

THE CAPACITY FOR CARE: A CARE ETHICS ANALYSIS OF IMMIGRATION
AND SETTLEMENT POLICIES IN THREE CANADIAN PROVINCES

by

Leah Nicholson

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

at

Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia
December 2023

Dalhousie University is located in Mi'kma'ki, the
ancestral and unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq.
We are all Treaty people.

© Copyright by Leah Nicholson, 2023

DEDICATION PAGE

To the settlement staff, volunteers, organizers, immigrants, and refugees I have worked with, laughed with, and cried with.

You inspired me to keep caring even when it felt impossible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	1
Positionality and motivations for this research	5
Thesis organization	5
CHAPTER 2 – CARE ETHICS AND IMMIGRATION: LITERATURE REVIEW ..8	
CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY	18
Temporal scope	19
Case study/text selection	20
<i>Trace</i> method.....	22
Limitations	24
CHAPTER 4 – NEOLIBERALISM IN IMMIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT POLICY	26
CHAPTER 5 – THE FEDERALIZATION OF IMMIGRATION AND CASE STUDIES	37
Province-building and the federalization of immigration	38
Manitoba.....	40
Ontario.....	45
Nova Scotia	49
CHAPTER 6 – TRACING THE ETHIC OF CARE	53
Immigrants as Solutions	54
Independent Success as Human Nature	61
Caregiving as a Burden and a Necessity	67
CHAPTER 7 - RENEWAL WITH AN ETHICS OF CARE: DISCUSSION	74
Responsibility for care	76
Non-extractive and contextually relevant success	78
CHAPTER 8 – CONCLUSION	83
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Provincial-federal agreements and their economic-oriented objectives	Page 55
Table 2	Provincial and federal report problem definitions	Page 57
Table 3	Extractive lexicon	Page 58

ABSTRACT

Immigration has played a central role in Canada's economic development strategy since the 2015 federal election. At the same time, expanded provincial responsibility for immigration over the last three decades has created an increasingly complex immigration environment. At the heart of these dynamics is the non-governmental settlement sector, which continues to provide essential supports and services for a growing number of immigrants, refugees, and their families. This thesis makes a unique contribution to the literature on immigration and settlement policies by analyzing these policies against an ethic of care, using the *Trace* method of normative policy analysis. Using the provinces of Manitoba, Ontario, and Nova Scotia as case studies, the thesis offers critical insights into the deficiencies of the neoliberal normative framework underlying these policies and suggests ways that care ethics can inform responsive immigration and settlement policies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis was only made possible through a complex web of relations; of care; of support.

Thank you to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for the support provided by the Canada Graduate Scholarship program.

Thank you to my supervisor, Dr. Kiran Banerjee, for his thoughtful comments and guidance. He kept me on track while giving me space and support to be creative. I also want to thank the other members of my committee: Dr. David Black, for being a source of positivity and warmth throughout my degree, and Dr. Rachael Johnstone, for her time and expertise. A special thank you to my graduate coordinator, Dr. Kristin Good, for her patience, understanding, and eagerness to see all her students succeed.

Thank you to my family and friends, whose support has always been unconditional. Thank you to my mentors, whose guidance allowed me to move farther along in my academic career than I ever thought I could go, and whose encouragement fostered a sense of self-belief I could not attain on my own.

And finally, thank you to my partner, Anton. Your care makes everything seem possible.

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

Immigration has become a central policy concern in Canada in recent years. Since 2015, the Liberal government under the leadership of Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has signalled the importance of immigration in Canadian culture, society, and the economy (Bascaramurty, 2017; Office of the Prime Minister, 2015; The Canadian Press, 2018) and has substantially increased immigration levels. Between 2016 and 2021, immigrants accounted for 71% of population growth in Canada, and immigration numbers are expected to continue increasing for decades (Statistics Canada, 2022). During the COVID-19 crisis, immigration was positioned as a tool for economic recovery by the federal government (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2020). Marco Mendicino, the former Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship (IRCC), stated that immigrants were ‘essential’ to getting Canada through the pandemic, as well as sustaining the country’s short and long-term economic growth (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2020). Mendicino highlighted that the Canadian health-care system and agricultural sector, among other industries, rely on immigrants to function (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2020). Alongside targeted immigration, Canada was also designated the world leader in resettling refugees by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in 2019, at a time when the UN reports the highest levels of human displacement on record (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2023). Overall, immigration has become a central policy concern in Canada due to its role in population growth, economic development, and the country’s humanitarian commitment to refugees.

But immigration does not only figure prominently at the federal level in Canada. Evolving federal-provincial relations in the past three decades have resulted in the broad devolution of immigration policies from the federal government to the provinces, (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2022; Paquet, 2014, 2019) and this regional focus continues to be key priority for both levels of government. This process of “federalization” has resulted in varying levels of involvement and capacity between the provinces making the landscape of immigration in Canada increasingly complex. Accompanying this complexity is the importance of the largely non-governmental settlement sector. The settlement sector is a critical component of the Canadian immigration landscape, as it provides essential services for an increasingly larger number of immigrants, refugees, and their families. Due to the evolution of provincial-federal relations in immigration, there has been a growing asymmetry in settlement services across jurisdictions (Banting, 2012, p. 82; Paquet, 2019). Therefore, it is important to critically analyze immigration and settlement policies so that immigrants, refugees, and their families, are best supported in Canada.

Government reports and statistics on the settlement sector in Canada are primarily focused on measuring settlement outcomes (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2021) which the literature shows are driven by neoliberal rationales and impacted by austerity measures (Liu & Guo, 2023a, 2023a; Root et al., 2014; Zhu, 2016). Scholarly research on the settlement sector has provided insights into service accessibility, exclusions in service provision due to eligibility or other barriers such as language, and the efficacy of service delivery (Chekki, 2006; Duguay, 2012; George, 2002; Pashang, 2016; Zhu, 2016). While these contributions to our understanding of the

settlement sector are valuable, this thesis contributes to the literature in a novel way. Instead of examining immigration and settlement policy outcomes, this thesis focuses on the norms and values embedded in immigration and settlement policies and develops an analysis of these norms and values against an alternative framework of an ethics of care. The research question guiding this project is: *How is care conceptualized in immigration and settlement policies in Manitoba, Nova Scotia, and Ontario?* There are two central aims to this thesis: 1) to uncover the normative framework underpinning immigration and settlement policy texts, and 2) to analyze this normative framework against an ethic of care. My focus on these aims stems from the notion that ethics play a central role in policy decisions and outcomes, and thus critically evaluating them can allow for a more comprehensive policy analysis, as Maggie FitzGerald (2020) writes:

“policies inform and shape the lived realities of all our lives; to assess them without consideration for whether or not they adhere to the principles that we believe are important is to create space for misalignment between the way our daily lives are organized and our values.” (p. 254).

To answer my research question, I use care ethics as a mode of analysis to explore governmental discourse on immigration and settlement policies in Manitoba, Ontario, and Nova Scotia between 2015 and 2019. I explore the *instrumental* value of care ethics as a mode of analysis, specifically by applying a method of normative policy analysis called *Trace*, initially developed by care scholar Selma Sevenhuijsen. In this sense, care ethics plays a dual role in this project, both providing the analytic lens that informs my engagement with the discursive articulations of immigration and settlement policies I take up across my cases, while at the same time offering a critical normative standard for assessing these policies. *Trace* is used to literally “trace the normative framework(s) in policy reports, in order to evaluate and renew these from the perspective of the ethic of

care” (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p.14). Normative policy analyses such as *Trace* are important when evaluating social policies because policy decisions are always based on normative judgments, which themselves are based on certain ethical standards (FitzGerald, 2020, p. 253). In the context of this project, I draw on the tradition of care ethics which explicitly offers a normative framework that is intended to be an alternative source for moral and political judgments (Hankivsky, 2004, p. 2). Assessing policies against different ethical standards, such as care ethics, allows us to see different problems, and different solutions, and provides for a more comprehensive approach to solving important political, social, and ethical dilemmas. Care ethics began as a moral philosophy and has grown to become a political practice, concept, and framework, that has been used to analyze and evaluate many policy domains. However, care ethics research has primarily been concerned with policy domains that explicitly deal with ‘care’ in some way, such as health care, childcare, or welfare policies. My work expands the scope of care ethics applicability, echoing the arguments of FitzGerald (2020) and Stensöta (2015) that care ethics should be included in areas where care is not the sole priority and is weighed against other concerns on a daily basis. The core argument of this thesis is that care ethics should be considered a viable framework for analyzing immigration and settlement policies. It can illuminate the ways that these policies can be more responsive, inclusive, sustainable, and contextually relevant to immigrants. In addition, governments can be persuaded to take on the recommendations brought forward by care ethics analyses because they are holistic in nature, addressing various interrelated problems that governments face when creating policies to serve people in diverse contexts.

Positionality and motivations for this research

I share the position of Selma Sevenhuijsen (2004), the creator of *Trace*, that knowledge production is never value-free, and that academic scholarship needs to be open to its positionality and situatedness in specific knowledge and power systems (p. 16-17). I situate myself as a graduate student, researcher, and former settlement worker. My evaluation of these policy texts is influenced by my own life experiences and social locations and is not intended to be a fully complete analysis of the sector. My experiences working and volunteering in the settlement sector motivated this research and have pushed me towards critical reflections in my work. Being socialized and educated in a White settler world has also influenced my worldview, and while I have attempted to expand beyond the Euro-centric cultural borders that have shaped this worldview, I recognize that it is not always possible to do so. Recognizing these challenges is among the reasons that I engage with alternative and critical frameworks, such as an ethics of care, to evaluate policies that shape how immigration and settlement are practiced in Canada. Challenging the way that care is conceptualized, prioritized, and depoliticized in immigration and settlement is crucial to developing policies that sustain and foster well-being.

Thesis organization

In the following chapter, I discuss the growing scholarship of care ethics and its use as a methodological approach in policy analysis, as well as explore the relationship between immigration and care. This review of the literature demonstrates that there is a gap in work studying the intersection of care ethics and settlement policy analysis as well as highlights the ways that this research project contributes to bridging care ethics and

immigration studies. Chapter 3 outlines the theoretical perspective and methodological approach to this thesis. I discuss my case selection, text selection, and temporal scope before discussing this project's approach to using *Trace* and the limitations of the project. Chapter 4 examines the impact of neoliberal ideology on Canadian immigration and settlement policies. I draw out the tensions between neoliberalism and care ethics in a high-level examination of the literature on federal immigration policy, informing my analysis using the *Trace* method in Chapter 6. Chapter 5 begins by discussing the literature on immigration devolution in Canada, demonstrating the need for provincial-level analysis of immigration and settlement. I then introduce my case studies of Manitoba, Ontario, and Nova Scotia. I detail the process of federalization across these jurisdictions and their modes of intervention as classified by Mireille Paquet, showing that each case presents a different level of political will and involvement with immigration and therefore potential differences in the conceptions of care in immigration and settlement contexts. Chapter 6 is devoted to applying the *Trace* method to the policy texts. In my analysis, I show that a dominant neoliberal normative framework permeates the provincial and federal policy texts, concluding that each province's modes of provincial immigration intervention are highly indifferent to care. My analysis also reveals that IRCC has explicitly acknowledged some care ethics principles and that it may prove fruitful for revisioning some of the problem areas with an ethics of care to create more just and effective policies. Chapter 7 discusses the spaces for a renewal of the existing normative framework that predominates in the settlement sector with an ethics of care, providing two concrete examples where care ethics can be applied to the challenges

outlined in Chapter 6. In Chapter 8, I conclude my findings, discuss the limitations of the project and outline areas for future research.

CHAPTER 2 – CARE ETHICS AND IMMIGRATION: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I discuss the first and second generation of care ethics scholarship and its methodological application in policy analysis. I then move to discuss how immigration, though not generally seen in the realm of care policy, is tied intimately with many of the facets covered in care ethics scholarship such as caregiving, families, and access to social goods. I then focus on immigration and settlement scholarship and the need for care perspectives in both realms. I conclude by outlining the specific ways in which this research contributes to both scholarship on care and immigration and settlement studies.

