 -107.8 201.0 -23.1 11.5 -9.1 -1.8 1.1 ...


Table I.7 Interstate moves in Australia 1996–2001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory of origin</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>249.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>535.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>339.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>190.1</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>395.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>156.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>158.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>468.8</td>
<td>345.4</td>
<td>487.4</td>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>1844.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net gain/loss: -66.5 6.4 92.2 -12.9 2.9 -15.0 -2.2 -4.6 ...

Note: a) Includes Other Territories. Source: ABS 2003c.

Tables I.6 and I.7 show a steady out-migration from New South Wales to Queensland. Tasmanians' preferred destinations were Queensland and Victoria in 1991-96 but Victoria became the principal one in 1996-2001 while Queensland remained the second. Victorian highest net loss in interstate migration in 1991-96 (Table I.6) is attributed to economic recession in the state (ABS 1998b:34). In general, in both periods almost 50 per cent of all the interstate migration occurred in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland (ABS 1998b:34; ABS 2003c:40).

The above internal migration trends explain the earlier shown highest population growth rates in Queensland. Between 1991-2001 that state showed the greatest population increase (by 23 per cent or 700,000 people). By contrast, Tasmania experienced the smallest increase over the two decades leading to 2001. It increased by 9 per cent between 1981-91 but only by 1 per cent 1991-2001 (ABS 2003c:22-3). Different reasons are able explain why people move. Table I.8 summarises reasons behind internal migration.
Table 1.8 Main reasons for moving in Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family reasons</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Other reasons</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be with or near family</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>Become home buyer/owner</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered marriage</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Dwelling structure unsatisfactory</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be independent</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage/de facto separation</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Better area</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family conflict</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Lower housing costs</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landlord request</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total family reasons</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>Total other reasons</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It shows that one-third of the reasons for moving is family-related, another third is housing-related, and the rest is generally a matter of lifestyle choice, employment or education. The most mobile group over the 1991-2001 period was the 25-29 year olds. Their relocation usually has a rejuvenating effect on the destination areas and contributes to ageing in the origin areas (ABS 1998b:45; 2003c:51). Its movements are related to seeking independence (and so moving farther from the parental home) entry into the labour force, career development, post-secondary education and family formation (Bell 1995 in: ABS 1998b:45 and in: 2003c:52). On the other hand, people aged 75 and over move shorter distances and in 1991-96 and 1996-2001 their movements were to accommodation with support, closer to family or to accommodation with suitable facilities (ABS 1998b:45; 2003c:51,52).

Canada. Much like the Australians in the 1990s, the Canadians were also on the move and they similarly preferred certain provinces to others. The Censuses of 1996 and 2001 have shown a general population shift from east to west (Statistics Canada 1997:5,6; 2002a:3; 2002b:5). This pattern of depopulation of Eastern Canada has been present already for some time. In 1951 (this is the first Census that included Newfoundland and Labrador), 15 per cent of Canada’s population lived in Alberta and British Columbia. By 1996 that proportion had increased to 22 per cent. Similarly, Ontario’s share of the population had increased from 33 per cent (1951) to 37 per cent (1996). Over this period, the proportion of population of the Atlantic provinces had fallen from 12 per cent to 8 per cent and the proportion of the population living in Québec had dropped from 29 per cent to 25 per cent. Two Prairie provinces have also decreased in population: Manitoba’s
share of population has declined from 6 per cent to 4 per cent and that of Saskatchewan from 6 per cent to 3 per cent (Statistics Canada 1997:5,6).

Table I.9 shows the intercensal population growth rates in the Canadian jurisdictions, as measured by the 1996 and 2001 Censuses. Since at the time of writing (October 2004) detailed, fee-free statistics, as in Australia, showing rates of contribution of natural increase, net overseas migration and net interstate migration to these growth rates in each jurisdiction could not be located, the discussion below slightly differs from the one above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/territory</th>
<th>% change of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YK</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWT</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU 80</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a) Nunavut became a separate administrative unit in 1999 and hence it is only presented in the right panel.


Table I.9 illustrates the aforementioned general population shift from east to west. Both Censuses have established consistent population growth in two Western provinces: British Columbia and Alberta. British Columbia grew at the greatest rate in 1991-96 at Canada’s scale, followed by Ontario and Alberta (this excludes the Territories). This growth in British Columbia resulted from internal migration (35 per cent), international migration (45 per cent) and from the natural increase responsible for the remaining 20 per cent of the growth (Statistics Canada 1997:4). Clearly, the population movements rather than the natural increase have contributed to the provincial population growth.

In Alberta, the natural increase accounted for about 65 per cent of its population growth in 1991-96, and international migration contributed about 30 per cent (Statistics Canada
1997:4). This means that the internal migration constituted only about 5 per cent of the provincial population growth. The following Census has shown a dramatic growth in the interprovincial migration into Alberta. Prince Edward Island recorded in 1991-96 a population growth of 3.7 per cent, higher than Québec and the remaining provinces, except Ontario. Internal migration in Prince Edward Island constituted 35 per cent and natural increase 55 per cent. In Québec, the natural increase was responsible for 65 per cent of the population growth, followed by international migration but the distribution of that contribution between international and internal migration was not provided (1997:5).

The left panel of Table I.9 shows that other provinces, most notably in the Atlantic region (except Prince Edward Island) but also Manitoba and Saskatchewan, were in stagnation. Newfoundland and Labrador recorded a population decline, to which interprovincial out-migration has contributed (Statistics Canada 1997:4). Table I.10 illustrates the magnitude of net interprovincial migration flows as measured by the 1996 Census.

Table I.10 Net interprovincial moves 1991-96 in Canada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Territory</th>
<th>Net migration gain/loss `000</th>
<th>Province/Territory</th>
<th>Net migration gain/loss `000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>-23 240</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>-19 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>1 460</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>-19 775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-6 450</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>3 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>-1 965</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>149 945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>-37 450</td>
<td>YK</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>-47 010</td>
<td>NWT</td>
<td>-395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table I.10 shows that between 1991-96 all jurisdictions except Prince Edward Island, Alberta, British Columbia and the Yukon Territory recorded net population losses through interprovincial migration. Comparison of Table I.10 and Table I.9 further indicates that from among the provinces that posted net population losses through internal migration, only Newfoundland and Labrador recorded an overall population decline. The trend in Newfoundland and Labrador mirrors, although in the most extreme way, the general out-migration trend from the Atlantic provinces, which are behind the east to west population shift (see above). About 75 per cent of people who moved away from Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick actually moved outside the region (Statistics Canada 1998:11). Saskatchewan and Manitoba recorded comparable net population losses through out-migration (Table I.10), but their population growth
rates, although low (especially in case of Saskatchewan that remained practically static), were positive.

Such trends of population growth and decline, as well as of the interprovincial moves were exacerbated in the following period. Table I.9 shows that population growth continued at high rates in two Western provinces: British Columbia and Alberta. However, in 1996-2001 Alberta superseded British Columbia as the province that experienced the greatest population growth on Canada’s scale. That exceptional growth resulted from a strong economic expansion and a growing labour market. That proved to be a magnet for Canadians elsewhere in the country - indeed, Alberta recorded net population gains through interprovincial migration from every other province (see magnitude of that inflow in Table I.11 below), and that gain was particularly high among the 15-29 year olds. Between 1996-2001, the number of jobs in this province rose almost 16 per cent, which was the fastest growth of any province (Statistics Canada 2002b:5,8,16).

