SCTCMG 2021
International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»

EUROPEAN UNION AND CANADA: CORE ISSUES OF CONTEMPORARY MIGRATION AND INTEGRATION

Andrei Vladimirovich Zavialov (a)*, Oxana Alexandrovna Polyushkevich (b),
Roman Viktorovich Ivanov (c), Iuliia Vladimirovna Zavarzina (d),
Alexandr Nikolaievich Pruzhinin (e)
*Corresponding author

(a) Irkutsk State Medical University, 1, Krasnogo Vosstaniia St., Irkutsk, Russia, zavialovandrijko@yandex.ru,
(b) Irkutsk State University, 3, Lenina St., Irkutsk, Russia, okwook@mail.ru,
(c) Irkutsk State University, 3, Lenina St., Irkutsk, Russia, history2002@bk.ru,
(d) Irkutsk State University, 3, Lenina St., Irkutsk, Russia, julia661@mail.ru,
(e) Irkutsk State University, 3, Lenina St., Irkutsk, Russia, alex.pruzhin@gmail.com

Abstract

Countries and international organizations one by one are having problems of migration flows regulation. The migration policy of a country has an important role in integration and adaptation of immigrants. Migration policies of the European Union and Canada take special place among migration policies of other countries due to their uniqueness. The historical highlights of migration regulation in both the European Union and Canada is discussed; the general statistics of the migration situation, the social structure and demographic characteristics of the contemporary immigration to the European Union and Canada are considered; the role of integration and adaptation policies of the European Union and Canada into the adaptation process of contemporary immigrants using the Migrant Integration Policy Index data is determined. The obtained data show that Canada migration policy is considered one of the best in the world, while the European Union migration policy has a number of shortcomings due to the fact that it is regulated by both the European Union and its Member States, what slows the adaptation and integration of immigrants. However, all the measures taken by the authorities help immigrants feel included into the social life of their new country, which, as a result, positively influences their labour mobility and loyalty.

Keywords: Migration, immigrants, adaptation, integration, European Union, Canada

1. Introduction

In today's globalised world, problems of migration and migration flows are debated by politicians and scientists, economists and ordinary citizens. On one hand, it may seem that migration attains alarming rates, but on the other that nothing special happens because it is a matter of the globalisation phenomenon which is characterised by the erosion of international, inter-ethnic and inter-linguistic borders. The theme of migration is one of the most researched in our time (Arango, 2000; Stark & Bloom, 1985).

2. Problem Statement

Countries and international organizations one by one are having problems of migration flows regulation. Migration leads to a change of social patterns. Some countries simplify the procedure of obtaining visas and general schemes of human and traffic flows but others do the contrary: they implement new barriers in the way of foreign labour and goods. Migration always entails changes in the socio-cultural environment, labour market and social relationships. Such countries and international organizations as Canada and European Union have a unique experience in managing migration policy and flows, as well as adaptation and integration of immigrants (Tkachenko & Polyushkevich, 2019).

3. Research Questions

1. To highlight the current condition of the migration situation in the European Union and Canada;
2. To consider the social structure and demographic characteristics of the contemporary immigration to the European Union and Canada;
3. To consider and determine the role of integration and adaptation policies of the European Union and Canada into the adaptation process of contemporary immigrants using the Migrant Integration Policy Index data.

4. Purpose of the Study

Considering the current migration tendencies to the European Union and Canada, to analyse the migration policy and adaptation of contemporary immigrants in the European Union Member States and Canada.

5. Research Methods

For understanding integration and adaptation processes of migrants in different EU Member States and in Canada, the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) 2014 and 2020 reports were used. They are produced by the Barcelona Centre for International Affairs, Migration Policy Group, co-funded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals, International Organization for Migration, Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety of the European Commission (DG SANTE) and Consumers, Health, Agriculture and Food Executive Agency of the European Commission (CHAFEA) via the Project "Integration policies: Who benefits?". The group analyses integration, adaptation and

opportunities of immigrants in a new society: 38 countries were analysed in 2014, and 52 in 2020 (providing data for 2019) with a 100-points scale in 8 major policies which influence their integration and adaptation into a new society using 167 policy indicators:

- "Labour Market Mobility" shows the migrants' possibilities to work and live in a country having the same access to labour market (both private and public sector) as nationals and opportunities to improve a language and other necessary skills through trainings which public services offer.