At its core, ethics is about what we ought or ought not to do. But who is ‘we’? While ethical theories are often used to analyze the actions of individuals, or interpersonal relationships, questions of ethics are also applicable to “groups of individuals - whether these groups are small, such as families, or large, such as nations and the international community” (Boston et al., 2010, p. 1). Therefore, in addition to personal life, ethics is concerned with public and political life. In public policy, ethics is concerned with why and how governments do what they do and what guidelines or values inform their decisions. Hankivsky (2004) and FitzGerald (2020) argue that normative judgements always guide policy decisions, even when we think that we are making purely empirical assessments. Therefore, all policy decisions are either explicitly or implicitly guided by normative principles and frameworks. Because of this, “the system of moral principles that has shaped the quality of life, the circumstances of living, and power and social relations needs to be interrogated” (Hankivsky, 2004, p. 4). One such

framework for interrogating these moral systems is care ethics, which this research project employs to analyze immigration and settlement policies.

Care ethics is a “young, emerging discipline” that is “rooted in feminist ethics, moral theory, theology and philosophy” (Klaver et al., 2014, p. 755). Over the years, it has expanded into other fields such as political science, international relations, medicine, nursing, and law (Klaver et al., 2014, p. 755). Two generations of care ethics—representing distinctive approaches to this field of work—can be found in contemporary scholarship.

What is viewed as the first generation of work on care ethics begins with Carol Gilligan’s (1982) book: *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development*, where she is credited with coining the term care ethics (Hankivsky, 2004; Mahon & Robinson, 2011; Rummery & Fine, 2012). Gilligan’s (1982) work was responding to Lawrence Kohlberg’s theory of moral development, which was based on an ethic of justice. As a normative framework, an ethics of justice is concerned with notions of individualism, autonomy, rights, justice, and freedom, and is closely associated with liberal values (Hankivsky, 2004, p. 3). Kohlberg’s research on moral development found that men often scored ‘higher’ than women based on his framework of moral development centred around an ethics of justice. Gilligan was interested in how this framework measured moral development and why women were scoring lower than men. Based on her own research, Gilligan argued that other values – care, concern, responsibility, and relations with others – also guided moral development (Hankivsky, 2004, p. 4). Gilligan (1982) argued that women’s experiences were not represented in studies of human development and psychology, arguing that “the failure of women to fit

existing models of human growth may point to a problem in the representation, a limitation in the conception of the human condition, an omission about certain truths of life” (p.2). She observed that women often considered relations with others, as well as with the community at large, and how those relations affect one another when coming to a moral decision, whereas men often made a decision based on the more abstract principles and rules of justice. In essence, Gilligan’s theory of moral development saw that moral reasoning did not occur out of disembodied principles or rules like Kohlberg’s, but instead was developed through accounting for relationships and contextual specificities. This understanding of moral reasoning is what Gilligan (1982) called a ‘different voice’ (p. 2). She writes that this different voice is not specific to a gender, even though her observation of this phenomenon is associated with women (Gilligan, 1982, p.2). Gilligan’s work ultimately linked women’s morality and ‘mothering’ activities to an ethic of care (Hankivsky, 2014, p. 253). This linkage influenced the first generation of care ethics scholarship, which followed Gilligan’s approach but was heavily criticized for essentializing women’s roles as caregivers and limiting the scope and view of caregiving to personal relations (Hankivsky, 2004, p. 4; Mahon & Robinson, 2011, p. 4). However, Gilligan’s work was highly influential in filling a crucial gap in moral theory, demonstrating that attending to the role of care can prove essential to solving moral and social dilemmas.

The second generation of care ethics scholarship is closely associated with Joan Tronto’s (1993) book, *Moral Boundaries, A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*, and led to care being conceived as both a moral and political concept (Hankivsky, 2014, p. 253). Second generation care ethicists argue that the values in care ethics have

historically been associated with women: care, nurturance, motherhood, relationships, peace, etc. (Hankivsky, 2014; Sevenhuijsen, 1998; Tronto, 1993). This ‘women’s morality’ is problematic for two reasons. First, it has worked to exclude many women who were not seen as ‘moral’, primarily women of colour, immigrant women, poor women and queer women, and women who were deemed not to be ‘fit’ mothers (Tronto, 1993, p. 2). Second, because of its association with women and women’s issues, ‘women’s morality’ has not been given priority or centrality in political contexts (Tronto, 1993, p.3). To take ‘women’s morality’ and therefore care ethics seriously, we need to ensure that it is not seen as a ‘personal’ morality only. We need to also see it as a serious model for organizing society, as we do with ethics of justice in liberal nations.

Conceiving of care as a political concept, therefore, gives us the tools to see how we can organize society around it. Tronto (2018) writes:

“Care serves as a political concept in both of the usual sense in which we use the language of politics: care is both a goal (a collective ideal) and a strategy (a way to affect the outcome of political conflict) (p.143).

Since the publication of Tronto’s work in 1993, a more critical application of care ethics has emerged, tending both to issues of race and class, as well as gender (Hankivsky, 2006, 2014; Sevenhuijsen, 1998; Williams, 1989). Marion Barnes (2012) writes that this more recent uptake and expansion of an ethic of care in the social sciences and politics is part of a broader movement that seeks to re-center values such as relationality, emotions, ethics, and values against the values of independence and autonomy that social policies are built around (p.8).

Contemporary care ethics can be broadly understood as “an approach to morality that fundamentally challenges the dominance of universalist or rule-based approaches to

ethics” (Mahon & Robinson, 2011, p. 3). Because care ethics arises “from the realities of caregiving and care receiving that shape and inform all of our lives” (Murphy, 2017, p. 4) it is highly contextual and employs a “rich and thick description” (Hankivsky, 2014, p. 255) of people’s circumstances to analyze different social, moral and political problems. This means that care ethics is not a set of static or unwavering rules or principles. It is, however, predicated on a relational ontology. Ontology refers to a conception of the nature of the social world (Halperin & Heath, 2020, p. 28). Thus a relational ontology sees interdependency at the center of the nature of the social world (Hankivsky, 2004; Murphy, 2017; Sevenhuijsen, 1998; Tronto, 1993, 1995). Our interdependency is contextually specific, as political, social, economic, cultural, and environmental systems shape our needs, capacities, and relations (Hankivsky, 2004; Murphy, 2017; Sevenhuijsen, 1998; Williams, 1989). Care ethics also privileges responsibility as a moral orientation, (Sevenhuijsen, 1998; Tronto, 1993; Williams, 1989); as Virginia Held (2006) has written, the central focus of care ethics is “the compelling moral salience of attending to and meeting the needs of particular others for whom we take responsibility” (p.10). In sum, care ethics prioritizes the values of interdependency and responsibility in human relations, and engages in contextually specific analyses, to understand moral, political, and social dilemmas.

Joan Tronto (1993) asserts that only by understanding care as a political concept “will [we] be able to change its status and the status of those who do caring work in our culture” (p. 157). That is, locating an ethics of care as central to political, as well as personal life, renders it visible to decision-makers and society at large. Care ethics have been applied as a methodology to many corners of the political arena in various policy

domains: caregiving policy (Murphy, 2017), border control policy (Abu-Laban et al., 2023; López-Farjeat & Coronado-Angulo, 2020), immigration policy (Abu-Laban et al., 2023; Sullivan, 2016), family intervention policy (Bond-Taylor, 2017), welfare and other social policies (Williams, 1989, 2021), and healthcare policy (Daly, 2022). It has also been more broadly applied to areas such as human security and development (Robinson, 2011) theories of cosmopolitanism (Clark Miller, 2010) and international relations (Mahon & Robinson, 2011). Its application is therefore broad in scope, demonstrating that “care is fundamental to the human condition and necessary both to survival and flourishing” (Barnes, 2012, p. 1) However, operationalizing care ethics in the context of policy analysis is a complex and involved process. Stephanie Collins (2015) synthesizes four key claims of care ethics yet still maintains that “not all care ethicists hold all of these views, different theorists define them differently, and different theorists emphasize different ones ... it is difficult to be more precise, as there is no generally agreed-upon the statement of what care ethics is” (p.5). Despite this, scholars still use care ethics as an analytical tool to examine various policy domains. There is considerable variation in methods, however, as some scholars directly draw on other’s principles of care, such as Joan Tronto’s (1993) 4 phases of care, to assess policy priorities (Bond-Taylor, 2017; Sullivan, 2016; Murphy, 2017), while others take up various principles in the literature such as responsibility (Lopez-Farjeat & Coronado-Angulo, 2020, p.11), interdependency (Abu-Laban et. al, 2022, p. 284), or perceived need, (Daly, 2022, p.3) to investigate the extent to which they are meaningfully present in policies.

Care ethics principles figure prominently in the field of immigration and settlement. These policy domains are deeply intertwined with the concepts of

interdependency, responsibility, relationships, and caregiving (Abu-Laban et al., 2023; Francisco-Menchavez, 2018; Satzewich, 2016, p. 6). In contrast to these concepts, there is an extensive critical literature on how Canadian immigration policy operates under an increasingly privatized and marketized model, which has been, for the most part, categorized as neoliberal (Abu-Laban et al., 2023; Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2002; Bauder, 2005; Dobrowolsky, 2011). Recent work of note in this critical literature is Abu-Laban et al.'s (2023) book, *Containing Diversity: Canada and the Politics of Immigration in the 21st Century*. This book examines the extent to which Canada contains diversity through immigration and multiculturalism policies. One of their concluding remarks is that a feminist care ethics approach may address some of the critiques of Canadian immigration policy discussed throughout the book, underscoring the timely and practical nature of this thesis. One prominent strand of immigration literature that has attended to care is scholarship on migrant care work (Abu-Laban et al., 2023; Banerjee et al., 2018; Gabriel, 2014; Hande & Nourpanah, 2022; Koo & Hanley, 2016; Macklin, 1994; Nicholson et al., 2023; Tungohan, 2019, 2023). Immigration policies, temporary foreign worker programs, and labour controls often channel predominantly racialized im/migrant women into the devalued and low-paying care sector (Banerjee et al., 2018; Chang, 2004). Critical analyses of various domestic worker/caregiver programs (Koo & Hanley, 2016; Macklin, 1994) have drawn attention to the control exercised by employers and unequal relations of power that proliferate in these programs. The care work that migrant domestic workers engage in to sustain and nurture family and community relations abroad and at home also goes unrecognized in policy (Francisco-Menchavez, 2018; Tungohan, 2019). Yet the necessity of immigrant care work for the Canadian economy has been formally

recognized (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2020) underscoring the connections between care and immigration.

Despite the clear connections between ‘care work’ and immigration, care is under-explored as a framework for analyzing immigration policy, and especially neglected with respect to ‘settlement policy’ in Canada. From a formal standpoint, settlement policies govern what the Canadian federal government calls the “short period of mutual adaptation between newcomers and the host society, during which the federal government provides supports and services to newcomers” (Government of Canada, 2022b). Some of these supports and services include counselling, language training, employment training, mentoring, family programming, senior programming, translations, and interpretation services (Government of Canada, 2019). Moreover, from the perspective of the Canadian state, the settlement sector is a core component of fostering inclusive and welcoming communities in Canada for immigrants by engaging in social planning, anti-racism work, collaborative research, and civic engagement (Burstein, 2010; Esses et al., 2021) Prior research on settlement has examined the interplay of federal-provincial-municipal government relations in settlement (Carter et al., 2014; Türegün, 2013; Young & Tolley, 2011), the efficacy of service delivery for immigrants (Chekki, 2006; Duguay, 2012; Sadiq, 2004), and immigrants’ varying settlement needs (George, 2002; Pashang, 2016). Recent work of note on settlement includes Liu and Guo’s (2023b, 2023a) research on immigrant settlement workers’ experiences navigating the “neoliberal outcome measurement approach” in IRCC’s Settlement Program. These scholars found that, although evaluating settlement outcomes can be useful in locating areas for improvement, the neoliberal rationales underpinning these outcomes have worked to develop a “one

size fits all” approach in service provision at the individual level. For settlement workers, this “restricts their abilities to provide customized assistance to those who faced structural oppression, institutional discrimination, and system racism” (Liu & Guo, 2023b, p. 2242). In this sense, IRCC’s outcomes-driven approach, which centers neoliberal values such as self-reliance, self-responsibility and productivity, constructs workplace knowledge, behaviour, goals, and service provision in the settlement sector. Therefore, settlement workers are guided to work, learn, and promote these values in their jobs. Liu & Guo’s (2023a, 2023b) findings demonstrate that settlement policies and planning are operating through a specific set of values, underscoring the need for a critical analysis of these values.