Apart from Ontario and British Columbia, where reasonable growth rates (Table I.9) were shown, the population growth in the Eastern provinces either decelerated or turned negative. Again Newfoundland and Labrador represented the most extreme case, where the overall population decline deepened: from -2.9 per cent (1991-96) to -7.0 per cent in 1996-2001. The growth in Prince Edward Island remained positive but very low, and the net interprovincial migration gain was minimal. Other Atlantic provinces recorded negative population growth rates. This reflected an overall weaker economic situation than in the top destination provinces, and it was unemployment that drove people to look for work in other jurisdictions (Statistics Canada 2002b:11,13), as shown by net losses through internal migration in Table I.11. It is also worth noting that the bulk of the outflows from the Atlantic provinces (including outflows from Prince Edward Island that did not experience a negative population growth) was composed of young people (2002b:11,12,13). Table I.11 shows the net interprovincial moves in Canada measured by the 2001 Census.
Table I.11 Net interprovincial moves 1996–2001 in Canada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Territory</th>
<th>Net migration gain/loss '000</th>
<th>Province/Territory</th>
<th>Net migration gain/loss '000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>-31,055</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>-24,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>119,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-1,275</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>-23,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>-8,425</td>
<td>YK</td>
<td>-2,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>-57,315</td>
<td>NWT</td>
<td>-3,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>51,905</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td>-330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>-18,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada 2002b.

Table I.11 shows that between 1996–2001 the only three provinces that recorded net population gains through internal migration were Prince Edward Island, Ontario and Alberta. What also draws attention is the volume of the net out-migration from Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Their level of out-migration confirms the continuation of the earlier depopulation trend as the volume of out-migration from Manitoba remained comparable to the one reported by the preceding Census (Table I.10). In Saskatchewan, though, the net out-migration increased.

Unlike in the preceding period, where the net migration losses were offset otherwise in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, so that they maintained low but positive population growth rates, their population trends most recently have become even less favourable. In Manitoba, the population growth in 1996–2001 stagnated (Table I.9), while in Saskatchewan it turned from stagnation into negative growth, and it is reasonable to assume that the higher out-migration shown in Table I.11 contributed to this. As in the Atlantic provinces discussed earlier, young adults were represented in the outflows from Manitoba and Saskatchewan in 1996–2001, and many moved to Alberta (Statistics Canada 2002b:15,16). The net out-migration was also recorded by Québec, and it was a continuation of the outflow from that province recorded in the preceding period (Table I.10).

As far as the three most populous Canadian CMAs are concerned, population losses through internal migration exchanges with the rest of the country were noted in the 2001 Census. However, their overall volume was not large. These three cities lost jointly 62,000 more people through internal migration exchanges than they gained. These losses however were more than offset by large inflows of migrants to each one of them (Statistics Canada 2002b:9).
Stagnated or declining populations in the Atlantic provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, partially explainable by out-migration of the local residents as well as the decelerating population growth in Québec, have motivated the operation of the provincial immigration policies, in addition to the smaller migrants’ settlement mentioned in the preceding Subsection (Québec excepted). These trends and smaller population bases (Québec excepted) bear resemblance to Tasmania and South Australia. In addition, the non-central location in the country of the Atlantic provinces may be an adverse factor in migrants’ settlement choices. Therefore, the provincial immigration policies are timeliest for these jurisdictions.

There are many reasons for interprovincial migration. Although gradation of reasons, as presented in the case of Australia, could not be located for Canada, the above trends strongly support the economic motivation behind relocation within the country, especially illustrated by the young age of the movers and inflows into strongly performing Alberta in 1996-2001. The propensity of young individuals to move resembles the trend observed by ABS in Australia. According to the 1996 Census, another factor was the mother tongue (English or French). For example, in 1991-96 Québec lost more than 24,000 of Anglophones (Statistics Canada 1998:15). Other reasons such as family or housing-related issues are also likely to be behind relocation within Canada, but details showing the importance of such factors could not be located.

1.3.3 Population projections

Some Australian and Canadian jurisdictions face imminent demographic and related economic pressures (see quotations in Section 1.7 in Chapter One). This Subsection presents the possible scenarios of future population growth trends for Australia and Canada, which are additional reasons for embarking on the regional migration policies in both countries. It also comments on the labour force age structure issues, as they are another consideration in operating the policies.

Australia. The ABS has published three different population growth projections for Australia between June 2002 (according to the estimated resident population at that time) to June 2101, and from June 2002 to June 2051 for the states and territories. The most likely medium-growth projection is presented here. Under that projection, the fertility rate is 1.6 per woman, net overseas migration is 100,000 per year and life expectancy is 87.7
years (female) and 84.2 (male). The Australian population is projected to reach 26.4m in 2051 and remain at that level in 2101 (2003f:1).

Under this scenario, the population increase is projected between 2002-51 in all states and territories, with exception of Tasmania and South Australia (ABS 2003f:3). Between 2002-51, the population of the Northern Territory is projected to increase by 55 per cent, Queensland by 73 per cent and Western Australia by 49 per cent, all three above the growth projected for Australia (34 per cent). Under this scenario, New South Wales is projected to remain the most populous state, and Victoria will be replaced by Queensland as the second most populous state. Western Australia will increase its share of the total population, while South Australia's and Tasmania's shares will decline (ABS 2003f:3). The medium-growth scenario is also projected to result in larger percentage growth in all capital cities in relation to the balances of their respective states and territories. This will bring further urbanisation (2003f:3). Such possible trends of population decline in South Australia and Tasmania further support inclusion of their entire territories as eligible for regional migration. These possible trends also confirm that the discussed earlier population shift to the north and the west will continue to occur.

Considering the distribution of net overseas migration at the state/territory scale, the regional migration schemes seem timeliest. Under the medium-growth population scenario, net overseas migration is projected to be positive for each state and territory, but it is projected to benefit particularly capital cities in all but one case (Darwin is projected to receive fewer migrants than the rest of the Northern Territory) (ABS 2003f:25).

New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia are all projected to have negative net overseas migration outside their capital cities. Although gains are projected for Tasmania and the Northern Territory, they are expected to be minimal. Only Queensland, outside Brisbane, is projected to see a net inflow of migrants at any considerable scale (ABS 2003f:25). Such projections indicate that the concentration of international migration is going to continue to occur in capital cities and contribute to their further population growth, at the expense of the population growth in rest of the country. Therefore, dispersal through the policy out to these other locations in the jurisdictions provides at least one measure to assist in population and economic growth of these areas.
The Australian population is ageing. This is a product of improving longevity, the ‘baby boomer’ generation nearing retirement and falling fertility rates brought about by social changes in recent decades. Under the medium-growth scenario, and, in fact, under each of projected scenario, people aged 25-54 form a smaller proportion of the population over time, and they are projected to decline as a share of the total population to around one-third in 2101 (ABS 2004a:19). The number of people aged 55-64 is projected to increase slightly from around 10 per cent (2002) to around 11-12 per cent (2101). Since they currently have lower labour force participation rates than younger groups, if this trend continues, shifts in the distribution of the working age population towards older groups may have an impact on the future labour supply (2004a:19). In line with the unfavourable population projections for Tasmania and South Australia shown above, their populations aged 25-54 are projected to decline under all ABS scenarios (2004a:20).

At the occasion of discussing the potential impact of the population ageing on the labour force supply, the recent state/territory population age structure of Tasmania and South Australia may provide an additional explanation for eligibility of their entire states for regional migration. In 1996 and 2001, South Australia had the highest proportion of people aged 65 and over in its population at Australia’s scale. Tasmania, in both Censuses, had the second highest proportion of that age group in its population (ABS 1998b:6; 2003c:8). Similar trends were also the case of their respective capital cities. Adelaide and Hobart had two highest median ages of all capital cities (35.6 and 34.5, respectively) in the 1996 Census (ABS 1998a:8). That trend of highest median age from among the capital cities in Adelaide and Hobart was confirmed in 2001. Both cities recorded a median age of 37 years (2004b:3). This indicates that the ageing of their populations is likely going to influence both the capital cities and the rest of their territories equally, thus justifying eligibility of their entire territories for regional migrant settlement, as migrants are particularly targeted for their young age and their potential to contribute to the labour force.

Canada. The Canadian population projections could be obtained in a less detailed format than in Australia (due to the unavailability of data other than on a commercial basis at the time of writing in October 2004). In consequence, general comments may only be offered, but they nonetheless indicate largely similar possible population trends. As is the case in Australia, Statistics Canada has prepared three population growth projections for
Canada: low, medium and high growth for the period 2000-51 (2026 for provinces and territories), using preliminary population estimates for 2000, derived from 1996 Census (2001:1,2). The medium-growth scenario, as the most likely one, is discussed here. Note that the values for each component variable are not provided, unlike in Australia.