- "Family Reunion" shows the migrants' possibilities of having the same rights as the EU families moving through the Union, opportunities to apply for spouse/partner, children, dependent parents and grandparents through free and short procedure where authorities cannot reject an application if it is not fraudulent or if it does not pose security threats.

- "Education" is about possibilities of any child and adult of foreign nationality to attend educational institutions and benefit from the same general measures as classmates with the same socio-economic background, with opportunities to obtain additional support due to immigration experience from well-trained teachers, including mastering host and native language skills because schools use intercultural approach of living in the intercultural society.

- "Health" focuses on the possibility of migrants to access the health care system of a host society, health insurance, providing of medical services equal to nationals and on different languages.

- "Political Participation" provides information on the possibilities of migrants to vote and run in regional elections, participate in protests and marches and enjoy the same political liberties as nationals have.

- "Permanent Residence" is about legal immigrants having the right to decide for themselves where to settle permanently in the country. The procedure is free and short because the only issue to resolve is whether there is potential fraud or a real security threat and there is a possibility to appeal any rejection or withdrawal of an application. In the case of acceptance, an immigrant is secure and treated equally as nationals with the same rights and obligations in most areas of life.

- "Access to Nationality" reflects the possibility of immigrants who see their future in a new country to obtain support to become citizens and participate in public life equally with other nationals while keeping their second nationality (dual citizenship) and being protected by the new country equally with fellow nationals. Children born in a country become citizens automatically. Nationality is received after meeting general conditions such as no criminal record, a passed citizenship test and language proficiency which is possible to get through free, flexible and professional courses provided by a country.

- "Anti-Discrimination" analyses possibilities of immigrants to fight discrimination and benefit from equal opportunities, to bring a case against any discrimination practices in all fields of public life and courts use a wide-range of sanctions to prevent, discourage and correct discrimination (MIPEX, 2020).

6. Findings

6.1. Migration and integration of migrants in the European Union

The EU migration policy is not a classical, but unique model of migration regulation. The free movement of persons was a core part of the original Treaty of Rome and, from the early days of the European Economic Community, nationals of EEC member states could travel freely from one Member State to another upon production of their passports or national identity cards. However, systematic identity controls were still in place at the border between most Member States. The Schengen Agreement, which became among the first steps on total border control refusal, was signed in 1985 by five EEC members: Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, France and Federal Republic of Germany. It came into force in 1995 forming the Schengen Area. In 1990, it was supplemented by the Schengen Convention. These agreements are about common passport-visa control and abolishing of internal borders control among European Community Member States. The Schengen Agreement was incorporated into the EU law under the 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam which came into force in 1999.

Today, the Schengen Area unites 26 European countries covering a population of over 410 million people, an area of over 4,3 million km^2 and comprises of 22 European Union Member States plus Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland. Monaco, San Marino and the Vatican have open or semi-open borders with the Schengen Area. Ireland has an opt-out from the Schengen Area as it has its Common Travel Area with the United Kingdom with systematic border control with other European Union Member States. The other four EU Member States – Romania, Bulgaria, Croatia and Cyprus are obliged to join the Schengen Area due to their Accession agreements. As these four Member States prepare for accession to the Schengen Area, they must implement measures with regard to air borders, visas, police cooperation and personal data protection. They are under an evaluation process which involves a questionnaire and visits by EU experts to different institutions and workplaces in the countries.

Upon the elimination of internal border controls and strengthening external border controls, Schengen Area countries operate like a single state for international travel purposes with external border controls for travellers entering and exiting the Area and a common visa policy but with no internal border control among the Member States. According to the European legislation and treaties, Schengen Area countries have the right to make the constant internal border controls for the half-a-year period.

Coordination and harmonisation of migration policies between different European countries form a strong institutional mandate and a solid conceptual basis which unifies rules and simplifies the movement of people, goods, services and capitals or the EU four freedoms.