As has been shown in this section, care ethics is a growing body of scholarship that has been applied to various political arenas that deal with care in some way. Immigration and settlement policies have been partially attended to through this lens, with critical research examining the negative impacts of neoliberalism on immigration policies, the settlement sector, and migrant care work. Overall, this thesis contributes to care ethics scholarship and immigration scholarship in four ways. First, this project expands the application of care ethics in policy arenas not predominantly associated with care, contributing to its capacity “to reach its full transformative power in the realm of politics” (FitzGerald, 2020, p. 248). Immigration and settlement policies directly deal with care and are intimately tied to human relations both within and across families, communities, and international boundaries. Second, this research will be the first to use a care ethics analysis on settlement policies in Canada. Third, this project responds to calls for care ethics scholarship to move from the national context to the international (Mahon

& Robinson, 2011). As Rianne Mahon & Fiona Robinson (2011) conclude in their book, *Feminist Ethics and Social Policy: Towards a New Global Political Economy of Care*, the dichotomy of global/national in care ethics cannot be upheld given the increasing transnational commodification of care through feminized migration and labour (p. 182-183 & Tronto, 2011, p. 162). Their central argument seeks to expand care ethics from the national setting to the transnational, arguing that “the social politics and ethics of care ... have to be situated within a setting that is increasingly global” (p. 10). Immigration and settlement policies directly deal with global issues, migration patterns and contexts, and the lives of transnational families and communities. Therefore, while being an important domestic policy arena, immigration and settlement have direct international implications. Finally, I contribute to their argument that care as a moral orientation is not restricted to those close to us in personal and intimate relationships. Instead, “one of the main tasks of moral inquiry is to think about how care, and responsibilities of care, are distributed both within and across societies” (Mahon & Robinson, 2011, p. 132). Indeed, immigration and settlement contexts explicitly bridge ideas of relations near and far.

CHAPTER 3 – METHODOLOGY

As noted in Chapter 1, there are two central aims to this thesis: 1) to uncover the normative framework underpinning immigration and settlement policy texts, and 2) to analyze this normative framework against an ethic of care. To do this, I take a comparative approach using a method of normative policy analysis called *Trace*, developed by care scholar Selma Sevenhuijsen, on the case studies of Manitoba, Ontario, and Nova Scotia. In this chapter I discuss my methodological approach to using *Trace*, as well as the rationale for my case study selection, text selection, and temporal scope of the project. I end by outlining the limitations of the *Trace* method and the project overall.

The main goal of *Trace* is “literally to trace the normative framework(s) in policy reports, in order to evaluate and renew these from the perspective of the ethic of care” (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p.14). Sevenhuijsen argues that policies can be analyzed as “vehicles of normative paradigms” and that these paradigms define problems in society and the ways we speak about them and judge them (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p. 14-15). Because these policies define problems and how we view them, they play a powerful role in producing and sustaining hegemonic discourses and excluding particular ways of knowing. *Trace*, therefore, is meant to shed light on how this happens and to bring the values and ideas in care ethics from the margins to the center of political discourse (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p.15). *Trace* works with an ethic of care in a double sense for the purposes of analysis. It is first used as a lens to trace the normative frameworks in policy documents, providing the researcher with a set of concepts and guidelines to uncover the frameworks. Then, it is used as a standard to measure the frameworks against the values, ideas, and concepts in care ethics scholarship. When I refer to the presence of ‘care’ in

policy texts in this project, I refer to the presence of care ethics principles and values, discussed in Chapter 2. My hope is that this thesis contributes to the literature on care ethics as a methodology, such as *Trace*, to conduct normative policy analyses (Barnes, 2011; Bond-Taylor, 2017; FitzGerald, 2020; Hankivsky, 2006; Murphy, 2017; Sevenhuijsen, 2004; Simm, 2004; Sullivan, 2016) as well as calls for expanding the scope of care ethics applicability to policy realms that do not explicitly deal with the provision of care (FitzGerald, 2020; Stensöta, 2015). I begin this chapter by discussing my rationale for the temporal scope of this project, case study selection, and text selection. I then discuss how I used the *Trace* method and note some limitations with the method itself and the project overall.

Temporal scope

The time frame for this project is between 2015 and 2019 in order to analyze a period of significant import for Canada's immigration policy. In 2015, the Liberal government won a majority in the federal election, beginning a period of policy coherence and public messaging with implications for Canadian immigration policy. This election also saw issues of immigration, citizenship and multiculturalism at the fore due to the large number of Syrian refugees and the previous Harper government's lack of response to this development (Abu-Laban et al., 2023, p. 4). The analysis ends in 2019 because the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 presented new challenges and prompted changes in Canadian immigration policy (Abbas, 2022; Arya et al., 2021; Helps et al., 2020; Niraula et al., 2022; Shields & Abu Alrob, 2020; Zahid, 2021) that are beyond the scope of this project. This time frame helped keep the project manageable, but there are a few texts I analyzed that are outside this temporal scope. First, the provincial-federal

immigration agreement documents were created in 2003, 2007 and 2017. Two of the texts are outside of the timeframe but are key policy texts that frame the province's roles and responsibilities towards immigration and are therefore key to the analysis. Two other documents are outside of the time frame: the 2014 report *Now or Never: An Urgent Call to Action for Nova Scotians* (hereafter called the Ivany report¹) and the 2021 IRCC Settlement Outcomes Report. The 2014 Ivany report was researched and written by a group commissioned by the provincial government in 2013 (Government of Nova Scotia, 2013) with subsequent governments acknowledging the report's influence on policymaking (Government of Nova Scotia, 2016). It is therefore still a relevant document for the 2015-2019 period. The 2021 IRCC Settlement Outcomes Report analyzes settlement outcomes between 2015 and 2019, so while it was published in 2021, it still covers the correct time frame.

Case study/text selection

This research project takes a comparative approach, following the Most Similar Systems Design (MSSD). The MSSD approach selects cases that share many important characteristics and is frequently used in area studies in a specific region (Halperin & Heath, 2020, p. 239); in this project I apply this approach within Canada, selecting the provinces of Manitoba, Nova Scotia, and Ontario as my case studies. In accordance with the MSSD, each province is situated on a different Canadian region (East, Prairie, Atlantic), and is similar with respect to several important characteristics, such as government, political processes, and federal policies and norms (Imbeau et al., 2000, p.

¹ This report is known as the Ivany report after the chair, Ray Ivany, of the Nova Scotia Commission on Building Our New Economy. The term Ivany report has been used by the provincial government, academics, and news media.

782). Yet an important difference between them is Mireille Paquet's (2019) classification of modes of provincial intervention in immigration. I will discuss these case studies, as well as Paquet's research in greater detail in Chapter 5, but for now, I will briefly mention the variation in modes of intervention between the provinces. Nova Scotia's mode of intervention in immigration was "attraction-retention", for the purposes of building and sustaining the province (Paquet, 2019, p. 17). Ontario's was "reactive" and limited to reacting to current immigration needs (Paquet, 2019, p.17). Manitoba's was "holistic", seeing immigration as part of a society-building effort (Paquet, 2019, p.17). Therefore, while these provinces share many important characteristics, they have been classified as having important distinctions in their involvement and attitudes toward immigration, which may lead to distinctions in the way that care figures in these provinces' immigration and settlement policies. To reveal how care is conceptualized in provincial discourse I analyzed government policies, reports, and Speeches from the Throne as well as reports commissioned by governments², all of which were suitable to use with *Trace*. First, the provincial-federal immigration agreements, Ontario Immigration Strategy, Settlement Program and Settlement Logic Model are categorized under "single policy documents that play a role in policy preparation and agenda-setting" (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p. 17), which are the most common documents used with *Trace*. Second, the Ivany Report is an important document that "feeds into policy frameworks" (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p.19). As I stated in the prior section, it contains recommendations that the subsequent provincial governments put in place. Finally, Speeches from the Throne are similar to how Sevenhuijsen (2004) describes using parliamentary minutes with *Trace*.

² For a full list of the documents analyzed in this thesis, refer to the full bibliography.

Parliamentary minutes “often contain insightful statements on prominent principles and values around care” (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p. 18). Similarly, Speeches from the Throne officially open new parliamentary sessions and announce the priorities and agendas of new governments (Kennedy et al., 2021, p. 922). They are more focused on the new government's ideological positions and policy priorities than party manifestos, for example (Kennedy et al., 2021, p. 918). Because Speeches from the Throne outline the ideological positions of governments, they can also produce insightful statements of values around care and are therefore an appropriate text to use with the *Trace* method. There are two important considerations regarding my text selection. First, I analyzed federal policy documents even though the focus is on comparing provincial policy contexts because federal data is useful in identifying national trends (Braun & Clément, 2018, p. 7), jurisdictional boundaries, or dominant discourses that impact provincial immigration and settlement contexts. Second, I recognize that settlement sector reports feed into policy frameworks as well. In my analysis, I found it helpful to draw on materials from settlement sector agencies to help illustrate my findings. But in trying to make this project manageable, my core analysis focused on official documents either coming from the government or commissioned by the government, as is the case with the Ivany report.

***Trace* method**

Trace is divided into four steps: Tracing, Evaluating, Renewal with an Ethic of Care, and Concretize. Each step has several themes to help structure the analysis. However, Sevenhuijsen (2004) states that it is not always possible to answer all of the questions and not necessarily possible to address the themes in the presented order (p. 23). Additionally,

other themes, concepts, or questions might present themselves through the researchers' reading and analysis of the texts (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p.23). Because of this, she invites those who use *Trace* to be creative and imaginative, rendering *Trace* as a method under continuous construction (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p. 24). I used these themes suggested by Sevenhuijsen (2004) to structure my analysis: problem identification, political philosophy, leading values, human nature, care, gender, and the role of the state. I also found that the concept of success was woven throughout many of the texts and played an important role in the conception of human nature, and therefore it became a theme itself. My approach to reading the texts began by uploading the texts into NVIVO, a qualitative data analysis computer program, and then I conducted a primary content analysis by coding the documents according to the themes in the *Trace* method outlined above. Where the codes were more evaluative, such as "human nature," I referred to care ethics theory to code texts that describe how humans live and act. For codes such as "problem identification" I coded where the texts referred to needs, issues, etc. Through several focused readings of the texts with these themes, two distinct features of my analysis became clear.

First, there exists a literature on the political philosophy underpinning Canadian immigration policy that my reading of the texts aligned with, and therefore I engaged with this literature and its tension with care ethics in detail in Chapter 4 instead of integrating it throughout the *Trace* analysis in Chapter 6. I believe this more focused chapter was necessary due to the scope of my project, working with several policy documents instead of only one or two as other *Trace* researchers have done. Sevenhuijsen (2004) recommends taking this approach (engaging with secondary literature on the

political philosophy one finds in policy texts) because it helps to understand how these norms work in other contexts, how they have dealt with care elsewhere, and other benefits or drawbacks (p.23). Second, the themes I used to structure my analysis began to illuminate three overarching themes that make up the core of Chapter 6. Again, because my project works with several policy documents, identifying overarching themes helped to focus the analysis. This is, I think, part of how Sevenhuijsen (2004) intended for *Trace* to be used as a flexible and dynamic ‘method’ which aligns it with an ethic of care and the tenets of contextual sensitivity and instead of a rules-based, universalist ethics which care ethics is in direct contrast to.

Limitations

This research has limitations in terms of scope and potential insights. First, the scope of my research was much wider than that of other care scholars using the *Trace* method. In the examples of studies in Chapter 2, these authors usually either focused on a few elements of *Trace* or analyzed a single policy document. To keep my project manageable, I had to focus my engagement on the most relevant themes at hand while creating space for new concepts and themes to emerge during my analysis. Sevenhuijsen (2004) actually recommends using *Trace* with a group of people who have different areas of expertise to “bring fresh perspectives” (p.17). My singular reading and analysis of the texts may therefore have limited its potential. Additionally, there were limitations to relevant texts. For example, I did not find a government report from Manitoba that was suitable for the temporal scope of this project, and several of the Speeches from the Throne for each province did not mention care or immigration; therefore, I could not draw from any of them to analyze the texts. However, the aim of my thesis was not to

engage in an exhaustive scan of immigration and settlement policies, but rather to break ground on a novel usage of the *Trace* method in a policy realm that is not traditionally associated with care, therefore I believe this limitation did not affect the project's overall analysis. In addition, as Marion Barnes (2011) writes, analysis based solely on official texts has limitations because public workers (such as settlement workers) and service user's agency cannot be captured (p. 156). Their experiences with care may differ significantly from formal policy articulation, so future research would benefit from interviews or focus groups with service users and settlement workers.