Under that scenario, up to 2026 population gains are expected for all provinces, except Newfoundland and Labrador, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan. However, the population growth rates tend to decline (Statistics Canada 2001:4). Under that scenario, as well as under the two other scenarios, the population shares of the Atlantic provinces, Québec, Manitoba and Saskatchewan are likely to decline. On the other hand, Ontario and British Columbia’s shares are projected to increase (2001:4). Such possible trends point to serious population issues and related economic consequences in the Eastern provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and, as in Australia, operation of the provincial migration policies is the timeliest under such likely developments in these jurisdictions. These projections indicate that the depopulation of Eastern Canada, as it has been happening before, will continue. Unlike in Australia, no projections related to the population growth rates in CMAs and the rest of the jurisdictions are available. However, the UN indicates that the urbanisation trend is going to continue in Canada (2002:121), suggesting that growth will generally continue to be concentrated in CMAs.

The Canadian population is ageing for similar reasons to those underlying this trend in Australia. As a result of the increase in the number of older individuals (45-64 years old) from 20 per cent of the population (1991), to 25 per cent of the population (2001) and fewer number of young people entering the working age population, the working age population has aged (Statistics Canada 2002c:4). Under the above discussed medium-growth population scenario, the proportion of the working age population (15-64 years old) will start shrinking from 2016, while at the same time having to support a growing proportion of seniors aged 65 and over. The proportion of children in the population is already decreasing and this trend is projected to continue in the future (Statistics Canada 2001:3).

Such negative demographic trends may be already observed at the sub-national level and they seem to be the case more in some provinces than in others. The median age of the current populations of the Canadian jurisdictions differs. According to the 2001 Census,
the oldest provinces are those in the East. Québec and Nova Scotia top the list of the oldest jurisdictions with median age of 38.8 years each. New Brunswick comes second (38.6) and Newfoundland and Labrador together with British Columbia come third (38.4 years each). Prince Edward Island and Ontario follow (37.7 and 37.2, respectively). The Prairie provinces are among the youngest in the country: Alberta, with a 35 years median age, Saskatchewan 36.7 and Manitoba 36.8. The Yukon Territory has a median age of 36.1 years (Statistics Canada 2002c:30).

Such characteristics are a continuation of the median age distribution among the jurisdictions established in the preceding Census, where some Eastern provinces and British Columbia were also among the oldest in the country, most notably Québec (the oldest in the 1996), Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The Prairie provinces were among the youngest in the country (2002c:30).

Such characteristics suggest further considerable challenges in terms of the age of the labour forces in the Eastern provinces and the provincial migration policies targeting young individuals are intended to be one of the means to alleviate the related pressures. Indeed, in the 2001 Census, the Eastern provinces had in the some of the highest average ages of labour forces on Canada’s scale. These were Québec, Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island (Statistics Canada 2003b:30).

Other provinces may face similar problems, and this may be despite other positive demographic trends. For example, Saskatchewan and the Yukon Territory that, as shown above, had some of the youngest median ages in the country, had also the first and the second highest average ages of their respective labour forces in 2001 Census (Statistics Canada 2003b:30). Manitoba, similarly being one of the youngest provinces, had nonetheless the fourth oldest average age of the labour force at Canada’s scale. Furthermore, that province had the third highest proportion of individuals aged 55 and over in its labour force, according to the 2001 Census (Statistics Canada 2003b:30).

The unfavourable compounded trends in the Atlantic provinces and Québec, including high median ages of their populations, older labour forces and projected population declines suggest that the negative effects of these trends will be most acute in these jurisdictions at Canada’s scale. This further suggests that they should be particularly
active in implementing a number of strategies beyond their provincial immigration policies to address these issues. Also the trends in Saskatchewan and Manitoba suggest a similar approach.

It is predicted with some certainty then that the populations of Australia and Canada will age, and some of their jurisdictions are projected to experience population declines. Such jurisdictions as Tasmania, South Australia, Manitoba and the Eastern Canadian provinces should be the most active in their immigration policies as well as in implementing a range of domestic policies aimed at mitigating the negative effects of the above trends on their economies. It is the latter policies (due to the fact that they affect the local populations, which are unpararelly larger than the inflows of regional and other migrants), that take precedence and may have a greater relative impact on the labour forces’ continued supply rather than the regional immigration policies.

1.4 Socioeconomic characteristics of regional areas

In each of the Subsections in this Section, slightly different definitional frameworks are used. It is acknowledged that they are not perfectly comparable, especially in case of the RSTs (which are not particularly targeted for the provincial migrants’ settlement), but they are used as best available data that could be obtained.

First, the selected characteristics of the Australian and the Canadian regional areas that may potentially make them attractive or unattractive settlement choices for migrants are presented. Second, the socioeconomic characteristics of leavers from the Australian capital cities that move to live elsewhere in the country and characteristics of the RSTs in Canada are discussed. Finally, employment trends in different industries in regions in Australia and Canada are presented. The regional migration policies in both countries attempt to address these trends by targeting particular occupations. The approaches to bringing skilled migrants under the regional schemes and particular occupations targeted are compared in Chapter Two (Subsections 2.3.2 and 2.3.4).

1.4.1 Housing, income, services and education

Communication and transport have enabled peoples’ mobility. It is possible to live on the fringes of large cities and commute daily to work located in that city (Hugo 2002:28;
Mendelson and Bollman 1998:8). Housing costs between urban and rural areas may be one of the advantages of living in the latter, as observed by Hugo (2002:27).

It can be reasonably expected that a similar pattern prevails in Canada, although comparable information regarding the differences between the urban and rural areas could not be readily located. However, Industry Canada (2004) shows that housing costs are lower in CAs than in CMAs (2004:42). This indicates that such smaller urban areas could be potentially attractive to migrants looking at reasonable housing prices. Yet, in the context of regional migration, it may be also worth noting that the quality of housing was deemed inadequate by (seemingly Canadian) professionals working in regional (northern) Manitoba, who were accustomed to more comfortable conditions (HRDC 2000:9). Therefore, the issue of price versus quality may be one of the migrants’ households’ considerations.

Furthermore, household incomes outside ‘major urban’ areas in Australia and outside large Canadian CMAs are generally lower. According to ABS (1998a:53; 2004b:96–7), the differences stem from different age structures and household characteristics (high presence of young couple families without children contributes to higher income), types of qualifications (high and medium skill level occupations are related to higher incomes), full-time/part-time employment and the number of household members working. Usually there were higher proportions of households with two or more earners in major cities rather than in other areas. Industry Canada (2004) calculated on the basis of the 2001 Census that, on average, the proportion of households with incomes above CAD$100,000 was about by half lower in CAs with 50,000 inhabitants than in large CMAs (2004:40). Two provinces constituted an exception. CAs located in Ontario and Alberta had the highest percentages of households with incomes above CAD$100,000 on Canada’s scale and above the Canada’s average. Interestingly, Albertan CAs smaller than 50,000 people had altogether a greater proportion of such high-income households than Calgary and Edmonton combined (2004:40).

The lower incomes are however confirmed for the rural areas. From 1970 to 1997, rural families in Canada had the lowest average incomes, as opposed to families living in areas with populations of 100,000 and more inhabitants, which had the highest incomes
The income opportunities can be considered by regional migrants, and, therefore, regions can be perceived by informed migrants as less attractive than large cities in the context of them carving a better future for themselves and their families. Not only the achievable income levels but also the existing or perceived broader employment/business opportunities in these cities may be a potential disadvantage for regional areas in their attempt to attract skilled and business migrants.

There were exceptions to these typically lower incomes outside major cities in both countries. In Australia, Garnaut et al. (2001:7,78-9) show that there was a high proportion of households with high annual incomes in some remote areas, especially in those with thriving mining activities. In Canada, in early 1990s, the resource-rich northern regions had higher median earnings than Canada overall (Grenon 1997:28). This was similarly related to employment in the mining industry.