The EU migration policy has been under pressure since the beginning but especially with COVID-19 pandemic and migration crises. This is why the migration policies of EU Member States and the EU itself might become more restrictive (Zavialov, 2019).

If EU migration policy is at the nexus of internal and external migration, there are several differences between EU citizens and foreigners:

1) EU citizens can travel within the EU without internal checkpoints;
2) Non-EU citizens are subjects to a restrictive set of national migration policies by different EU Member States.

With that, the EU practices the dual approach on its migration policy:

- internal migration is harmonised;

- external migration is not yet harmonised (a. all EU Member States have special immigration schemes; b. they regulate illegal immigration in a different way; c. there are different durations of temporary work and another types of permits; d. different naturalisation rules); the only EU level rule that is universal is that after five years of living in a Member State, legal immigrants can ask for a permanent residence.

The EU migration situation is analysed below in accordance with the Eurostat data which are described in four groups: Immigrants and non-EU citizens residing in the EU; Residence permits and reasons for issuing; Acquisition of EU citizenship; Asylum (Eurostat, 2020).

1. Immigrants and non-EU citizens residing in the EU:

In 2018, approximately 3,9 million people immigrated to one of the EU Member States, while 2,6 million people emigrated from a EU Member State (these figures represent flows between EU Member States, as well as migration flows to/from the EU). The 3,9 million people group consists of 2,4 million of non-EU citizens.

As for number of received immigrants in 2018, the top 5 were Germany at 893,900 (692,700 in 2013), Spain at 643,700 (280,000 in 2013), United Kingdom at 604,000 (526,000 in 2013), France at 386,900 (332,600 in 2013), Italy at 332,300 (307,500 in 2013). Most of EU Member States reported more immigration than emigration but Bulgaria, Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania and Romania had the contrary situation.

Concerning the gender distribution of immigrants in 2018, there were 54% male (highest in Croatia – 75%) and 46% female (highest in Portugal – 52%). As for age structure, the median age of the EU population was 43.7 years while the same indicator for immigrants was 29.2 years.

In 2019, the largest number of non-EU citizens living in one of the EU Member States were 5.8 million in Germany (7 million in 2014), 3.7 million in Italy (4.9 in 2014), 3.1 million in Spain (4.7 in 2014) and 3.4 million in France (4.2 in 2014). These top 5 countries have around 70% of all non-EU citizens living in the EU.

2. Residence permits and reasons for issuing:

In 2019, there were 3 million first residence permits issued to non-EU citizens which is 163,000 more than in 2018. Poland issued 724,000, followed by Germany at 460,000, Spain at 320,000, France at 285,000, Italy at 176,000, Czechia at 117,000 and The Netherlands at 102,000 which total more than 77% of issued first permits. But taking into consideration the ratio between the number of first permits issued and the size of resident population, then Malta issued the highest number of permits – 42 per 1000 (23 per 1000 in 2014), followed by Cyprus – 27 (16 in 2014), and Poland – 19 (9 in 2014).

The highest number of residence permits in 2019 was issued to citizens of Ukraine – 757,000 (303,000 in 2014); followed by citizens of Morocco – 133,000 (96,000 in 2014), India – 131,000 (135,000 in 2014) and China – 110,000.

Employment reasons in 2019 were cited for 1,200,000 (40.5%) (572,000, or 25% in 2014) permits with Poland issuing 625,120 (206,000 in 2014), United Kingdom – 108,150 and Czechia – 66,442.

Citizens of Ukraine obtained 659,602 (206,000 in 2014) permits for employment, India – 50,154 and Belarus – 40,794.

Family reasons in 2019 were cited for 810,000 (27.4%) residence permits (680,000, or 29% in 2014): Germany issued 167,443, Spain – 143,860, Italy – 100,939, United Kingdom – 100,540; citizens of Morocco obtained 78,828, India – 41,091 and Ukraine – 40,190 of permits on the family reason.

There were 400,000 (13.5%) permits issued in 2019 for education (477,000, or 25% in 2014) with the United Kingdom issuing 190,346 permits, followed by France – 90,388. Citizens of China obtained 43,581, India – 31,310 and United States of America – 27,208 had permits for education.

Other reasons include international protection, residence without the right to work and diplomatic duties – 546,000 (19.1%) in 2019 (577,000, or 21% in 2014).