CHAPTER 4 – NEOLIBERALISM IN IMMIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT POLICY

As I discussed in Chapter 3, identifying the political philosophy in texts when using *Trace* is helpful for both spotting the normative framework and pointing to secondary literature that engages more in-depth with the philosophy, including its application in other contexts and how it deals with care (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p.32). With respect to political philosophy, there is a significant literature which examines the influence of neoliberalism on Canadian immigration policy at the federal level (Abu-Laban et al., 2023; Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2002; Arat-Koc, 1999; Bauder, 2008; Dobrowolsky, 2012; Dobrowolsky & Ramos, 2014; Liu & Guo, 2023b, 2023a; Richmond & Shields, 2005; Root et al., 2014; Zhu, 2016). In this chapter, I examine this literature to identify national trends that may impact provincial policies, which helps to situate my findings on the provinces within the larger scholarship. My analysis of this literature suggests that the neoliberal values in Canadian immigration policy are in tension with care ethics principles³. In what follows, I discuss immigration policy in Canada first before moving onto the settlement sector specifically.

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada formally state that their mission is to develop and implement policies and programs that facilitate and manage the arrival and integration of people into Canada, protect refugees, promote the rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship and reach out to Canadians to create an inclusive and integrated society with equal opportunity for all (Immigration, Refugees and

³ In terms of their intrinsic values, neoliberalism and care ethics are diametrically opposed. However, in practice, some principles of care ethics may, indirectly, serve neoliberal immigration and settlement goals of the federal and provincial governments, which I explore in Chapter 6 and 7. I recognize that there is a larger, and important, discussion to be had about the intrinsic value of care ethics, both as a framework and a method, but it is beyond the scope of this thesis to engage in that comprehensively.

Citizenship Canada, 2018). Therefore, immigration policy is concerned with security, the economy, and human rights.

Though discussing the full history of immigration in Canada is beyond the scope of this project, it is worth emphasizing that until the 1960s immigration policy in Canada was marked by explicitly racist, exclusionary, and discriminatory policies that sought to create a white settlement state (Abu-Laban et al., 2023, p. 34). A few examples of these policies are as follows. Black immigrants arrived in Canada as early as the 1600s but were actively discouraged from immigrating to Canada because they were not “suitable” for the Canadian climate (Go, 2016, p. 16). A ‘head tax’ of \$50 was created for Chinese immigrants to Canada in 1885, and anti-Chinese policies continued to grow into various exclusionary acts from 1923-1947, after which the only Chinese immigrants allowed were the spouses and unmarried dependents of Canadian citizens and permanent residents (Go, 2016, p. 16). And a ‘work-around’ method of excluding immigration from India was developed through immigration regulations stipulating that immigrants must arrive via “a continuous passage from the point of departure” (Go, 2016, p. 17). The late 1960s were a decade that Abu-Laban et. al (2023, p. 47) defined as creating the modern immigration system as we know it today for three reasons: the removal of explicitly exclusionary criteria for immigration, the introduction of a points-based system, and the development of the three broad immigration categories that are still in effect today. Exclusionary immigration policies were reconfigured at the time for two reasons. First, both the racial/ethnic exclusions and “valorization of values and morals associated with Anglo-Saxon Britain” guiding immigration policy were no longer acceptable in post-WW2 international discourse (Abu-Laban et al., 2023, p. 48). Second, there was a growing need

for the immigration of skilled workers, as the economy was shifting to become more dependent on technology as opposed to primary agriculture (Abu-Laban et al., 2023, p. 48). To screen for ‘skilled’ immigrants, needed for an emerging technological economy, the ‘points’ system of immigration was created in Canada in 1967 (Abu-Laban et al., 2023, p. 48; Government of Canada, 2022b). This meant that independent immigrants coming to Canada had to obtain a high enough score to receive permanent resident status. This score was based on education, training, work experience, occupational skills, occupational demand, age, and language ability (Tannock, 2011, p. 1333). Immigration streams that select immigrants based on these criteria remain today, such as the Express Entry Program that uses ‘points’, and the Economic Mobility Pathways Pilot, which gives ‘highly skilled’ refugees access to permanent residency in Canada through economic immigration streams (Government of Canada, 2023a, 2023b). In sum, while explicitly racist and discriminatory immigration categories were removed, new exclusions using market logics emerged. In the following section, I expand on these new exclusions and their tensions with care ethics.

This ‘points’ method of immigration selection has been defined as a ‘human capital approach’ to immigration (Abu-Laban et al., 2023, p. 108; Papademetriou & Sumption, 2011, p. 2) and has been heavily criticized by scholars (Abu-Laban et al., 2023; Ellermann, 2020; Papademetriou & Sumption, 2011; Tannock, 2011; Tungohan, 2023) and migrant justice advocates (Caregivers Action Centre et al., 2018; Migrant Workers Alliance for Change, 2019) for its limited purview on who deserves to both immigrate and remain in Canada. This is because the points system remains exclusionary despite the removal of explicitly racist and discriminatory eligibility criteria. First, the

‘education’ and ‘skills’ based criteria invisibilize race, gender and class hierarchies (Tannock, 2011, p. 1336). Women in different countries have differentiated access to formal education compared to men, and therefore their eligibility through these streams is more constrained than men’s (Abu-Laban et al., 2023, p. 49; Tannock, 2011, p. 1336). What is counted as a ‘skill’ and ‘skilled’ labour is also highly gendered. For example, the Canadian domestic caregiver programs that have existed since the eighteenth century (Tungohan, 2023, p. 22) discount domestic and caring labour as ‘low-skilled’ and therefore ineligible for economic immigration streams (Government of Canada, 2023a) despite the high level of skills and education caring labour requires (Tannock, 2011, p. 1336). Viewed through the lens of care ethics, the immigration policy criteria on education and skills decontextualize the lived experiences of many women who cannot access formal education and devalues the role of interdependency (through care) in sustaining Canadian society.

Second, these exclusions more broadly embody neoliberal logic which marginalizes care ethics values. Neoliberalism is a political ideology and set of related policy choices that “emerged as a response to globalization” (Bhuyan et al., 2017, p. 50) and helped to foster globalization. Neoliberal values are generally understood as follows: minimization of the welfare state, small government, individual responsibility or family responsibility over collective/state responsibility, privatizing public goods (education, healthcare, etc.), and prioritizing a ‘free’ market (Bhuyan et al., 2017, p. 50). Root, Gates-Gasse, Shields and Bauder (2014) found that neoliberalism was a “helpful” lens for understanding the shifts in Canadian immigration policies in their research (p. 3). The “substantial” focus in Canadian immigration policy on selecting immigrants based on perceived economic

contributions (Bauder, 2008, p. 131) has constructed an image of the ‘ideal’ or ‘designer’ immigrant. The ‘ideal’ immigrant embodies neoliberal values, as they should be self-sufficient, independent, highly-educated, skilled, and not rely on state support (Bhuyan et al., 2017, p. 50; Shields et al., 2016, p. 12; Tastsoglou et al., 2014, p. 68). Immigrants who are dependent on others, whether literally labelled as ‘dependents’ in the Family Class immigration stream (Abu-Laban et al., 2023, p. 209) or immigrants with health, social, or cultural needs that must be met through state supports, do not fit this categorization. McLaren and Dyke (2004) elaborate on this dichotomy:

“the immigration point system implies that skilled, market-based workers drive the economy, and that those who enter Canada as family class or refugees, who work in poorly paid jobs, who have difficulties in finding employment, who lack employment, who are poor, or who may be ‘merely’ mothers, fail to contribute adequately to society and, indeed, are ‘drains’ on the system” (p. 43).

This neoliberal vision of the ‘ideal’ immigrant sees independence as inherent to the success of individuals, and interdependency and vulnerability as drains to society. A care ethics approach, instead, would see those responsibilities to others (through mothering or caring for others), and reliance on outside forms of support, as normal parts of the human experience that are integrated into policymaking. Additionally, the relational ontology central to care ethics would recognize that the ‘ideal’ immigrant is only made ‘ideal’ through the complex web of relations that all humans are part of. In sum, immigration policies’ eligibility exclusions work to decontextualize the experiences of immigrant women and deem care work as ‘unskilled’. In addition, the neoliberal vision of the self in immigration policy has foregrounded values antithetical to care ethics. The same issues of exclusionary eligibility criteria and devaluing of care work are found in the settlement sector in Canada. I begin this section with a clarification of what

settlement policies are, and what the settlement sector is, before discussing how the aforementioned issues are in tension with care ethics.

Settlement policies, in a formal sense, govern what the Canadian federal government calls the “short period of mutual adaptation between newcomers and the host society, during which the federal government provides supports and services to newcomers” (Government of Canada, 2022). Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) provides funding to ‘third-sector’ agencies, (Richmond & Shields, 2005, p. 514) such as nonprofit, educational, and private organizations across the country to provide settlement services to eligible immigrants. Additional funding for settlement services comes from municipalities, provinces, and other public and private streams (Richmond & Shields, 2005, p. 514). The Canadian model of settlement services has been highly regarded internationally as a “case of best practice” (Shields et. al, 2016, p. 3). Shields et. al’s (2016) conceptualization of settlement services found that the definition of settlement does vary between non-profit organizations, but several definitions overlap and co-exist. As the federal government defines settlement as a ‘period of mutual adaptation’, many non-profits and organizations understand settlement as a ‘process’ or ‘continuum of activities’ that encompasses not only meeting immigrants’ immediate needs but “includes the longer term process of deeper integration” (Shields et al., 2016, p. 5). In this sense, the nonprofit sector sees settlement as a longer process than the federal government’s ‘short’ period of adaptation. Shields et. al (2016) argue that settlement policies are more than just administrative decisions; they are established programs and practices that provide a general reflection of what the host society believes should be the place of immigrants in their communities, and reflect something about how welcoming they are to

immigrants (Shields et. al, 2016, p. 6). Settlement policies also reveal how the state sees its responsibility towards immigrants and newcomers. Immigrant settlement policies include both formal assistance policies and programs that deliver services, and general policies, such as Canada's multiculturalism and anti-racism policies (Shields et al., 2016, p. 6). Additionally, settlement organizations are a crucial component in fostering inclusive and welcoming communities in Canada for immigrants by engaging in social planning, anti-racism work, collaborative research, and civic engagement (Burstein, 2010; Esses et. al, 2021).). In sum, the settlement 'sector' in Canada comprises policies, programs, services, organizations, and institutions that facilitate and assist immigrant integration.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, neoliberal logic in Canada's immigration policy has created exclusions based on education and skills that effectively maintain race, gender, and class hierarchies. Similarly, settlement policies are also exclusionary based on the classification of immigration categories. IRCC-funded service eligibility is limited to people with permanent resident status, their children, and spouses. Some of these supports and services include counselling, language training, employment training, mentoring, family programming, senior programming, translations, interpretations, and more (Government of Canada, 2019). Temporary foreign workers, refugee claimants, undocumented people, and international students cannot access IRCC-funded settlement services (IRCC, 2019, p. 11). These exclusions work to cast moral and social worth onto certain immigrants through controlling access to social goods (Villegas & Blower, 2019) which negatively impacts these immigrants' health and well-being (Campbell et al., 2014; Caulford, 2006; Chase et al., 2017). In Manitoba and Nova Scotia, studies have shown

that settlement service providers do not want to turn away immigrants from accessing services who need them but have no choice because of funding criteria (Ashton et al., 2015, p. 16; Nova Scotia Department of Labour, Skills and Immigration, 2022, p. 32). The Ontario Council of Immigrant Serving Agencies has also put out statements about the need for more immigrants to be eligible for services (Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants, 2015). Other levels of government may be more flexible with respect to eligibility criteria and fund programs and services for people who are not eligible for federally funded services (Praznik & Shields, 2018, p. 6). For example, Manitoba funds four settlement organizations to provide employment services that temporary foreign workers can access (Canadian Council for Refugees, 2018b), and Nova Scotia provides funding for a temporary foreign worker program that offers information on their rights (Canadian Council for Refugees, 2018c). But in many parts of the country it is volunteer-run groups or grassroots organizations with a very limited, or even nonexistent, budgets that provide support for migrant workers (Canadian Council for Refugees, 2018a, p. 5). Thus, the labour of caring for immigrants in the settlement sector has its own challenges, even in formal organizations.