The attractiveness of regional locations to skilled and business migrants may also depend on the accessibility and quality of services. As Hugo (2002) noted, non-metropolitan households in Australia (that is, all those located outside centres with over 100,000 inhabitants) have to travel greater distances to access services than population in metropolitan areas (2002:1,27). In Canada, the HRDC study referred to above (2000:14,15) found that access to services including for example specialised health care, quality education services (professional education inclusive), obtaining goods available normally in more populated areas and transportation costs make areas located far from large urban centres less attractive to live.

As with the HRDC study, which identified difficult access to good education as one of the drawbacks of regional areas, access to education services was highlighted as a major issue in non-metropolitan Australia (Hugo 2002:30). In 1996, the proportion of people in non-metropolitan areas with post-school qualifications was lowest in rural Australia, as opposed to highest in metropolitan Australia (2002:30). Skill level requirements under the regional migration policy are intended to address this issue.

---

7 Rural families in this context refer to those families that live in areas outside centres of 1,000 and more people, and areas outside the commuting zones of urban centres with 10,000 inhabitants or more (Rupnik et al. 2001:2).
Similar trends were found to be true in Canada. According to Industry Canada (2004), which looked at education levels of the working age population in the 2001 Census, the higher education levels (university degree) were found among that group in urban areas rather than in rural areas. The differences in percentage points between the urban areas and rural areas were quite large in each province and at Canada level (2004:32). Furthermore, within urban areas, CMAs were found to have typically a higher proportion of working age population holding a university degree, as compared to CAs (2004:33).

Although there may be interregional differences, as shown by example of incomes that were not always less attractive outside major cities, the issues discussed above indicate just a few socioeconomic characteristics of regional areas that migrants may find unattractive after some time had elapsed. Therefore, it seems sensible to encourage their settlement in areas where some reasonable services exist, including education, health care facilities, recreation and entertainment options and the like, rather than in remote, isolated places. There is little chance that regional migrants will go to and stay in areas with declining population and downsizing economies (such as those based on single industry). Such places are often characterised by fewer and limited services, are likely to offer fewer opportunities for business and professional development, as well as have restricted chances of establishing ‘the good life’ immigrants are usually trying to make for themselves and their families.

1.4.2 Characteristics of internal migrants and employment patterns

The characteristics of internal migrants in Australia relocating from the capital cities to other areas, and of the RST areas in Canada, as well as employment patterns in these areas, provide an additional rationale for operating the regional migration policies in both countries by influencing the socioeconomic composition of the regions.

Australia. To the best of the author’s knowledge, the Australian internal migration trends discussed below have been analysed for the 1991-96 period but not for the 1996-2001 one. Bell and Hugo found (2000) that between 1991-96 in Australia the net flows into non-metropolitan areas from the capital cities were composed mostly of people without any qualifications (note that in this study non-metropolitan defines as all areas outside the capital cities). New South Wales is an example. This group contributed 71.9 per cent of the net gains of people in non-metropolitan areas, while at the same time there was a net
loss of people with degrees. Non-metropolitan Queensland, Northern Territory and Western Australia on the contrary, experienced gains of people with degrees, likely related to the important role of the mining industry. In the rest of the states and in the Australian Capital Territory there was a net loss of people with degrees overall (2000:103).

These two authors also identified that between 1991-96 New South Wales and Victoria (contrary to other states and territories), were net gainers of low-income groups moving into non-metropolitan areas and net losers of higher income groups leaving these areas (2000:103). The case of New South Wales was especially interesting. This state had a particularly high inflow of low-income earners, which the authors found to reflect, to some extent, a trend discussed by them in another publication (Hugo and Bell 1998), and regarding the ‘welfare led’ movement (Bell and Hugo 2000:102,103). It is characterised by the in-migration of groups receiving some form of government transfers that may be better spent (considering lower housing costs) in non-metropolitan areas than in metropolitan ones. Amenity reasons were also found to play a role in the in-migration of the lower-income/transfer-reliant people. It was especially the case of transfer recipients around the retirement age. In general, retirement migration is directed to attractive coastal or riverside locations. Northern New South Wales and Queensland are especially popular because of their warmer climates (Hugo and Bell 1998:112-3,117).

Between 1991-96, non-metropolitan New South Wales had also a net gain of unemployed or not in the workforce people. Conversely, non-metropolitan Victoria had a net loss of people from these two groups and although it also lost employees, it gained self-employed people. Queensland lost its non-metropolitan employers, employees, self-employed people and gained instead unemployed people (Bell and Hugo 2000:102). These differences show that the socioeconomic changes in regional areas are not identical across Australia.

Furthermore, there were comparable levels of net gains of families with and without children moving into non-metropolitan areas in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and South Australia. The inflow of families without children reflects again the importance of the retiree couples. The single parent families were also represented in these inflows in these four states, partly reflecting the lower housing costs (Bell and Hugo
2000:102,104). On the other hand, there was a reverse movement into the capital cities from non-metropolitan areas by young adults relocating for higher education and wider employment opportunities, which is a typical feature of the rural-urban migration (2000:99).

Although almost all jurisdictions had a net migration gain of managers in non-metropolitan areas from the capital cities between 1991-96, all of them (except those with present mining industry: Queensland, Western Australia and Northern Territory) had net migration losses of professionals from non-metropolitan areas. Such losses were also recorded among tradespeople across the non-metropolitan areas of all jurisdictions except the Northern Territory (Bell and Hugo 2000:102).

Some employment patterns could be observed in particular industry sectors in states and territories. In 1991-96, there were net migration gains of workers in agriculture and mining sectors in non-metropolitan Australia (Bell and Hugo 2000:102,104). Gains across a number of industries that is in manufacturing, utilities, construction, education, health and community services were recorded by two jurisdictions: New South Wales and (with exception of utilities) by the Northern Territory. There were net gains in the education industry in non-metropolitan New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia and the Northern Territory but net losses were suffered elsewhere. Net losses were experienced by the majority of jurisdictions in manufacturing and utilities. In addition to New South Wales and the Northern Territory, construction industry in non-metropolitan areas gained workers in Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia. Health and community services suffered net migration losses in four states: Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania (2000:102). Finally, from among other industries, finance and insurance industry experienced net migration losses from non-metropolitan areas in 1991-96 in each jurisdiction except the Australian Capital Territory (2000:102).

Some of these trends correspond to findings of another study of employment growth and decline in non-metropolitan Australia in the decade leading up to 1996 (Garnaut et al. 2001). ‘Non-metropolitan’ in this study refers to three regions: coastal, inland and remote, as opposed ‘metropolitan’ Australia comprising capital cities and other metropolitan regions, that is cities with populations of 100,000 or more. In each of these
three regions, localities from less than 2,000 to 100,000 (grouped into clusters according to their size) are studied (Garnaut et al 2001:1). This level of detail is not discussed because comparable data from Canada could not be located. Note that this definition differs from the one used above to examining the trends of internal migration into ‘non-metropolitan’ areas. Despite these definitional differences, this study is useful to provide a broader picture of the employment patterns in ‘non-metropolitan’ Australia.

Garnaut et al. (2001:33-4) have shown a percentage change in employment during 1986-96 in these three regions. They have reported an overall decline in employment in agriculture (combined with forestry and fishing) and mining across inland, remote and coastal regions (in the latter employment in mining grew) (2001:33-4). This suggests that the net migration gains in non-metropolitan areas reported by Bell and Hugo (2000) in the period between 1991-96 (see above) may have been negatively offset by the trends in the other part of the decade. Reported employment growth in manufacturing across coastal, inland and remote regions must have also been stronger overall across the decade, in comparison to widespread net losses of workers reported by Bell and Hugo (2000).

The decline in employment in utilities (electricity, gas and water) reported by Garnaut et al. in 1986-96 (2001:33-4) corresponds to prevailing net losses of workers between 1991-96. Construction, as Garnaut et al. (2001:33-4) found, represented a mixed picture with growth experienced by the coastal and remote regions but decline in inland regions. This growth in employment in construction in the coastal regions of Australia is worth highlighting as it seemingly corresponds to the direction of internal migration trends in the country. Also Bell and Hugo (2000:102) reported net gains in construction in non-metropolitan areas in the majority of jurisdictions.