In general, there were approximately 21.8 million non-EU nationals residing in the EU in 2019 (20 million in 2014).

3. Acquisition of EU citizenship:

The number of granted citizenships in 2018 were 672,300 (984,800 in 2013). Germany granted the highest number of citizenships to its residents – 116,800, followed by Italy – 112,500, France – 110,000, Spain – 90,800 and Sweden – 63,800. Spain also had the highest increase in the number of citizenships granted (+24,300 comparable to 2017). This is followed by Portugal (+3,300), and Luxembourg (+2,000). Italy and Greece experienced the highest decrease of the number of granted citizenships: –34,100 and – 6,400, respectively.

Approximately 84%, or 566,100 of all national citizenships in 2018 were granted to non-EU citizens (871,300, or 89% in 2013), among them 28% were from Africa, 25% from Europe outside the EU, 16% from Asia, 14% from Americas. The largest group were citizens of Morocco (67,200 or 10% of all citizenships granted), followed by citizens of Albania (47,400 or 7.1%), Turkey (28,400 or 4.2%), and Brazil (23,100 or 3.4%).

4. Asylum:

Most of the current migration crisis in Europe is caused by instability and wars in the Middle East and North Africa (Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Eritrea and Somalia). In 2019, there were 612,700 asylum seekers in the EU (1,300,000 in 2015; 627,000 in 2014; 424,000 in 2001). In 2019, among all applications for asylum, the largest number of citizens was from Syria – ≈75,000: 39,270 in Germany, 10,750 in Greece, 5,015 in Sweden (363,000 in 2014: 159,000 in Germany, 64,000 in Hungary, 51,000 in Sweden). They are followed by citizens of Afghanistan (≈55,000) and Venezuela (≈42,000).

Germany received the highest number of asylum applications in 2019 – 142,400, or 23.3% of all applications in the EU (442,000, or 35% in 2015; 173,000 or 31% in 2014). Some Member States reported a significant increase of asylum applications if compared with 2018: Spain (+118.4%), Cyprus (+66.8%), Sweden (+27.9%). Italy, Germany and Austria reported that they received less applications in 2019 than in 2018.

Concerning the age structure of first-time asylum applicants, it should be taken into consideration that around 77.3% were less than 35 years old with the 18–34 years old category at 47% and less than 18 years old category – 30.3% (7.1% of them were unaccompanied). Approximately 61.9% of asylum applicants were male.

In 2019, 31.8% of first-time asylum application decisions were positive (52% in 2015) among them 109,000 resulted in grants of refugee status (229,000 in 2015). Subsidiary protection status was granted to 52,000 applicants (56,000 in 2015) and authorisation to stay for humanitarian reasons to 45,100 (22,000 in 2015). Spain has the highest rate of positive decisions of first-time asylum applications – 67%, followed by Luxembourg, Austria and Greece (in 2015, 91% in Bulgaria, followed Malta, Denmark and the Netherlands). Thus, Hungary, Czechia and Poland reported the highest rates of negative decisions at more than 85%.

It should be noted that EU Member States have different policies and conditions of integration and adaptation of migrants into their societies. In recent years, the integration of non-EU nationals legally living in the EU has gained an increased importance in the European agenda. The EU has targeted the promotion of immigrant integration and for this reason has established actors, institutions and instruments to promote such integration: the Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee, Ministerial Conferences, National Contact Points on Integration, the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals, the European Integration Forum, the European website on integration, handbooks on integration, European integration modules, etc. The adaptation and integration of immigrants have a great importance for the EU: it supports projects and finances various events. For the period of 2008–2015 there was 13 million euro available for such events. The same amount of money is available for 2016–2023, of which 25% is co-financed by a particular Member State (Table 01).

According to the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) Report, in 2019 the EU-28 had the score of 49/100 (MIPEX, 2020).