The labour environment of the settlement sector also embodies neoliberal values and renders issues of care and gender as subordinate. By labour environment, I refer to working conditions, the demographics of employees, and the stability, security, and ascribed ‘value’ of jobs in a particular sector. As discussed in Chapter 2, in order to take care ethics seriously, it should be recognized as a model for organizing society, which I infer to include labour environments. Following this argument, the next section explores how labour environment issues in the settlement sector are at odds with care ethics.

A rich body of scholarship has explored the societal devaluation of gendered and/or racialized work, especially work that provides some type of care or supports for others (Bahn et al., 2020; Billingsley, 2016; Elson, 1998; Hochschild & Machung, 1990; Laslett & Brenner, 1989; Nasol & Francisco-Menchavez, 2021; Power, 2020; The Care Collective et al., 2020). In Canada, the settlement sector is marked by two features relating to this scholarship: it predominantly employs racialized, immigrant women (Jayaraman & Bauder, 2013; Lee, 1999), and it is characterized by a precarious labour environment (Bushell & Shields, 2018; Türegün, 2013). With respect to the former, Jo-Ann Lee (1999) argues that “the state has used gender and race assumptions to structurally organize the immigrant integration/multiculturalism sector as a separate, parallel, and marginalized sector of publicly funded services” (p. 97). Jayaraman & Bauder (2013) also came to the same conclusion over a decade later, writing that “cultural competencies facilitate the employment of immigrant women and the positions they occupy are characterized by precarious working conditions with limited opportunities for professional growth” (p. 2). They note that senior management is most likely to be non-racialized and non-immigrant men (Jayaraman & Bauder, 2013, p. 2). The latter feature, the precarious labour environment, has been explored through the possibilities for professionalization (Türegün, 2013) and neoliberal restructuring impacts (Bushell & Shields, 2018; Richmond & Shields, 2005; Shields et al., 2016). Türegün (2013) writes that the terms of employment in settlement are challenging, with few full-time and stable positions. It is also not professionally represented: the sector has no system of post-secondary training or certification⁴ and no regulatory body (Türegün,

⁴ Some Canadian colleges offer settlement worker diploma programs such as Seneca College, Fanshaw College, and Norquest College. These programs are generally part of social service work or community

2013, p. 402-403). Compared to other professions such as social work, healthcare, or education, settlement work lacks a unified, regularized organization that can grant workers access to unions, benefits, entitlements, and professional development (Türegün, 2013, p. 398). For example, a 2015 study on the settlement sector in Manitoba found that 58% of SPO's reported needing more professional development training to maintain and deliver services, but professional development was not a part of the funding they received (Ashton et al., 2015, p. 17). These challenges to professionalization have been compounded by neoliberal restructuring in the sector. Program funding cuts, and the notion of advocacy work being a 'special interest' (Bushell & Shields, 2018, pp. 27–28) suggests that the work of caring for immigrants, through direct service provision and political advocacy, is not highly-valued by the federal government. Additionally, downloading this responsibility for care while simultaneously defunding it has affected workers' well-being, as intensifying workloads and constant scrambling for secure and stable funding leads to worker burnout (Bushell & Shields, 2018, pp. 31–32; Mukhtar et al., 2016, p. 401).

In contrast to the aforementioned environment, labour environments organized around care ethics would value caring work, and stability and security would be expected conditions. Defunding programs that care for immigrants and increasing the workloads and job precarity of predominantly racialized, immigrant women, is not aligned with centering care ethics values as a model for organizing society. Care work provided in these environments would be fully supported by the federal and provincial governments through stable and permanent funding to meet people's caring needs in their unique

development programs and prepare students with skills such as case management, advocacy, and counselling. However, there is no 'system' of programs that provide a nationally recognized qualification.

contexts. In addition to meeting caring needs and providing environments where care workers and care receivers are supported, the political work of care through advocacy would also be fostered instead of restricted by naming it a ‘special interest’.

This chapter provides a general overview of the values inherent in immigration and settlement policies at the federal level by examining prior scholarly literature on the subject. I demonstrated that neoliberal ideology, and its corresponding values of independence, self-sufficiency, and individualism, have impacted contemporary immigration and settlement policies and programs at the federal level. Though care ethics is not a framework used in the scholarly literature I explored in this chapter, the aforementioned values are at odds with the principles of contextual sensitivity, interdependency, and responsibility for others that make up the core care ethics tenets discussed in Chapter 2. This high-level analysis of the general trends in immigration and settlement policies suggests that there are clear tensions with care ethics values, and thus a deeper analysis of the provincial contexts I engage with in Chapter 6 will be an important contribution to the literature. Prior to this however, I provide more detail on the unique immigration contexts of the case studies for this project: Manitoba, Ontario, and Nova Scotia.

CHAPTER 5 – THE FEDERALIZATION OF IMMIGRATION AND CASE STUDIES

The values that underpin immigration policy at the federal level are in tension with care ethics principles. Yet unlike most federations, Canada's provinces have had shared jurisdiction in immigration since the Constitution Act of 1867 (Seidle, 2010), and as I will discuss in this chapter, the provinces have also been directly involved in shaping local immigration contexts that differ in the scope and level of government responsibility and political will. It is therefore important to understand how the case study provinces have engaged with immigration and settlement responsibilities, and how their contexts may differ from the federal trends I explored in the previous chapter.

Though I draw on additional sources, this chapter primarily engages with Mireille Paquet's (2019) book, *Province-building and the federalization of immigration in Canada*. This is because there is no other work at this level which provides in-depth comparative provincial analyses of the ideational, political, and economic contexts that informed each province's process of involvement in immigration and settlement. Paquet's (2019) research demonstrated that in each province, mobilization to take up control and responsibility for immigration came from the provincial elite, and in the case of Ontario, societal actors such as immigrant-serving organizations were against provincial involvement in immigration. The core of my analysis for this thesis is based on government texts, including policy agreements and government-created and/or commissioned reports, and therefore Paquet's conclusions about provincial elites' attitudes and ideology are especially useful for this project.

Through examining the process of federalization, province-building mechanisms, and the attitudes of the provincial governments, two key findings emerge. First,

Manitoba, Nova Scotia and Ontario share the same economic-driven focus of immigration and settlement policy as the federal government, as examined in the previous chapter. Given the conclusions from the previous chapter, this finding suggests tensions with care ethics, especially in the case of Nova Scotia, where the provincial focus has been on the selection and recruitment of immigrants but not on settlement policy to care for them. Second, each province (except for the Harris government in Ontario in the 1990s) has a history of political consensus towards immigration when different political parties have taken office. Each political party that came to power, whether Liberal, New Democratic Party (NDP), or Conservative, has viewed immigration in a positive light and has worked towards increased provincial involvement in immigration. In what follows, I first explain the key terms in Paquet's (2019) book: province-building, federalization of immigration, and the modes of intervention for my case study provinces. I then discuss each case study's process of federalization of immigration and province-building, beginning with Manitoba, then Ontario, then Nova Scotia.

Province-building and the federalization of immigration

As stated earlier, immigration has been a shared jurisdiction in Canada since 1867. This means that both the federal government and the provincial government have power in shaping immigration policy, but the federal government ultimately decides who is allowed to immigrate and who is not. However, aside from Quebec, provinces did not take up an active role in immigration until the 1990s, when immigration began being used as a "province-building" tool across the country (Paquet, 2019, p. 36). Province-building refers to the creation of provincial development strategies, including economic

and population development, that have been put in motion by elite political actors (Paquet, 2019, p.24). In each province, political elites, including civil servants and those with executive power, were the main drivers of province-building. This means that taking up immigration as a province-building mechanism and provincial responsibility was not spurred by immigrants themselves or civil society but instead was pushed for by economic elites and political actors that wanted to use immigration to solve economic and demographic problems. Between 1990 and 2010, a process of the federalization of immigration occurred, whereby a range of new actors gained authority and power in the field of immigration without decreasing the level of authority and power of existing actors (Paquet, 2014, p. 52). Paquet (2019) uses an interactional approach to understand this federalising dynamic by drawing out the significant roles that provinces have played in influencing the interests of the federal government with respect to immigration, instead of viewing federalization as merely the result of decentralization by the federal government (p. 12-13). In sum, between 1990 and 2000, provincial elites took up an active interest in using immigration as a province-building mechanism through a process of federalizing immigration, as these elites gained new authority and power in immigration. Through this approach, it is recognized that provinces are active players in building the immigration landscape in their local contexts, even with jurisdictional constraints. For this research project, the interactional approach to the federalization of immigration advanced by Paquet affirms the importance of provincial analyses in Canadian immigration studies, and this thesis' focus on provincial case studies.

To explore the variation among provinces during the process of federalization, Paquet (2019) developed a typology of provincial modes of intervention for immigration

and integration (p. 17). Modes of intervention refer to the assemblage of immigration and integration policies in each province that are a result of the process of federalization of immigration. The four modes of intervention Paquet identified are: holistic, bridging, reactive and attraction-retention. She found that Nova Scotia's mode of intervention in immigration was "attraction-retention", for the purposes of building and sustaining the province (Paquet, 2014, p. 17). Ontario's was "reactive" and limited to reacting to the needs of the existing immigrant population (Paquet, 2014, p.17). Manitoba's was "holistic", viewing immigration as part of a society-building effort (Paquet, 2014, p.17). I will discuss the holistic, reactive, and attraction-retention modes of intervention in greater detail in each case study section, beginning in the following section with Manitoba.

Manitoba

Manitoba is the fifth most populous province in Canada, with a population of just over 1.4 million in 2023 (Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, 2023, p. 1) According to the 2021 census, just under 20% of Manitoban residents are immigrants (Statistics Canada, 2021). Under the holistic mode of intervention, Manitoba is characterized by the significant role that the provincial government plays in implementing and administering immigration activities and programs, along with substantial intervention in immigrant selection and integration, and a strong relationship between these two activities (Paquet, 2019, p.18). Immigration is viewed as a form of development for the population, social community, and labour force (Paquet, 2019, p.18).

Manitoba (and Quebec) were "pioneers in the process of federalizing the governance of immigration and integration in Canada (Paquet, 2019, p. 36). Manitoba has had a long and fairly active history of immigration to increase the population,

creating a Department of Agriculture and Immigration as early as 1890 (Paquet, 2019, p. 36). More recently, it was the Conservative controlled minority government elected in 1988 and forming a majority government in 1990 that would “activate Manitoba’s province-building mechanism centred on immigration” (Paquet, 2019, p. 48). The Conservative party’s mandates shifted the policy regime in the province. This shift was from “Keynesian conservatism” to a model inspired by the new right (Paquet, 2019, p. 41). This model led to austerity measures, restructuring social policies and a wave of privatization of public enterprises (Paquet, 2019, p. 48). These efforts combined with an economic recovery in the region reoriented the vision for immigration in the province, with a 1989 provincial Speech from the Throne positioning immigration as an economic issue for the first time (Paquet, 2019, p. 48). In this context, the Manitoba government signalled that it wanted to undertake immigration negotiations with the federal government and, in particular, demanded more provincial power in selecting and recruiting immigrants (Paquet, 2019, pp. 51, 56). Provincial activities began to reorient around immigration, such as developing provincial immigration recruitment strategies, holding public consultations on immigration, expanding anti-racism activities, and developing a new approach to language training for immigrants (Paquet, 2019, p. 50). After Canadians elected a Liberal government federally in 1993, the Manitoba government amped up its demands on Ottawa⁵. First, Manitoba was displeased with Prime Minister Jean Chretien’s immigration policy changes: higher costs for immigration applications, new procedures for immigration hearings, and potential changes to the number of family reunifications allocated in Manitoba per year. Manitoba saw these

⁵ Paquet uses the city’s name in reference to the federal government in her work at various times which I have kept in. Therefore, when using the term Ottawa, I refer to the federal government.

changes as negative because they could decrease the number of immigrants coming into the province. Second, the province was experiencing growth in industry as its economy recovered, so the province made efforts to persuade the federal government to support the permanent residency of potential industry workers who otherwise could not qualify under the points system of immigration (Paquet, 2019, p. 56). Aside from Quebec, Manitoba was alone in this early involvement and political pressure on Ottawa regarding immigration.