Education industry observed earlier by Bell and Hugo (2000) to have experienced net gains in non-metropolitan areas of four jurisdictions between 1991-96, has displayed a growing employment trend in 1986-96 across coastal, inland and remote regions according to Garnaut et al. (2001:33-4).

On the contrary, the health and community services reported by Bell and Hugo (2000) to have suffered net losses from non-metropolitan areas in four states between 1991-96,
were found to be strongly growing in 1986-96 in all regions, especially the remote ones (Garnaut et al. 2001:33-4). This may suggest that the positive trend in the first part of the decade has influenced the overall result.

Finally, the finance and insurance industry declined in employment across the decade leading up to 1996 in inland and remote regions. This reflects to some extent closing down small bank branches in these regions (Garnaut et al. 2001:32,33-4). On the other hand, employment growth was the case in the coastal regions (2001:33-4). This could reflect their growing populations and a resultant increasing demand for such services.

**Canada.** Conditioned by the aforementioned non-perfect comparability of data with Australia, some observations may be made. First, unlike in Australia, there was a net migration gain of people with university degrees in RSTs (see Box I.3) between 1991-96 (Rothwell et al. 2002:12,15,22). Hence, there has been a net ‘brain gain’ in RSTs in Canada. While this is a positive trend, even in conjunction with the provincial policies for skilled migrants, this could only provide a marginal improvement of the situation presented earlier, where the rural areas in Canada had a lower percentage of people with university degrees than the urban areas. As in Australia, comparable data could not be located for the 1996-2001 period.

Second, in Canada, there was a net in-migration of employed people into RSTs in 1991-96, but there was also a net in-migration of the unemployed as well as people not in the labour force (Rothwell et al. 2002:16,22). According to these authors, the in-migration of the latter group can be attributed to the migration patterns of the retirees (2002:15), which would bring the Canadian trends in line, at least to some extent, with the trends in non-metropolitan Australia described by Bell and Hugo (2000). Although comparable dynamic data that would show, as these authors have, the socioeconomic status of in-movers into RSTs, could not be located, RSTs in other studies were found to receive more social transfers than urban areas. This is related to higher unemployment rates, more children in the families thus drawing more child tax credits and a higher proportion of the retirees receiving benefits (Rupnik et al. 2001:12-3). This suggests some similarities in the socioeconomic situation of the RSTs and the non-metropolitan Australia.
Regrettably, no similar study to that undertaken in Australia by Garnaut et al. (2001), regarding the employment growth and decline in different industries in non-metropolitan regions, could be located for Canada. Some partially comparable information available on a fee-free basis examines changes in employment in RSTs between 1997-2000 (Rothwell 2001). However, this should be seen only as broad comparison for three reasons. First, the RSTs (see Box I.3) cover only a small portion of areas equivalent to those studied by Garnaut et al. (2001). Second, the Canadian data cover different years to those studied by Garnaut et al. (2001) for the period of 1986-96. Third, the Australian study has shown the percentage change in employment in the decade leading up to 1996, while in Canada, the employment patterns in RSTs are presented in year-to-year percentage change.

Employment rates in some industries in RSTs between 1997-2000, in comparison to growth established by Garnaut et al. (2001) for coastal, inland and remote regions of Australia, have fluctuated. This is likely to have resulted from the year-to-year basis of this study. Such fluctuating rates in RSTs, where in Australia Garnaut et al. (2001) identified growth across all regions included manufacturing; construction, health and community services as well as education. On the other hand, the total absolute employment in these industries in RSTs has been growing, with exception of education industry in 2000 (Rothwell 2001:29). Both in terms of the annual percentage change and in terms of the total employment figures, employment in agriculture in RSTs has declined between 1997-2000 (2001:29). This resembles the downward trend identified by Garnaut et al. (2001) in Australia.

Other industries demonstrated different growth patterns to those in Australia. For example, employment in finance, insurance, real estate and leasing industries (considered jointly) fluctuated in employment rates and in absolute figures (Rothwell 2001:29). This makes the trend and any existing shortages less able to be understood based on the limited data that could be located. By contrast, in Australia in 1986-96 there has been an increase in employment in financial and insurance industry in the coastal regions, but decline in the two other regions (see Garnaut et al. 2001 above).

There were also fluctuations in percentage growth and absolute growth in employment in utilities in RSTs in 1997 2000, and this included negative rates of growth (Rothwell

The above comparison, although based on limited data and not fully comparable across the countries, suggests two major conclusions. First, in Australia and Canada employment in some primary industries, such as agriculture, is declining. Second, there appears to be a more pronounced pattern of employment growth in service industries, such as health and community services. Taking into consideration the socioeconomic characteristics of the non-metropolitan (Australia) and RST areas (Canada) discussed in the preceding Subsection, it may be concluded that some common patterns prevail in both countries.

1.5 Settlement choices of immigrants

This Section discusses three issues. First, it presents the motivations of migrants who choose to settle in regional areas of Australia and Canada. Second, it compares recent settlement trends of migrants in Australia and Canada. Finally, it describes their internal migration patterns.

1.5.1 Locational motivations of immigrants

The motivations of regional migrants in choosing their settlement location are discussed on the basis of the available Australian and the Canadian literature, and biased, but nonetheless providing the only first-hand views expressed by the migrants themselves and published on the governments' websites. The combination of these sources allows seeing what some of the key drivers behind settling in regions are, and what knowledge the governments must possess for future policies' development. However, no conclusive list of such factors is claimed to be provided here.

According to DIMIA in Australia, migrants' settlement in general depends on the location of family members, employment, business opportunities and prior local experience (DIMIA 2004:n:37). Castles et al. (1998), who discussed outcomes from the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia (LSIA) noted that first settlement decisions are affected by the location of family, friends and spouses. They also noted the attraction of established ethnic communities (1998:43).
The latter is not reported as a reason for choosing a location by regional migrants. This reflects the migrants' poor dispersal outside the 'major urban' areas (see Subsection 1.5.2). A survey of the RSMS migrants, who arrive in Australia to take up a pre-arranged employment in regional areas or low population growth areas (see explanations in Section 1.6 in Chapter One and Table 2.1 in Chapter Two for such eligible areas) has found that apart from an obvious employment motivation, the lifestyle considerations rated just as importantly as the first factor (Cully and Goodes 2000:40-1). On the other hand, family or friends links were incidentally mentioned as reasons for settling in a particular location. However, that survey further showed that just below one-fifth of the surveyed migrants had indeed relatives living near by (2000:42).

By contrast, under another regional Australian scheme - SDAS, where migrants are sponsored by a family member, almost half of surveyed principal applicants indicated that they migrated to ensure a better future for their family in Australia, followed by such reasons as lifestyle and climate (32 per cent), family reasons (26 per cent) and employment reasons (24 per cent) (DIMIA 2005b:7-8). This may suggest that a sponsorship by a family member may have other, broader motivations beyond family reunification in Australia.

The Canadian research into settlement outside the three largest CMAs of Toronto, Vancouver and Montréal (Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants in Canada - LSIC) distilled the five most important reasons that principal applicants in the economic class gave to explain their settlement location. These reasons were (in order) family/friends, employment prospects, education opportunities and lifestyle. The fifth reason was business prospects, a little surprisingly since this were not mentioned as any top motives to settle in the three largest CMAs. By comparison, in these three CMAs, links with family/friends were the dominant factor in each case. Employment prospects, education and lifestyle were also noted. The language factor rated high in Montréal, while in Toronto one of the reasons was the ethnic community presence (Statistics Canada 2003e:15).
Academic research into immigrant settlement in regional cities in Canada has highlighted the role of family and friends as important factors for settlement.\textsuperscript{8} The importance of employment/business opportunities were also noted (Walton-Roberts 2004:9-11,15,17). On the other hand, identical problems to large cities related to employers not recognising foreign qualifications and work experience were observed (Walton-Roberts 2004:23-4; Henin and Bennett 2002:7-9,11,19). In practice, this means that regardless of the settlement location, credential non-recognition continue to restrict immigrant access to the labour market and dispersal does not solve that problem (Walton-Roberts 2004:27). Furthermore, tight labour markets could also make the participation more difficult and those who turned to self-employment faced competition from other migrants in similar situations (2004:17-8). Canadian provincial responses to these common non-recognition issues are discussed in Chapter Two (see Subsection 2.3.2).