Table 1. Top 5 European Union Member States' scores on integration and adaptation policy according to Migrant Integration Policy Index

Index	Top 5 EU Member States in 2014 – Value (rank) [38 countries analysed]		Top 5 EU Member States in 2019 – Value (rank) [52 countries analysed]	
	Best 5	Worst 5	Best 5	Worst 5
Overall score	Sweden – 78 (1)	Malta – 40 (33)	Sweden – 86 (1)	Poland – 40 (44)
	Portugal – 75 (2)	Lithuania – 37 (34)	Finland – 85 (2)	Croatia – 39 (45)
	Finland – 69 (4)	Slovakia – 37 (35)	Portugal – 81 (3)	Slovakia – 39 (46)
	Belgium – 67 (7)	Cyprus – 35 (36)	Belgium – 69 (7)	Latvia – 37 (47)
	Germany – 61 (10)	Latvia – 31 (37)	Ireland – 64 (10)	Lithuania – 37 (48)
Labour market mobility	Sweden – 98 (1)	Poland – 38 (33)	Portugal – 94 (1)	Poland – 31 (43)
	Portugal – 91 (2)	Ireland – 38 (34)	Finland – 91 (2)	Slovenia – 26 (46)
	Germany – 86 (4)	Slovenia – 38 (35)	Sweden – 91 (3)	Cyprus – 24 (47)
	Finland – 80 (6)	Cyprus – 34 (36)	Germany – 81 (5)	Ireland – 22 (49)
	Denmark – 79 (7)	Slovakia – 21 (37)	Estonia – 69 (8)	Slovakia – 17 (52)
Family reunion	Spain – 90 (1)	Malta – 48 (33)	Portugal – 87 (3)	Austria – 36 (48)
	Portugal – 88 (2)	Denmark – 42 (35)	Estonia – 76 (4)	Cyprus – 35 (49)
	Slovenia – 80 (3)	Ireland – 40 (36)	Slovenia – 72 (8)	Netherlands – 31 (50)
	Sweden – 78 (5)	Cyprus – 39 (37)	Sweden – 71 (9)	UK – 29 (51)
	Belgium – 72 (6)	UK – 33 (38)	Spain – 69 (11)	Denmark – 25 (52)
Education	Sweden – 77 (1)	Latvia – 17 (33)	Sweden – 93 (1)	Slovenia – 33 (35)
	Portugal – 62 (6)	Lithuania – 17 (34)	Finland – 88 (2)	Latvia – 26 (38)
	Belgium – 61 (7)	Croatia – 15 (35)	Belgium – 74 (7)	Bulgaria – 21 (43)
	Finland – 60 (8)	Hungary – 15 (36)	Portugal – 69 (10)	Slovakia – 7 (48)
	Estonia – 58 (10)	Bulgaria – 3 (38)	Estonia – 69 (11)	Hungary – 0 (51)
Political	Luxembourg – 81 (2)	Bulgaria – 13 (33)	Finland – 95 (1)	Czechia – 10 (43)