One of the most significant events in Manitoba's immigration history was the outcome of the process of 'Settlement Renewal' undertaken by the federal government between 1995 and 1996 (Canadian Council for Refugees, 2000; Carter et al., 2014, p. 18; Paquet, 2019, p. 59). The federal government was trying to address a large federal deficit, leaving Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC, now IRCC) with \$62 million in budget cuts. In this context, the federal government tried to persuade provinces to take on the work of administering settlement programming to offset the deficit; eventually, however, only two provinces negotiated those deals with the federal government: Manitoba and British Columbia (Clement, Carter & Vineberg, 2013). This deal came with increased federal funding, which was an important factor in the positive reception of the decentralization of immigration and settlement to the province. In addition to the increase in finances, the Manitoba government's province-building strategy sought to have a direct hand in immigration, recruitment, selection, and controlling and delivering settlement services, and therefore this agreement aligned with that strategy (Paquet, 2019, p. 60-61). The province-building mechanism (the active involvement and development of recruitment and integration efforts discussed above) was already activated before the

period of Settlement Renewal, which meant that Manitoba had the capacity to administer and deliver settlement services. The other provinces outside of Quebec had not activated their province-building mechanisms yet, so they were not interested in taking on this responsibility in the same way Manitoba was due to limited capacity (Paquet, 2019, p. 59-61).

Manitoba's sustained demands on Ottawa led to the creation of the Manitoba Provincial Nominee Program and the Manitoba Immigration Integration Program (MIIP) 1998 (Paquet, 2019, p. 67). Through the MIIP, the province funded a wide range of settlement services and organizational capacity building with a focus on inclusion and retention of immigrants (Paquet, 2019, p. 67). These efforts made Manitoba unique in the immigration and settlement sector, as the government both sought this responsibility out and invested much of its own money into programming (Paquet, 2019, p. 67). The subsequent NDP government of 1999-2009 and 2009-2016 continued to accelerate this province-building mechanism, by increasing the number and categories of PNP candidates, delivering settlement services, and increasing collaboration with community groups for the development of integration policies (Paquet, 2019, p. 67). Taken together, these proactive efforts and the push for more control illustrate the holistic model of intervention (Paquet, 2019, p. 67).

However, Manitoba's initiative and direct role in planning and delivering settlement services ended in 2012 when the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Jason Kenney, under a majority-elected Conservative government, served Manitoba and B.C with notice that their settlement agreements would be terminated the following year. The rationale was that immigrants should have a shared standard level of access to

services across Canada, not a ‘patchwork’ system. Manitoba NDP Premier at the time, Greg Selinger, criticized the federal Conservatives for this decision because of a lack of consultation with the Manitoba government and the existing strength of Manitoba’s settlement sector (Carter et al., 2014; Jeram & Nicolaides, 2019, p. 624). The only other province (outside of Quebec) that had control over settlement services at the time, British Columbia, was also against the federal government taking back control of settlement services (Schertzer, 2015, p. 391).

Despite this policy change, Manitoba maintained its holistic mode of intervention. The province’s NDP government from 1999-2016 saw immigration and settlement as a “key source for societal development” and continued to push the federal government for more local controls on immigration (Paquet, 2019, p. 68). After seventeen years of NDP leadership, a Conservative government was elected in Manitoba in 2016. In general, this government’s policy changes were described as a “regressive strategy” in their undoing of progressive social and economic policies introduced by the prior NDP governments (Fernandez & MacKinnon, 2019). One important change for immigration occurred in 2016, when the provincial Conservative government introduced a \$500 application fee for skilled foreign workers, stating that this fee would be spent on provincial settlement services (CBC News, 2019). The Manitoba Liberal party accused the Conservative government in 2019 of not keeping their promise to use this fee on settlement and said that the fee was an unnecessary burden for immigrants (The Canadian Press, 2019). Since then, immigration has remained a key priority for the Manitoba government, as they created the Advisory Council on Economic Immigration and Settlement (ACEIS) in July 2023 (Government of Manitoba, 2023). Overall, Manitoba’s experience of federalization

and province-building was premised on the idea that local control of immigrant selection and administration of settlement services was best for the province-building strategy. Investing in local integration strategies and partnerships was a key part of its province-building strategy before the federal government took back control of its settlement services. This involvement, investment, and effort suggests that Manitoba's conception of immigration, and responsibility towards immigrants, may be unique compared to other provinces, which had less involvement and investment in settlement. Care, then, may figure distinctly in the Manitoban immigration context, which I will investigate in Chapter 6.

Ontario

Ontario is the most populated province in the country, with approximately 15.6 million people in 2023 (Government of Ontario, 2023). Around 30% of the population are immigrants according to the 2021 census (Statistics Canada, 2021). Ontario has always been the primary destination for immigrants, as it is the industrial heartland and the primary beneficiary of national economic development policies (Paquet, 2019, p.75). Ontario is characterized by the reactive mode of intervention. This mode of intervention is characterized by a limited role for the province in immigration and integration, with most responsibility being downloaded onto civil society and, to a lesser extent, the market (Paquet, 2019, p.18). Provinces adopting a reactive mode of intervention receive significant flows of immigrants without having to recruit them, so public intervention by the provincial governments is influenced by the needs of an existing population of immigrants. The focus of provincial efforts is to maximize the benefits of the large

immigration population by focusing on labour market integration and preventing social exclusion (Paquet, 2019, p.18).

Historically, Ontario has carried out limited, targeted immigration activities in the area of integration since the 1990s (Paquet, 2019, p. 71). But before the 1990s, the Ontario government had enacted some programs for integration such as an airport reception service for immigrants in 1971, and the opening of ‘welcome houses’ in 1973 - a centralized service for reception, orientation, and language instruction for new arrivals (Paquet, 2019, p. 75). It was not until the 1990s, however, that the provincial elite began to make demands on Ottawa about immigration. In 1990, the NDP government under Bob Rae was elected at the same time as a severe recession began in Ontario (Paquet, 2019, p. 75-76). This government tried to negotiate with the federal government on immigration, arguing that Ontario was not getting a fair share of federal transfers for immigration considering the large number of immigrants that come to Ontario compared to other provinces (Paquet, 2019, p. 76). However, with the election of the Progressive Conservative Party under Mike Harris in 1995, the province returned to a more passive attitude towards immigration. Harris’ Conservative party was “at odds” with the social justice objectives of the preceding government that sought to ensure immigrants had comparably fair and equal access to services in Ontario as they did in other provinces (Paquet, 2019, p. 77). Harris’ government instead saw immigrants as ‘special interests’, a term that had been used at the time by political actors to delegitimize the concerns and needs of groups of people deemed not ‘ordinary’ citizens (Dobrowolsky, 1998, p. 731; Paquet, 2019, p. 92). It also positioned immigrants as people who could “commit fraud, threaten public security, or abuse the system” (Paquet, 2019, p. 77). This government saw

settlement efforts as a private domain, cutting the province's settlement program budget by almost 50%, eliminating programs to combat racism, and closing Welcome houses (Paquet, 2019, p. 77-78). Paquet (2019) writes that "these cuts would foster long-lasting divisions and a lack of trust between the provincial government and the organizations responsible for delivering immigrant services" (p. 78).

Because of the cuts under the Harris government, settlement organizations and similar actors were opposed to devolving responsibility to the provinces during the period of Settlement Renewal, discussed in the prior section on Manitoba. While the province was absent from consultations with the federal government during Settlement Renewal, societal actors and groups active in immigration and service delivery were there to voice their concerns about devolution (Paquet, 2019, p. 83). Settlement organizations and other actors pushed against increased provincial involvement in immigration, which pushed political elites to be the "champions of questions relating to immigration" (Paquet, 2019, p. 89) meaning that they took up the mantle of involvement on immigration issues. During the 2003 election, the Ontario Liberal party highlighted immigrant contributions to Ontario and expressed interest in developing a funding agreement for settlement services with the federal government. When the Ontario Liberals won the election that year, there was a marked shift from the previous government in how they viewed immigrants, from a burden to an economic benefit (Paquet, 2019, p.89), with settlement programs presumed to maximize this benefit (Paquet, 2019, p. 88). The pressure to decentralize and take on more provincial responsibility came from this shift. In May 2005, the federal and provincial government created their first immigration agreement, the same year as the Nova Scotia agreement was created (Paquet, 2019, p. 98). At this

time Ontario was still not very interested in immigrant selection and recruitment. Instead, the province was more interested in integration (settlement) because, unlike other provinces such as Manitoba and Nova Scotia, Ontario experienced high rates of immigration and therefore recruiting and selecting immigrants was seen as unnecessary (Gagnon & Larios, 2021, p. 700; Paquet, 2019, p. 98).

It was not until 2012 that the Ontario government, under Liberal Dalton McGuinty, created an official immigration strategy (Government of Ontario, 2012). After the Conservative Party under the leadership of Doug Ford was elected in 2018, there were two important changes in the Ontario immigration context. First, the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration was dissolved, and immigration issues were amalgamated into other ministries. Representatives from the Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants, and the FCJ Refugee Centre stated that they were worried that this change could put at risk the funding that the ministry provided for settlement services (Meyer & Syed, 2018). Second, the Ford government cut funding to Legal Aid in 2019 which included eliminating funding for refugee and immigration law services. 70% of refugee claimants in Ontario, who are excluded from federal IRCC services, use legal aid to help with their asylum applications (The Canadian Press, 2019). Overall Ontario's process of federalization came out of a desire to have a fair share of federal money given the amount of immigrants that Ontario received, not because of a push for local control and administration of immigrant and settlement services as was the case in Manitoba. Though Ontario did focus its involvement on settlement services, it was largely due to the desire to maximize the benefits of the large population of immigrants who lived in the province.

Nova Scotia

Nova Scotia is the 7th largest province by population and the most populated Atlantic province sitting at just over 1 million in 2023 (Government of Nova Scotia, 2023). Only about 7% of the population identified as immigrants in the 2021 census (Statistics Canada, 2021). Compared to Ontario and Manitoba, Nova Scotia has a much smaller population and percentage of immigrants in the province. Nova Scotia's mode of intervention, the attraction-retention mode, is characterized by public measures to increase immigration and retain immigrants once they are in the province through focused efforts on selection and recruitment, but a comparatively less strong focus on integration (Paquet, 2019, p.19). Immigration is viewed as a tool for demographic survival and economic development, both of which are seen as necessary to sustain these provincial societies (Paquet, 2019, p. 19). In this section, I sometimes refer to the Atlantic region of Canada generally instead of only Nova Scotia. This is intentional because the political economy of the Atlantic region experienced similar challenges and affected immigration in the same way. Much of the literature (Cottrell et al., 2015; Dobrowolsky & Ramos, 2014; Lionais et al., 2020; Murray et al., 2021; Paquet, 2019) that I draw on for my analysis discusses the region as a whole, but I discuss the particular context of Nova Scotia as much as possible.

Nova Scotia's proactive involvement in immigration came later than that of Manitoba and Ontario. To start, none of the Atlantic provinces included immigration in any of their demands during constitutional negotiations in the 1980s and 1990s. The lack of interest in provincial control continued through the Settlement Renewal process and into the 2000s. Nova Scotia was not interested in taking up a provincial role in

immigration settlement because of a lack of knowledge, capacity, and workforce (Paquet, 2019, p. 143-144). This contrasts sharply with the Manitoban experience, as discussed earlier in this chapter, because they had activated their province-building mechanism early in the 1990s and had built up the capacity to administer recruitment, selection, and settlement programs by the time the Settlement Renewal process was underway. However, in the early 1990s, Nova Scotia began focusing on attracting immigrant investors as opposed to recruiting immigrants to live in the province because of fear of backlash from citizens for inviting immigrants to the region while there were high rates of local unemployment (Paquet, 2019, p. 143). The Atlantic Provinces had experienced some of the most significant population loss and economic decline in Canada for decades (Ramos & Yoshida, 2015, p. 38). There were also other more pressing matters in Nova Scotia in the 1990s such as equalization and natural resource management (Paquet, 2019, p. 143). However, concerned with demographic issues, the Atlantic provinces generally came to see immigration as a resource of human rather than financial capital (Paquet, 2019, p. 138).