While lifestyle, clean environment and recreation options were perceived as incentives to move to and stay in smaller cities (Walton-Roberts 2004:16,17; Henin and Bennett 2002:4,7,14,18), the difficult labour market situation, as reported above, and the community attitudes ranging from impersonal and not welcoming (Krahn et al. 2003:16)\textsuperscript{9} to prejudicial and racist, including the local authorities (Walton-Roberts 2004:19,20; Henin and Bennett 2002:15-7), seemed to diminish the overall assessment of a location choice. Yet, even when some aspects of life in such communities were criticised, this did not lead to relocation in every case. It seems that people developed coping strategies.

Access to services, such as education (including English language classes), were a reason for dissatisfaction with a regional location (Walton-Roberts 2004:20-1), and in some cases this resulted in relocation to the next largest city (Krahn et al. 2003:16-7). By comparison, participants in the LSIC reported education prospects as one of the reasons for settlement outside the three largest CMAs (Statistics Canada 2003e:15). Given that outcome and the fact that the studies quoted above reported on the basis of migrants’ experiences in CMAs and CAs, it is not possible to disentangle any further trends on the basis of the information available. All in all, there are many reasons behind regional settlement and they are not easily generalised in terms of unicausal motivations.

\textsuperscript{8} The size of these cities covered the whole spectrum of the policy understanding of 'region' in Canada from CAs to CMAs but the text integrates the findings from all such areas.

\textsuperscript{9} That study reported on refugee settlement in Alberta.
To validate those findings, some selected ‘success stories’/regional migrants’ profiles were consulted on official Australian and Canadian governments’ websites. At the time of writing (November 2004), the ‘success stories’/regional migrants’ profiles were available in Australia from the Victorian, South Australian and Tasmanian websites (see links from Live in Victoria n.d.; see links from Immigration SA n.d.j; DED TAS 2004c). They reflect the policy understanding of ‘region’ in Australia and therefore some capital cities, such as Adelaide, were featured. In Canada, migrants’ profiles were available from one British Columbia website (MCAWS BC n.d.g), which featured the PNs. A review of the material in May 2005 revealed that other jurisdictions now feature similar stories but for the purposes of the discussion below, the aforementioned websites provide sufficient information.

A comparison of the migrant stories in both countries indicates that lifestyle (also covering recreation options and clean environment) and employment (also business opportunities in Australia) are principal motives for the regional settlement. For some regional settlers in Australia featured in the ‘success stories’, the previous local experience (holidays, studies or work for a local employer) or personal reasons (meeting a partner) played a role in permanent relocation. This concurs with the role of the previous experience noted in the Australian research (DIMIA 2004n). Also, welcoming and friendly communities were mentioned in most of the Australian and the Canadian ‘success stories’/migrants’ profiles. Interestingly, the family connections in regions were less stressed in ‘success stories’/migrants’ profiles than in the literature. This could perhaps point to a greater personal independence of the regional migrants.

The reviewed studies and the ‘success stories’/migrants’ profiles indicate that there is a host of factors influencing the decision to settle in a region. They were reported in different order but commonly mentioned were employment/business opportunities, lifestyle qualities and social networks (family and friends). Reasons mentioned less often included education prospects and previous local experience; in addition, the contrasting evidence in relation to education was present in the Canadian research. This does not allow drawing a definitive list of key drivers behind migrants’ settlement in regional locations. In developing the policies, the governments should be paying particular attention to issues identified as disincentives to move to, or stay in, regional locations. Two such issues seem to emerge. First, the non-recognition of qualifications continues to
prevent full labour market participation regardless of the location and dispersal does not solve that problem. Second, despite positive evidence for the role of the community attitudes present in the ‘success stories’/migrants’ profiles, they may in fact diminish the immigrants’ contentment with being in a regional location, if they are not sufficiently positive, as shown in the Canadian academic research.

I.5.2 Settlement trends of immigrants

**Australia.** The overseas-born population displays a higher preference for a city living than the Australian-born population. According to the 2001 Census, 85.5 per cent of migrants who arrived between 1996-2001 lived in a capital city compared to 14.5 per cent residing in the balance of the state/territory. This is a continuation and in fact a strengthening of the trend in the previous years. A total of 80.2 per cent of migrants who arrived in Australia prior to 1995 or earlier, lived in capital cities in 2001 (ABS 2003c:26). In general, according to the 2001 Census, 80.8 per cent of the overseas-born usually resided in capital cities as compared to 58.5 per cent of the Australian-born population (2003c:25). These proportions are comparable to those established in the 1996 Census, when 80.6 per cent of the overseas-born population resided in the capital cities, as compared to 58.1 per cent of the Australian-born population (1998b:20). This city living phenomenon has been observed at least since the 1970s (ABS 2004a:22). Table I.12 below illustrates in greater detail the settlement trends of the overseas-born and the Australian-born populations based on the 2001 Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital City SD</th>
<th>Overseas-born population #</th>
<th>Proportion of state/territory population - %</th>
<th>Australian-born population #</th>
<th>Proportion of state/territory population - %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1 229 972</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>2 467 252</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>954 897</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>2 216 722</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>336 984</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>1 200 544</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>253 582</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>774 436</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>421 105</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>849 734</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>22 334</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>160 412</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>19 059</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>72 465</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>66 656</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>227 960</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Capital Cities</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 304 589</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 969 525</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** a) Definition of SD is provided in Chapter One (note 22).
**Source:** ABS 2003c.

Table I.12 shows that Sydney, Melbourne, Perth and Canberra have the highest proportions of the overseas-born residents. All 'major urban' areas (see Box I.1) had in
the 2001 Census almost 82 per cent of all population born overseas (ABS 2004a:23). Its further dispersal was minimal. Most of the remainder of that population (11 per cent) was reported to be living in ‘other urban’ areas, providing yet another illustration of their high urbanisation. By comparison, 25 per cent of the Australian-born population was living in the ‘other urban areas’. Around 5 per cent of the overseas-born population in 2001 was living in rural areas (all areas outside the ‘major urban’ and ‘other urban’ areas), compared to 12 per cent of the Australian-born population (ABS 2004a:23). These proportions of the settlement trends of migrants illustrate the challenge that the regional migration policy has undertaken in attempting to disperse them.

Generally, immigrants who have arrived after the WWII are likely to be more dispersed than recent immigrants. Those who have recently arrived, especially from Asia, are highly urbanised. For example, the Viet Nam-born live almost exclusively in ‘major urban’ areas (97 per cent), as do the China-born (96 per cent), India-born (91 per cent) and 85 per cent of the Filipino immigrants. By contrast, immigrants from the Anglophone countries are more widely dispersed (ABS 2004a:25). The high urbanisation rates of the Asian immigrants are related to their period of residence in Australia. Asian immigration is of recent history compared to the European immigration and therefore, the former have had less time to disperse. In addition, immigrants from the non-English speaking backgrounds may be attracted to places where their ethnic communities are concentrated, such as Sydney or Melbourne (Birrell and Rapson 2002 in: ABS 2004a:25).

Immigrants, regardless of entry class, tend to go to most popular and economically attractive jurisdictions, and within those, to the largest metropolitan centres. Regional migration policy may assist in either attracting these immigrants to alternative locations in these jurisdictions, or it may encourage them to consider states and territories that are less popular. The challenge consists in dispersing migrants away from such preferred settlement destinations (or to other locations in these jurisdictions). In 1995-96 and 2001-02, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia were such top destinations for all classes of migrants (DIMIA 1997:33; DIMIA 2004n:104).

**Canada.** Just like immigrants in Australia, immigrants who have landed in Canada in the 1990s have displayed a strong preference for settlement in CMAs, particularly in the three largest ones. According to the 2001 Census, 94.1 per cent of immigrants who
landed in that period were living in CMAs and the remaining 5.9 per cent in all other areas of the country. A lower proportion of the total Canadian population was living in CMAs in 2001 - 64.4 per cent. The total Canadian population living elsewhere in the country, that is in CAs and rural areas, represented 35.6 per cent (Statistics Canada 2003a:40).