participation	Finland – 79 (3)	Latvia – 13 (34)	Luxembourg – 85 (2)	Romania – 5 (44)
	Portugal – 74 (4)	Croatia – 13 (35)	Ireland – 85 (3)	Slovakia – 5 (45)
	Ireland – 73 (6)	Poland – 6 (37)	Sweden – 80 (4)	Lithuania – 5 (46)
	Sweden – 71 (7)	Romania – 0 (38)	Portugal – 80 (5)	Bulgaria – 0 (51)
Permanent residence	Belgium – 86 (1)	UK – 51 (31)	Finland – 96 (1)	Ireland – 50 (42)
	Sweden – 79 (2)	Malta – 50 (34)	Sweden – 90 (2)	Latvia – 46 (44)
	Spain – 74 (3)	Ireland – 49 (35)	Hungary – 81 (5)	Malta – 46 (47)
	Denmark – 74 (4)	France – 48 (36)	Slovenia – 77 (10)	Greece – 46 (48)
	Estonia – 71 (5)	Cyprus – 37 (37)	Spain – 75 (11)	Denmark – 42 (52)
Access to nationality	Portugal – 86 (1)	Austria – 26 (34)	Portugal – 86 (6)	Slovenia – 22 (46)
	Sweden- 73 (2)	Slovakia – 25 (35)	Sweden – 83 (7)	Croatia – 19 (48)
	Germany – 72 (3)	Bulgaria – 21 (36)	Luxembourg – 79 (8)	Estonia – 16 (50)
	Belgium – 69 (6)	Estonia – 18 (37)	Ireland – 79 (9)	Austria – 13 (51)
	Luxembourg – 68 (7)	Latvia – 17 (38)	Finland – 74 (12)	Bulgaria – 13 (52)
Anti-discrimination	Bulgaria – 89 (3)	Spain – 49 (29)	Sweden – 100 (1)	Spain – 59 (37)
	Portugal – 88 (4)	Czechia – 48 (31)	Belgium – 100 (2)	Austria – 53 (40)
	UK – 85 (5)	Lithuania – 43 (32)	Portugal – 100 (3)	Denmark – 51 (41)
	Sweden – 85 (6)	Latvia – 34 (33)	Finland – 100 (5)	Lithuania – 51 (43)
	Hungary – 83 (7)	Estonia – 32 (34)	Bulgaria – 100 (7)	Estonia – 48 (46)
	Italy – 65 (6)	Lithuania – 26 (34)	Ireland – 85 (1)	Bulgaria – 29 (42)
	UK – 64 (7)	Poland – 26 (35)	Sweden – 83 (4)	Estonia – 29 (43)
Health	Austria – 63 (8)	Croatia – 20 (36)	Spain – 81 (5)	Hungary – 29 (44)
	Sweden – 62 (9)	Slovenia – 18 (37)	Austria – 81 (6)	Croatia – 27 (46)
	Ireland – 58 (10)	Latvia – 17 (38)	Italy – 79 (8)	Poland – 27 (47)

6.2. Migration and integration of migrants in Canada

Canada is usually defined as a classical immigrants' country. It was formed by immigrants through the centuries. The first Europeans were recorded in 11th century (Vikings) and 14th century (Basques), but they did not have permanent settlements. After the initial colonisation period of Britain and France, four waves of immigration and settlement of non-aboriginal population are identified. Currently Canada experiences the fifth wave of immigration.

The first wave of immigration started at the beginning of the 17th century and continued until the 1812 War between the United States of America and Great Britain in the North American colonies and consisted of French explorers settled in Québec and Acadia, Americans fleeing the American Revolution and Europeans settled in the South Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The second wave of immigration continued until the beginning of the 20th century, and mainly consisted of British and Irish military personnel and peasants who came to Canada to serve Royal military forces, or emigrated due to famines (especially in 1846–1849) or other reasons connected with economic situation and agriculture. Starting from 1872, Canada offered 160 acres of free land to any person with the obligation to live, plot and improve it. During the same period Canada faced another problem: it became a port of entry for Europeans seeking to gain entry into the United States. The third and fourth waves of immigration lay between 1901–1914 and 1940–1969 which mainly consisted of Europeans seeking a safe place from the wars in Europe. The last, fifth wave, started in 1970 and continues today. It overwhelmingly consists of so called "visible minorities" from the developing countries (South Asia, China, Caribbean countries) which has led to significant changes in the Canadian ethnic composition structure for the last 30 years. (Portes, 1997).

The main document which regulates immigration to Canada is the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act of 2002. This legislative document regulates the entry of foreigners as temporary residents, students, workers, immigrants, protected persons, etc. It follows the replaced Immigration Act of 1976, where provinces received additional power to create their own immigration laws, established four classes of immigrants (refugees, families, assisted relatives and independent immigrants), established a point system for independent immigrants and created alternatives to deportation. Main principles of that Act are in force till nowadays.

Immigrants receive Canadian citizenship through the naturalisation process. Recent changes to the law took place in 2015 including residency requirements increasing to 4 years out of 6 from 3 years out of 5, during the period immediately prior to filing the application thereby reducing the length of time to 66% from 75% of the relevant residency period. The physical residence requirement states that an applicant for citizenship must stay for at least 183 days per year in each of four calendar years and to file income tax. Applicants aged 14–64 years old must demonstrate general knowledge of Canada and basic ability of any official language (English or French). The main issues of adaptation and integration of immigrants are stipulated in the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1985 (Zavialov, 2019).