Starting in 2003 there was a “period of reflection” in Nova Scotia on immigration (Paquet, 2019, p. 156). The Progressive Conservative premier John Hamm was concerned with population decline, and invited actors in the settlement and immigration sector to present information to the province, organized public hearings, and developed an immigration discussion paper: *A Framework for Immigration* (Paquet, 2019, p. 156). Nova Scotia signed a Provincial Nominee Program Agreement in 2004 (Paquet, 2019, p. 144) five years after Manitoba signed the first agreement, but at a similar time period as most provincial-federal PNP agreements were signed. Then, the province published its

first immigration strategy in 2005 and created a Department of Immigration in the same year, indicating that the province-building mechanism had been activated (Paquet, 2019, p. 156-157). Between 2005 and 2010, and the election of an NDP party led by Darrell Dexter in 2009, the province-building mechanism strengthened government activities and made them more visible, as the province focused its settlement services on economic outcomes: recognizing credentials, business creation, and language courses focused on the labour market (Paquet, 2019, p. 169). Compared to Ontario's experience with Mike Harris' government stepping away from immigration responsibility, each successive government in Nova Scotia carried forward a consensus on immigration as a province-building mechanism during the process of federalization of immigration. However, there have been criticisms of Nova Scotia's continued focus on economic outcomes at the expense of other settlement issues, as Dobrowolsky and Ramos (2014) write:

“This approach is narrow, instrumental and epitomizes short-term thinking. It aims to maximize the economic contributions of immigrants to the province and minimizes the costs associated with attracting them; immigrants are expected to do all the giving, while the province does all the taking” (p.5).

In the same vein, provincial funding for more settlement supports, including for those who are excluded from IRCC-funded services such as temporary foreign workers, refugee claimants, and international students, has been recommended by the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives in their Alternative Budget reports in (2023) (p.34), 2017 (p.29), and (2016) (p.81). In each report, the authors state that Nova Scotia must do more than just select and recruit immigrants to come to the province: it must also invest in their settlement and integration. Some suggestions included increased funding for supports for refugee claimants and providing core funding to the Halifax Refugee Clinic, a legal aid organization, as well as outreach to newcomers who are not aware of services they can

access (Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2016, 2017; Saulnier et al., 2023). In sum, Nova Scotia's experience of the process of federalization has been later, and slower, than Ontario and Manitoba. The province has focused much of its involvement and investment on recruiting immigrants to shore up the workforce, including settlement investments focused on this goal.

Overall, each province shares a similar focus on economically motivated immigration policy with the federal government. Second, each province has had a history of political consensus on immigration when different political parties took office, except for the Harris government in Ontario. But Manitoba and Nova Scotia differ from Ontario in their immigration involvement because of their focus on recruitment for province-building. Given this conclusion, I hypothesize that retaining immigrants in those provinces through robust settlement programming would help each province to reach their province-building goals, and so perhaps they have a more well-rounded vision than Ontario for settlement that includes elements of care. In the following chapter as I trace the normative framework in the policy texts under study my hypothesis will be tested through assessing the normative frameworks against an ethics of care.

CHAPTER 6 – TRACING THE ETHIC OF CARE

In this chapter, I examine the normative frameworks in the provincial policy texts (federal-provincial agreements, government reports, and Speeches from the Throne) as well as the federal policy texts (Settlement Logic Model, IRCC Settlement Outcomes Report and Settlement Program) through the *Trace* method. I draw on care ethics principles to measure these frameworks against an ethics of care. After uncovering the normative framework, I examine how care is conceptualized primarily in the IRCC Settlement Outcomes Report. This was done because provincial government reporting on settlement is limited,⁶ likely because the Settlement Program is administered through IRCC and not the provincial governments. Therefore, I focused my analysis on the IRCC Settlement Outcomes Report. Where possible, I supplemented the analysis with grey literature to give a provincial perspective.

I found that, for the most part, a neoliberal normative framework underpinned these texts, which supports the literature on Canadian immigration policy discussed in Chapter 4. There were also several observations supporting Paquet's (2019) modes of intervention: Ontario's focus on immigration for economic growth above all, Nova Scotia's disproportionate focus on recruitment, and Manitoba's wider view on immigration as a builder of society. Yet these differences did not produce significant distinctions in the role of care ethics in each case study. In the IRCC report, I found that

⁶ For example, Auditor General of Nova Scotia reported in 2022 that the Department of Immigration had not done a single analysis of the settlement sector and was uninformed about settlement needs and outcomes. In November that year the province completed a review of settlement services, which I could not find access to through government channels, but CBC uploaded a copy of the report August 2023. Similarly, the Auditor General of Ontario reported in 2017 that the provincial government was duplicating programming by the federal government because it was not collecting information or evaluating settlement programming in the province. I did not find any Auditor General report or data from the Manitoba government on settlement.

care was discussed in relation to labour and the report acknowledged the gendered implications of care work. It also positioned care as a burden for immigrant women's participation and access to settlement programs and as necessary labour for the economy. This chapter begins by engaging with the following themes in *Trace* – problem definition, leading values, and conception of human nature – to identify the normative framework.

Immigrants as Solutions

Sevenhuijsen (2004) argues that policy texts are usually trying to solve a problem of some kind, and the ways that these texts define the problem and solution also usually contain several normative presuppositions (p.24). My analysis of the texts suggests that immigration and settlement are primarily seen as tools to address provincial and federal nation-building concerns. By nation-building, I refer to economic and demographic needs, in local and provincial contexts but also federally. The nation-building concerns are, for the most part, the same between provinces. The primary objective of these policies is to ensure the labour market integration of immigrants, but there are small differences between each province's objectives concerning immigration. Ontario's policy texts focus more on economic growth as an immigration objective, which coincides with Paquet's (2019) mode of intervention, as recruiting immigrants for demographic needs has not been a focus for Ontario, but maximizing the benefits of the existing immigrant population is. Nova Scotia's policy texts see immigration as a tool of economic well-being, as opposed to growth, and as a tool for demographic sustainability, also coinciding with Paquet's (2019) categorization of the attraction-retention model. Finally, Manitoba's policy texts see immigrants as a more general nation-building tool, meeting economic, demographic, and social needs, again supporting Paquet's (2019) holistic mode of

intervention. In what follows, I discuss the problem definition in the federal-provincial policy texts, provincial government reports, and federal policy texts, and what this reveals about the role of the state in immigration and settlement.

None of the provincial-federal agreements describe a problem that they are trying to solve, but instead position immigration in the context of provincial goals, showcasing their roles as solutions to them. Most of the objectives in each provincial-federal agreement are procedural, describing the role of collaboration between the federal and provincial governments in monitoring and evaluation. Key differences lie in the focus on economic immigration and family reunification. First, Ontario's immigration agreement mentions economic immigration twice as much as Nova Scotia's or Manitoba's, which can be seen in the table below. Second, the Nova Scotia and Manitoba agreements both state that they will cooperate on meeting family reunification goals, but the Ontario agreement does not mention family reunification. The 2015 Throne Speech in Manitoba, which was led by the NDP under Premier Greg Selinger, discussed the importance of family reunification. The province stated that it would work with the federal government to lift the cap on immigrants and refugees to reunite families, and that this would create a "stronger" province. This declaration to take responsibility for family reunification by negotiating with the federal government demonstrates the presence of care because it acknowledges the role of relations and interdependency in our well-being. Given the context of the influx of Syrian refugees at the time (Government of Canada, 2022a), this declaration may not be particularly surprising, but this emphasis was not taken up by other provinces in their Speeches from the Throne. I take this also to be an element of the

‘holistic’ mode of intervention (Paquet, 2019), as it demonstrates a non-economic and non-demographic rationale for immigration.

Table 1: Provincial-federal agreements and their economic-oriented objectives

Manitoba	Ontario	Nova Scotia
<p>5. to provide Manitoba with the opportunity to influence its particular social, demographic, economic development and labour market priorities, including responses to skills shortages;</p> <p>10. to collaborate in the development and implementation of strategies to address barriers to qualification recognition and integration of immigrants into the labour market; and</p>	<p>3.2b: Maintain and enhance a positive relationship between Canada and Ontario related to the appropriate level and composition of Immigrants to the Province, including collaborating on increasing economic immigration, acknowledging their respective roles for the promotion, recruitment, selection and admission of Immigrants and Temporary Residents</p> <p>C: respond to Ontario’s current and emerging economic development, social and labour market priorities through bilateral discussions on immigration policies and programs, including economic immigration policies; recognizing the role of immigration in supporting the economic development of communities in Ontario.</p> <p>d. support the successful economic and social integration and settlement of Immigrants and Refugees in Ontario through programs supported by appropriate, fair, equitable, predictable and ongoing provincial and federal funding;</p>	<p>e) to provide Nova Scotia with the opportunity to address its particular social, demographic, economic development and labour market needs, including responses to skills shortages;</p> <p>j) to collaborate in the development and implementation of strategies to address barriers to qualification recognition and integration of immigrants into the labour market; and</p>

	<p>f. facilitate collaboration in the development and implementation of strategies to address barriers to foreign qualification recognition and integration of Immigrants into the labour market;</p>	
--	---	--

Apart from the provincial-federal agreements, the reports from Ontario and Nova Scotia that I analyzed⁷ identified specific problems that immigration will help solve. The Ivany Report (2014) states that immigration is needed to increase the population to maintain levels of economic *well-being* in the province. Ontario’s Immigration Strategy does not mention population growth but instead sees immigration as a tool for *economic growth*. The terms well-being and growth may sound similar, but well-being may encompass a wider range of economic objectives than just growth, for example, sustainable, equitable, and/or inclusive employment. But in both cases, immigration is how they will achieve those goals. The IRCC report identifies the problem more similarly to Nova Scotia’s policy texts, highlighting that Canada needs workers to maintain economic stability. The table below has quotes from each report showing the problem identification.

⁷ I did not find any relevant reports on immigration from the Manitoba government on immigration and/or settlement.

Table 2: Provincial and federal report problem definitions

<p>IRCC Settlement Outcomes Report (2021)</p>	<p>Ontario Immigration Strategy (2017)</p>	<p>Ivany Report (2014)</p>
<p>“Newcomers can help maintain Canada’s working age population and offset skills shortages, compensating in part for an aging population with birth rates below replacement levels, while enriching Canada’s social and cultural fabric. In the future, immigration will be vitally important for working age population growth – without it, Canada’s core working age population is projected to decrease in the next 20 years” (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2021).</p>	<p>“Ontario not only needs more immigrants, it needs to specifically attract newcomers who possess the skills and ability to meet the province’s labour market needs and help our economy grow” (p.6).</p> <p>“In times of rapid technological change and fierce global competition, we need a skilled and resilient workforce to give us a competitive advantage over other jurisdictions. With this in mind, we continue to attract the best and brightest international students and workers who have the skills we need to strengthen our workforce and ensure continued economic prosperity for all Ontarians” (p.3).</p>	<p>“It is a simple fact: unless Nova Scotia first stabilizes its population base and then begins to increase the population of working age people, it will not be possible to sustain current levels of economic wellbeing across the province, let alone improve them. In practical terms, there are only two ways to grow the population significantly over the medium term: expanded international immigration and substantial net inflows from inter-provincial migration” (p. 47).</p> <p>“International and inter-provincial immigration is needed to give Nova Scotia and economic boost through new business start-ups, expanded investment, and new ways of thinking, and majority support for policies to increase the attraction and retention of immigrants, especially in rural communities” (p.8).</p>

From the above discussion, I conclude that immigrants are positioned as tools of nation-building by these provincial and federal texts. How then do provinces see their responsibilities towards immigrants who are positioned as nation-building tools? My

reading of the texts found that an extractive lexicon permeated the federal-provincial immigration agreements as well as the federal documents. By extractive lexicon, I refer to the ways in which the provinces frame their responsibilities as ‘takers’ and frame immigrants as ‘givers’. The table below shows quotes to support this extractive lexicon.