In Canada, as noted earlier, an explicit policy objective is the dispersal of migrants away from three largest CMAs: Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver (compare also CIC quotation in Section 1.7 in Chapter One). Their settlement preferences for these three cities have been observed for some time and there has been a trend of increasing concentration. 58 per cent of all immigrants who landed during the 1970s lived in Toronto, Vancouver or Montréal in 1981. That proportion rose to 66 per cent for the immigrants who landed in the 1980s and were found living in these three cities in 1991. The 2001 Census established an even higher proportion. Almost 73 per cent of immigrants who landed in Canada in the 1990s lived in these three cities. The comparison with the total Canadian population living in Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver shows a very considerable impact of immigration on their growing populations. In 2001, only 33.7 per cent of the total Canadian population lived there (Statistics Canada 2003a:7,40).

Apart from these three largest CMAs, there are 24 other CMAs in Canada that are receiving disproportionately lower proportions of immigrants. Table I.13 shows the distribution of immigrants who landed in Canada in the 1990s among the 27 CMAs, as reported by the 2001 Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMA of residence</th>
<th>1990s' immigrants %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto ON</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver BC</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal QC</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa-Hull ON</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary AB</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton AB</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton ON</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener ON</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg MB</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor ON</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London ON</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbostford BC</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec City QC</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Catharines-Niagara ON</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria BC</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA of residence</td>
<td>1990s’ immigrants %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax NS</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa ON</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon SK</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston ON</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina SK</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherbrooke QC</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Sudbury ON</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.John’s NL</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder Bay ON</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicoutimi-Jonquière QC</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint John NB</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trois-Rivières QC</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All CMAs</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a) Now known as Ottawa-Gatineau.
b) Now known as Saguenay.
Source: Statistics Canada 2003c.

Table I.13 shows a large disproportion between the immigrant settlement in the three largest CMAs and other CMAs. The provincial immigration policies attempt to attract some of the individuals who are considering migration to Canada and particularly settlement in one of these three locations. Since there is a large number of alternative locations, and in some provinces, such as Saskatchewan or Alberta there is more than one such CMA, there is less push for migrants’ further intraprovincial dispersal than there is in Australia.

Precise information regarding the percentage distribution of migrants who landed in the 1990s and decided to settle outside CMAs (5.9 per cent of the total inflow during that period, see above) that is in CAs and rural areas could not be located. It may be expected that similarly to Australia, their settlement would occur in CAs rather than in rural areas. Their retention in CAs seems however somewhat questionable (see Subsection I.5.3). Furthermore, the rural settlement of immigrants may be a bit misleading. The 1996 and 2001 Censuses data indicate that their settlement in these areas occurred mostly in rural metro-adjacent regions rather than in rural non-metro adjacent regions (see Box I.5). Only in British Columbia and Nova Scotia a reverse trend was shown in both Censuses. (Beshiri 2004:21).

Finally, as in Australia, immigrants in Canada preferred certain provinces for settlement to others. According to CIC (2005b:37), all permanent residents in 1996 and in 2001 and 2002 chose Ontario, British Columbia (only in 2002 superseded by Québec that took second position and British Columbia moved to the third place), Québec, or Alberta. The
preference for the three provinces where the three largest CMAs are located, and as discussed, longer-term immigrant settlement trends in these cities makes the regional policy in Canada a similarly challenging task as in Australia.

1.5.3 Internal (secondary) migration trends of immigrants

The overseas-born Australians and Canadians display high mobility rates on arrival. In Australia, most of their movements occur during the first ten years of residence (ABS 1998b:48; 2003c:53). Similarly, in Canada secondary migration of immigrants takes place in the period of few years following the landing. CIC (2000b:7) reported that tracking down the location of immigrant taxfilers who landed between 1980-86 and were tracked for a period of ten years, had revealed that of those who had moved over their first ten years of residence, almost two-thirds had done so within their first three years in the country.

As Castles et al. (1998:46) observed in the Australian context, the post-arrival patterns of mobility can promote a greater dispersal or a heavier concentration. Both depend on the residence period. The longer this period is, the more the mobility rates tend to decrease. This is confirmed by ABS that has shown that longer-term immigrants who have arrived prior to 1981, as measured by the 1996 Census, had lower mobility rate than the Australian-born population as a whole (1998b:48). This was confirmed also in the latest 2001 Census (ABS 2003c:53).

Similarly in Canada, longer-resident and older immigrants are less likely to move than those who have recently landed (Schellenberg 2004:13,19). Newbold (2001) observed that with time their mobility rates converge towards the Canadian-born (2001:181). According to the 1996 Canadian Census, the non-recent immigrants were slightly less likely to move to a different province than the Canadian-born: 3.0 per cent versus 3.2 per cent, respectively. They were also less likely than the Canadian-born to move within the province: 7.0 per cent versus 9.0 per cent respectively (CIC 2001f:19-20).

An analysis based of the 2001 Canadian Census and regarding recent immigrants revealed that there was a minimal outward (outside the CMA) mobility among immigrants living in three largest CMAs between 1996–2001. The anticipated mobility trend among recent immigrants residing in CAs (according to the 2001 Census) seemed
somewhat unfavourable towards retention: about 20 per cent of recent immigrants left their CAs and about one quarter of these movers settled in Toronto (Schellenberg 2004:14). This may suggest that, for various reasons, these smaller centres have failed to meet these migrants’ expectations.

Like Australian-born citizens, migrants in Australia, regardless of the year of their arrival, displayed the highest mobility rates in the 25-29 year old age group (ABS 1998b:49; 2003c:54). In Canada, the study of the immigrant taxfilers landed between 1980-95 and captured in the 1995 tax year showed similar trends as in Australia. The most mobile immigrant group was that aged 25-34. Individuals aged 35-44 were less mobile and for those older than 44 the percentage of movers dropped dramatically (CIC 2000b:34). Bilingualism in Canada was also found to be positively related to secondary mobility (2000b:31).

Finally, information regarding rates of out-migration of landed immigrants from the Canadian provinces could be located. According to CIC (2001f:20,21), between 1991-96 longer-term immigrants (excluding those who landed between 1991-96) not residing in Ontario or British Columbia were more likely than the Canadian-born to leave their province. The highest out-migration rate for immigrants (as a share of the population) was recorded in Newfoundland and Labrador: -21 per cent. This was three times higher than the rate for their Canadian-born counterparts. Other provinces with high out-migration rates of immigrants were Saskatchewan (14 per cent), Nova Scotia (11 per cent), New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba (each one 8 per cent), Alberta (7 per cent) and Québec (5 per cent) (2001f:20). Immigrants were marginally less likely than the Canadian-born to leave Ontario and British Columbia: the out-migration rate of immigrants from both provinces was 2 per cent, whereas for the Canadian-born population it was 3 per cent for each province (2001f:20,21).