According to the 2020 Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration (Mendicino, 2020), which has the 2019 data on immigration to Canada, 404,369 temporary work permits were issued under the temporary foreign worker and international mobility programs, and 341,180 persons admitted in 2019 as new permanent residents (in 2013 the number was 258,953; current population of Canada is approximately 38 million people). Permanent residents are divided into four main immigration categories:

1. Economic class – 196,658 (57.6%) persons admitted in 2019 (148,181 in 2013); this category is divided into seven sub-categories: Federal economic—Skilled – 90,242 (52,877 in 2013), Federal economic—Business – 1,336 (5,098 in 2013), Federal economic—Caregiver – 9,807 (8,797 in 2013), Provincial Nominee Program – 68,647 (39,915 in 2013), Quebec skilled workers – 19,098 (30,284 in 2013), Quebec business immigrants – 3,387 (3,994 in 2013), Atlantic Immigration Pilot Program – 4,141;

2. Family class – 91,311 (26.8%) persons admitted in 2019 (81,831 in 2013); this category is divided into two sub-categories: Spouses, Partners and Children – 68,809 (49,513 in 2013), Parents and Grandparents – 22,011 (32,318 in 2013), Other – 491;

3. Refugees – 48,530 (14.2%) persons admitted in 2019 (24,049 in 2013); this category is divided into four sub-categories: Protected persons in-Canada and dependants abroad – 18,443 (11,863 in 2013), Government-Assisted Refugees – 9,951 (5,756 in 2013), Privately Sponsored Refugees – 19,143 (6,277 in 2013), Blended visa office referred refugees – 993 (153 in 2013);

4. Humanitarian and other – 4,681 (1.4%) (2,885 in 2013).

Canada receives its immigrant population from all over the world. Thus, there are the top 10 source countries which account for 61% (207,142) of all 341,180 (258,953 in 2013) permanent residence permits admitted in 2019: India – 85,593 (25%; 30,576, or 12% in 2013), China – 30,246 (9%; 33,908, or 13% in 2013), Philippines – 27,818 (8%; 28,943, or 10% in 2013), Nigeria – 12,602 (4%), Pakistan – 10,793, United States of America – 10,780, Syria – 10,121 (3%), Eritrea – 7,030 (2%), South Korea – 6,103, Iran – 6,056. Immigrants continue to be well-qualified with 56% of the permanent residents having completed a university degree.

The top 10 countries on granting Canadian citizenship in 2019 account for 131,511 people or 52.5% of all 250,367 (234,985 in 2015) persons who had been granted Canadian citizenship. These countries are: Philippines – 33,921 (29,967 in 2013), India – 31,341 (26,967 in 2015), Iran – 14,042 (8,667 in 2015), China – 13,453 (19,161 in 2013), Pakistan – 11,181 (8,062 in 2013), Syria – 6,371 (587 in 2017), United States of America – 5,621 (5,564 in 2015), France – 5,502 (2,081 in 2017), Iraq – 5,060 (2,231 in 2017), Nigeria – 5,019 (1,891 in 2017).

It should be noted that the immigrant population concentrates in the large cities (Montréal, Toronto, Vancouver) which experience increases in services demands leading to concerns about the infrastructure's capability to handle the influx. Around 40% of immigrants move to the GTA (Grand Toronto Area), and this number is stable today. This is why the provinces which do not have the destination cities mentioned above, implement strategies to boost their immigration share. Statistics Canada projects that in 2031, 1/2 of the population over 15 years old will be foreign-born or have at least one foreign-born parent, and the number of visible minorities will double and consist the majority of the population in Canadian cities (Table 02).

According to the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) Report, in 2019 Canada was 4th of the 52 nations under study with the score of 80/100 (MIPEX, 2020).

Table 2. Canada's scores on integration and adaptation policy according to Migrant Integration Policy Index

Index	2014 Value (world rank)	2019 Value (world rank)	Progress
Overall score	68 (4)	80 (6)	+12 (–2)
Labour market mobility	81 (5)	76 (6)	–5 (–1)
Family reunion	79 (4)	88 (2)	+9 (+2)
Education	65 (5)	86 (3)	+21 (+2)
Political participation	48 (20)	50 (16)	+2 (+4)
Permanent residence	62 (17)	77 (8)	+15 (+9)
Access to nationality	67 (8)	88 (4)	+21 (+4)
Anti-discrimination	92 (1)	100 (1)	+8 (0)
Health	49 (18)	73 (12)	+24 (+6)

7. Conclusion

The presented data show that the EU Member States succeed on integration and adaptation of migrants in absolutely different ways. Using the EU legal framework, some of them promote more rights and freedoms for migrants than others who have the minimum rights and freedoms provided by national legislation and limited by the European legislation. The question of adaptation and integration of migrants depends on many factors such as social, political, cultural, and economic which influence the decision-making processes in this area, this is why in 2019 EU had only 49 points out of 100 according to MIPEX.

Canada has the strongest commitment to anti-discrimination and equality, which significantly simplifies the adaptation and integration processes of immigrants. It helps newcomers and visible minorities practically obtain equal opportunities. Canada has the strongest anti-discrimination laws banning discrimination on the grounds of ethnicity, race, religion, nationality, etc. Many European Union Member States have started to use the Canadian experience in their practice.

Canada has one of the best policies to attract permanent immigrants as workers with their families and works on improving the system of recognition of foreign qualifications because immigrants trained abroad are not highly addressed on the Canadian labour market. But it has to be noted that Canada has the best labour market opportunities, far better than in the EU, because it provides equal rights to work in any sector except the public service.

Immigrants in Canada have equal labour rights with nationals and they do not have to wait for 5 years to obtain permanent residence as it is in many EU Member States. If an economic immigrant satisfies the necessary criteria, she/he can obtain permanent residence faster through different immigration programs. Family members and refugees are eligible for permanent residence automatically.

Canada tries to secure the family life of the immigrant through recognising the many types of families and giving them equal rights as their sponsors. If compared with the EU Member States, many of them only start introducing basic residence security and rights if a person satisfies some general conditions. The main Canadian weakness is the current backlog as applicants have to wait for years without knowing when and if they will be reunited with their families (but it changes now since the backlog shortens).

With regard to education, the schools and universities satisfy general needs of immigrant students making the education system the 2nd with Canada providing special language courses for immigrants in both English and French. At the same time, a multiculturalism policy provides for political participation of immigrants through freedom of associations and diversity education for Canadians and immigrants so that immigrants can learn about their heritage language and culture. But immigrants in Canada do not have the possibility to influence integration and adaptation policy or any other policy as immigrants have in 14 EU Member States.

Almost all residents who plan their future in Canada can become Canadian citizens. Newcomers who satisfy general legal conditions can apply after a few years' residence, it currently is 4 of the last 6 years. The new citizenship test and guide are defined as the most professional in the world. But there is a slight insecure because discretion is limited and judges have full oversight over the citizenship granting procedure. The EU Member States have different policies in citizenship granting: an immigrant has to wait from 3 years in case of Belgium to 10 years in case of Latvia.

The migration policy of a country has an important role in integration and adaptation of immigrants. All these measures help immigrants feel included into the social life of their new country which, as a result, positively influences their labour mobility and loyalty.

References

Arango, J. (2000). Explaining Migration: A Critical View. *Int. Soc. Sci. J., 165*, 283–296.

Eurostat (2020). Statistics Explained. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Main_Page

Mendicino, M. E. L. (2020). 2020 Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration. https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/ircc/migration/ircc/english/pdf/pub/annual-report-2020-en.pdf

MIPEX (2020). Migrant Integration Policy Index. https://www.mipex.eu/

Tkachenko, O. E., & Polyushkevich, O. A. (2019). Migration Mobility: Strength or Weakness of State Development. *Mobility as a Measurement of Soft Power: Theory, Practice, Discourse* (pp. 288–298). Discourse Pi Press.

Portes, A. (1997). Immigration Theory for a New Century: Some Problems and Opportunities. *International Migration Review, 31*(4), 799–825.

Stark, O., & Bloom, D. E. (1985). The New Economics of Labour Migration. *The American Economic Review, 75*, 173–178.

Zavialov, A. V. (2019). *Social Adaptation of Migrants: Sociological Analysis of Theory and Practice.* Irkutsk State Univer. Press.