Such trends indicate that often migrants do not stay in the Eastern provinces, thus replicating the settlement preferences of the Canadian-born population driven by better economic opportunities elsewhere and observed in Subsection I.3.2. Their settlement preferences reinforce the westward movement of the Canadian-born population. Migrants are driven by the same economic considerations as the local population and leave provinces that do not offer, or seem not to offer, attractive employment options.
Appendix II Summary of International Classification of Education (ISCED-1976 and ISCED-1997)

There are two international classifications used to determine skill levels: one classifying the educational levels and the other classifying the occupational skills. This Appendix presents the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED-1976 and ISCED-1997). ISCED-1976 is referred to in the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-1988) presented in Appendix III and constituting the international point of reference. ISCED-1997 is a revised version of the 1976 Edition and is provided in the right panel of Table II.1 for comparative purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>ISCED-1976</th>
<th>ISCED-1997&lt;sup&gt;b)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Education preceding the first level</td>
<td>0 Pre-primary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education at the first level</td>
<td>1 Primary level of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education at the second level, first stage</td>
<td>2 Lower secondary level of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Education at the second level, second stage</td>
<td>3 Upper secondary level of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Education at the third level, first stage, of the type that leads to an</td>
<td>4 Post secondary non-tertiary education&lt;sup&gt;c)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>award not equivalent to a first university degree</td>
<td>5 First stage of tertiary education (not leading directly to an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>advanced research qualification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Education at the third level, first stage, of the type that leads to a</td>
<td>6 Second stage of tertiary education (leading to an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first university degree or equivalent</td>
<td>advanced research qualification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Education at the third level, second stage of the type that leads to a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>postgraduate university degree or equivalent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Education not definable by level&lt;sup&gt;d)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) Level 9 was intended to include educational programs that could not be allocated to any other level. In the revised ISCED-1997 it has been removed.
b) ISCED-1997, from Level 2 to 5 inclusive, distinguishes between different types of programs, for example by their duration and purpose. These sub-categories may be consulted in OECD 1999.
c) Level 4 has been introduced in ISCED-1997. It covers programs straddling the boundary between upper secondary and tertiary education from an international point of view, even though some of these programs can be classified either as upper secondary or post-secondary in a national context. OECD 1999:47.

Source: OECD 1999.
Appendix III Summary of International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-1988)

This Appendix presents the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-1988), which (in combination with ISCED-1976 educational levels; see Appendix II) is an international reference point to determining skills. Table III.1 is drawn from the International Labour Organisation (ILO) website, which has compiled ISCO-1988, and from the OECD website. OECD, in cooperation with ILO and United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) have prepared a single approach to determining skill levels “The Measurement of Scientific and Technological Activities. Manual on the Measurement of Human Resources Devoted to S&T—“Canberra Manual” (OECD 1995). This manual integrates the ISCO-1988 skill levels with the ISCED-1976 educational levels, as shown in Table III.1. It contains detailed guidelines as to how determine the skill levels of skilled labour force named ‘Human Resources in Science and Technology’.

Table III.1 Summary of International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO–1988).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Groups</th>
<th>Submajor Groups</th>
<th>Minor Groups</th>
<th>ISCO-1988 skill level</th>
<th>ISCED-1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not assigned</td>
<td>Not assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professionals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Level 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Technicians and Associate Professionals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clerks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales Workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Skilled Agricultural and Fishery Workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Craft and Related Trades Workers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Plant and Machine Operators and Assemblers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Elementary Occupations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Armed Forces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not assigned</td>
<td>Not assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a) Submajor and Minor Groups may be consulted in ILO 2003.
b) ISCO skill level and correspondence to ISCED-1976 are based on OECD 1995 (Annex 4).
c) For Major Group 1 (Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers) as well as for Major Group 0 (Armed Forces) the skill level approach has not been applied. Tasks and duties of these occupations vary to such an extent that it is impossible to link them with any of the four ISCO-1988 skill levels. OECD 1995:92. In consequence, the educational level (ISCED-1976) could not be applied either.

Appendix IV Summary of Australian Standard Classification of Occupations (ASCO-II)

Table IV.1 Summary of Australian Standard Classification of Occupations (ASCO-II).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Groups¹</th>
<th>Skill level</th>
<th>Formal education and/or training level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Managers and Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Most occupations in Major Groups 1 and 2 have a level of skill commensurate with a bachelor degree or higher qualification or at least 5 years relevant experience. In some instances relevant experience is required in addition to the formal qualification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Associate Professionals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Most occupations in Major Group 3 have a level of skill commensurate with an AQF Diploma or Advanced Diploma or at least 3 years relevant experience. In some instances relevant experience is required in addition to the formal qualification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tradespersons and Related Workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Most occupations in Major Groups 4 and 5 have a level of skill commensurate with an AQF Certificate III or IV or at least 3 years relevant experience. In some instances relevant experience is required in addition to the formal qualification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advanced Clerical and Service Workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intermediate Clerical, Sales and Service Workers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Most occupations in Major Groups 6 and 7 have a level of skill commensurate with an AQF Certificate II or at least 1 year of relevant experience. In some instances relevant experience is required in addition to the formal qualification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intermediate Production and Transport Workers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Elementary Clerical, Sales and Service Workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Most occupations in Major Groups 8 and 9 have a level of skill commensurate with completion of compulsory secondary education or an AQF Certificate I qualification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Labourers and Related Workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) Submajor Groups, Minor Groups, Unit Groups and Occupations can be consulted in ABS 1997.
b) ASCO-II refers to the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), which describes levels of formal education and training. It can be found in Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) Advisory Board (2002).

Appendix V NOC-II Matrix

National Occupational Classification (NOC-II) Matrix in Canada differs visually from ASCO-II in Australia (Appendix IV). NOC-II classifies occupations by skill type and skill level and presents Major Groups (distinguished by two digits), broken down to Minor Groups (distinguished by three digits) (HRDC 2003:2). A Unit Group (distinguished by four digits), which provides the actual profile of the occupation is not presented on Matrix. Unlike in Australia, where ASCO-II (ABS 1997) contains the entire classification, NOC-II users usually have to refer to the Career Handbook (HRDC 2003), which contains the classification of the Unit Groups.

Details of occupational profiles can be searched by ‘Index of Titles’ at www23.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/2001/e/generic/welcome.shtml.
The National Occupational Classification (NOC) is a hierarchical system for classifying occupations. It is used by Statistics Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, and other organizations to collect and report data on the labor force. The NOC categorizes occupations into a series of levels from Level 1 to Level 5, with Level 1 being the highest and Level 5 the lowest. The levels are further divided into groups, subgroups, and types. The NOC is used in various fields such as labor force analysis, workforce planning, and education planning. It is regularly updated to reflect changes in the labor market.
Appendix VI  State/territory sponsored skilled and business migration. Governments' websites in Australia

Australian Capital Territory
Skilled and Business Migration

Victoria
Skilled and Business Migration
www.liveinvictoria.vic.gov.au

Tasmania
Skilled (STNI and SIR) and Business Migration
www.development.tas.gov.au/businovind.html#anchorBusMig

RSMS

South Australia
Skilled and Business Migration
www.immigration.sa.gov.au

Western Australia
Skilled (STNI, Skill Matching, SIR and links to RCBs) and Business Migration
www.migration.wa.gov.au (Business Migration information can be accessed by link to the managing agency's website)

Business Migration
www.sbdc.com.au

Northern Territory
Skilled and Business Migration
Due to frequent changes of website address follow link from www.nt.gov.au

Queensland
Skilled and Business Migration
www.sdi.qld.gov.au

New South Wales
Skilled and Business Migration
www.business.nsw.gov.au

All website addresses, unless indicated otherwise, are current as of May 2005.
Appendix VII Provincial Nominee Programs’ websites and Québec immigration website in Canada

Yukon Territory
Business Migration
www.economicdevelopment.gov.yk.ca/general/ybinp.html

British Columbia
Skilled and Business Migration
www.mcaws.gov.bc.ca/amip/pnp/index.htm (following provincial elections in May 2005, PNP was moved to the Ministry of Economic Development)

Visitors are redirected to the new site, or can visit
www.ecdev.gov.bc.ca/ProgramsAndServices/PNP/index.htm (September 2005)

Alberta
Skilled Migration
www.alberta-canada.com/pnp/

Saskatchewan
Skilled and Business Migration
www.immigrationsask.gov.sk.ca

Manitoba
Skilled and Business Migration
www.gov.mb.ca/labour/immigrate/index.html (Business Migration is co-managed with Manitoba Industry, Economic Development and Mines and can be accessed on a linked website)

Business Migration

Québec
Skilled and Business Migration
www.immigration-quebec.gouv.qc.ca

New Brunswick
Skilled and Business Migration
www.gnb.ca/immigration/english/immigrating/nominee_program.asp

Nova Scotia
Skilled and Business Migration
www.gov.ns.ca/econ/nsnp/default.asp

Prince Edward Island
Skilled and Business Migration

Newfoundland and Labrador
Skilled and Business Migration
www.nlpnp.ca/index.html

All website addresses unless indicated otherwise are current as of May 2005.
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