Table 3: Extractive lexicon

Text	Quote
Settlement Program	For Canada to realize the economic, social and cultural <i>benefits</i> [emphasis added] of immigration, newcomers must integrate successfully into Canadian society
Settlement Logic Model	Outcomes: Ultimate Integration: Successfully integrated and settled clients <i>benefit</i> [emphasis added] Canada
IRCC Settlement Outcomes Report	Ultimately, Canada has a vested interest in supporting newcomer outcomes. Positive newcomer outcomes not only <i>benefit</i> [emphasis added] Canada in terms of the economy and social cohesion, but they also increase support for immigration by demonstrating the value of immigration to Canadians” (p.3).
Manitoba-Canada Immigration Agreement	0.16 AND WHEREAS Canada and Manitoba share a mutual interest in: 5. enhancing and <i>maximizing/facilitating</i> [emphasis added] the social, cultural and economic <i>contribution</i> [emphasis added] of immigrants;
Ontario-Canada Immigration Agreement	1.13 AND WHEREAS Canada and Ontario share a mutual interest in:

	a. <i>maximizing</i> [emphasis added] the <i>contribution</i> [emphasis added] of immigration to the achievement of the economic, social, and cultural goals of both Canada and Ontario
Nova Scotia-Canada Immigration Agreement	1.16 AND WHEREAS Canada and Nova Scotia share a mutual interest in: f) enhancing and <i>facilitating</i> [emphasis added] the social, cultural and economic <i>contribution</i> [emphasis added] of immigrants;

In each text, immigrants are framed as individuals who will benefit and contribute to the nation either economically, socially, or culturally, and the provinces and federal government will help with ‘maximizing’ or ‘facilitating’ these benefits. Ontario’s agreement differs from Manitoba’s and Nova Scotia’s in a slight, but significant way in relation to care ethics. The Ontario agreement specifically only uses the word ‘maximizing’ to describe its interest and responsibility in settlement, which is exactly how Paquet (2019) describes the reactive mode of intervention, with the objective of maximizing the presence of existing immigrant populations (p. 18). The difference in language insinuates that Ontario’s role is comparatively more focused on extracting the maximum benefits of immigration with the least amount of involvement, and presumably cost. Based on recent articles from the Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants, this finding rings true, as Executive Director Debbie Douglas writes:

“How can we begin to compete as nonprofits when funding levels remain low and inflexible; when our sector, despite our significant contributions to the social and economic wellbeing of our society, appears to be an afterthought, funded often at levels of pennies to the dollar of ministries and departments like health, education and most egregious, policing, in our national, provincial, and municipal budgets?” (Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants, 2022).

Douglas' comment suggests that, indeed, Ontario's focus is on maximizing immigrant benefits by focusing on how they can contribute to economic growth in the province while not properly funding the supports and services that facilitate these contributions. This framing of immigrants, as solutions and tools for nation-building problems, is positioned within the larger context of the values underlying these texts and what image of human nature they conjure in the following section.

Independent Success as Human Nature

As Hankivsky (2004) has stated, values always guide policy decision-making, even when it is assumed that decisions are made purely on the basis of empirical findings (p.2). Sevenhuijsen (2004) writes that is it not self-evident how certain values are employed within texts and what they are supposed to produce (p. 25-26). Therefore, in using *Trace*, "the goal is not only to make an inventory of the values that are mentioned in (or are conspicuously absent from!) the text, but also to ask more detailed questions about their role in the overall message of the text" (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p. 25). The language in the Manitoba and Nova Scotia texts was value-laden, describing ways of being and ascribing certain moral positions to them. This proved to be very useful in drawing out the normative framework. Comparatively, the texts I drew on for Ontario were not as value-laden. The immigration strategy and federal-provincial immigration agreement were highly procedural. If we consider Paquet's (2019) mode of intervention for Ontario, it characterizes immigration as something the government merely reacts to because it already has a heavy presence in the province. In comparison, Nova Scotia and Manitoba's modes of intervention work to emphasize the necessity of immigration, grow it, and secure its success for the future. Therefore, Ontario's government may not have to

do the same work of building consensus around immigration and convincing the public and stakeholders that immigration should be invested in, in the same way that the governments of Manitoba and Nova Scotia do. I believe this may explain why the Ontario texts I found differed from the Manitoba and Nova Scotia ones in terms of values. In any case, because of this, I do not draw on Ontario texts (except for one finding from a report of the Auditor General of Ontario) for this section. For the rest of this section, I discuss the role of the concept of success in these texts and what this success says about human nature.

The Settlement Program and Logic Model say that successfully integrated immigrants will be the ones to benefit and contribute to Canada (see quotes in the Extractive lexicon table for an example). Immigrant success is therefore critical to solving nation-building problems identified in the previous section. However, IRCC states:

“Currently, **an absence of detailed definitions of success** [emphasis in original] limits the Department’s ability to interpret the results observed for specific groups of newcomers and adjust policy as necessary” (IRCC, 2021, p. 72).

Here IRCC acknowledges that ‘success’ is undefined and therefore difficult to measure. A 2017 report by the Auditor General of Ontario also found that the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration had not defined what a ‘successfully’ settled and integrated newcomer is, and therefore has no time frames or measurements to assess whether settlement services are meeting newcomer’s needs or if they need additional help (Auditor General of Ontario, 2017, p. 657). Where this absence is declared in the IRCC report and the Auditor General of Ontario’s report, a careful reading of the federal-provincial immigration agreements, government reports, and Speeches from the Throne

suggests a definition of success that coincides with the findings of the previous sections. That is, success is conceptualized in relation to immigrants' labour market participation and economic contributions.

The Ivany Report (2014) and Speeches from the Throne in Nova Scotia support the economic focus and extractive orientation present in their federal-provincial immigration agreement. First, the Ivany report (2014) states that immigrants in Nova Scotia are generally "successful", and then cites unemployment and education statistics as markers for this success (The Nova Scotia Commission on Building Our New Economy, 2014, p. 24). No other indicators of success are mentioned, signaling that employment is the most important indicator of success. The 2017 Speech from the Throne strengthens this notion of employment/economic participation as the key indicator of success coinciding with the 'ideal' immigrant image discussed in Chapter 4, through the story of Tareq Hadhad, a Syrian refugee who came to Halifax and started the company Peace by Chocolate. The Speech praised his success as a board member of Invest Nova Scotia and his recognition by the Prime Minister at the United Nations. It then says "through will and determination, he and his family pulled together to create a business – they created something great. By continuing to embrace a spirit of openness, we will discover new ideas, welcome new people, and create new businesses". Sheer will and determination are said to be the reasons why Hadhad is successful, foregrounding values of self-sufficiency and independence. From a care ethics perspective, it is understood that Hadhad's economic success was made possible through a complex web of relations (Sevenhuijsen, 1998, p. 140; Tronto, 1993, p. 103), including the work of the settlement sector, his family, and communities in Nova Scotia and afar. I do not say this

to question the hard work and determination of Hadhad, but instead to highlight how the provincial government has intertwined success with individualism and emphasize this individualistic economic success as a key rationale for welcoming newcomers. In contrast, the Hadad family's need for protection, support, and safety are omitted as reasons for the provincial government to be 'open' to newcomers. The province further supports this idea later in the 2017 Speech from the Throne:

“Welcoming new people to our province is the right thing to do. Immigration strengthens the economy by increasing the labour force, finding people with skills we need, and improving our productivity. Bringing new people with new perspectives and ideas will also see more businesses get started and more Nova Scotians employed (p.10).”

The following year's Speech from the Throne (2018) continues to situate success within independence and the labour market generally, stating that “whatever the situation, people in need must be supported to help build the income security they need to lead fully independent lives” (p.9). Overall, the rhetoric in these Nova Scotia Speeches from the Throne lacks care ethics principles and instead works to produce the 'ideal' immigrant. This is aligned with Paquet's (2019) classification of the attraction-retention mode of intervention, with less provincial focus on integration and more on recruiting immigrants for demographic and economic reasons (p. 19).

In the case of Manitoba, the Manitoba Settlement Annex (2003) does not explicitly use the word success. Instead, it states that it is important for immigrants to be “self-sufficient as soon as possible” and one of their key roles and responsibilities for settlement is to “foster self-reliance and personal commitment by individuals”. Here, self-sufficiency is seen as the norm and the role of Manitoba's settlement sector is to help immigrants achieve it. On the surface, it seems obvious that settlement supports would be temporary and their purpose would be to ensure that immigrants no longer need them.

But this idea of a person who must as quickly as possible become independent is not realistic, nor is it conducive to people's well-being as understood by care ethics. As I stated in the previous section on Nova Scotia, care ethics suggests that people are constantly embedded in complex webs of relations (Sevenhuijsen, 1998; Tronto, 1993, p. 140), and it is these relations that help us live well. The moral discourse surrounding personal commitment and self-reliance also problematizes other ways of being or people who do not fit that description (Simm, 2004, p. 89). This language works to create the 'ideal' immigrant I discussed in Chapter 4, supporting the neoliberal framework, as opposed to a care ethics framework.

The notion of immigrant success in these documents takes up a view of human nature that does not sit well with care ethics. Measuring success against the abstraction from supports and earning a wage assumes that it is normal to be independent and self-sufficient and therefore abnormal to be reliant on other relations, or institutions, for supports. As Sevenhuijsen (2004) writes "dependency appears as something that has to be overcome (citizens have to be made independent), instead of something that has to be dealt with on a daily basis" (p. 27). Under this assumption about human nature, it is assumed that needing social support is only temporary, instead of part of everyday human experience. To be fair, if an immigrant has permanent residence, they can likely access other provincial social services and therefore their access is not only temporary. But even if they can technically access other social supports, the language in the Nova Scotia and Manitoba policy texts frames immigrants' morality around not needing those supports at all.

Where Manitoba and Nova Scotia's texts have limited conceptualization of immigrant success, the federal government's may be more expansive. Returning to IRCC's discussion of success, while the report states that there is no clear definition of success to evaluate outcomes by, they do acknowledge that it may be fruitful to expand the vision for success. The first thematic finding in the IRCC (2021) report is about adjusting expectations for 'success', writing:

“involving newcomers themselves in the definitions of success might help generate more realistic expectations of success for various newcomer types (such as average earnings), as well as nudging society and government to considered other factors beyond economic success as markers of positive outcomes” (p. 64).

This statement recognizes that a wide range of settlement outcomes could be viewed positively, depending on the context of immigrants and their families, their histories, relationships, values, and capacities. However, my earlier findings in this chapter point to a dominant neoliberal framework in immigrant and settlement policies, which does not support adjusting expectations or definitions of 'success' in immigrant integration to include non-economic contributions. Nonetheless, it is promising that the need for a more contextually specific, self-determined, non-economic vision of success for immigrants has been acknowledged.

I conclude that a neoliberal normative framework underpins the policy texts I examined in this chapter, supporting the literature on Canadian immigration policy discussed in Chapter 4. It is potentially unsurprising that these ideals are found within each case study's policy texts, but it does not mean that neoliberal values are the only ones apparent. As seen in Manitoba's 2015 Speech from the Throne, the province declared that involving itself in reuniting immigrant and refugee families was an important task. Moving forward, I will also demonstrate that IRCC's Settlement

Outcomes Report acknowledges the role of gender in caring arrangements and possibilities for recognizing non-economic activity as a valuable contribution to society. Overall, though, given that a neoliberal framework dominates these provincial policies concerning immigration and settlement, there is ample opportunity to renew these policies against care ethics standards, which I will discuss in Chapter 7. For now, I turn to examining the location of care and caring practices.

Caregiving as a Burden and a Necessity

One of the guidelines in the *Trace* method is to find out how care is defined and conceptualized in the texts. As stated in Chapter 3, many of the studies that use *Trace* conduct analyses on documents that specifically deal with care provisioning, and so care is most often explicitly defined and elaborated on. Given that this thesis is analyzing texts that do not specifically deal with care provisioning, it is not expected that care will be explicitly defined. Indeed, I found that care was not conceptualized in the provincial policy documents, and that this omission is likely due to the fact that the Settlement Program is administered by the federal government, as mentioned in Chapter 4. Therefore, in this section, I focus my analysis on the federal IRCC outcomes report because it is the only core text that discusses care provisioning explicitly. To remain engaged with my provincial analysis, I supplement with grey and scholarly literature where possible.

Care is discussed primarily in relation to gender and caregiving responsibilities/other support services⁸. One of the thematic findings of the IRCC (2021)

⁸ Support services are services that help newcomers access a settlement program or service, such as childcare, transportation, interpretation, or disability supports.

report is that gender is a “significant factor” in settlement outcomes (p.5), and a Gender Based Analysis Plus (GBA+) lens was used in data gathering and analysis. IRCC (2021) states that future analyses and reports will include an “intersectional analysis of multiple identity factors simultaneously” (p.8), which is a positive indication of a more critical analysis of settlement outcomes. Their analysis of gendered settlement outcomes shows how the marginalization of care disproportionately affects women. Almost half of the service provider organizations (SPO’s) in the IRCC (2021) report stated that they could only provide limited childcare spaces because of high costs (p.24), and women were most adversely impacted by this because in most circumstances they stay home to provide care and miss out on settlement services or employment opportunities that men do not miss out on (IRCC, 2021 p.35). In the provincial context there were similar findings on immigrant women and childcare in reports from Manitoba (Ashton et al., 2015, p. 16) and Nova Scotia (Nova Scotia Department of Labour, Skills and Immigration, 2022, p. 2). In addition to inadequate funding for childcare, it was common among interviewed SPO’s to receive less funding for support services than requested (IRCC, 2021, p. 35) which again adversely impacts women because they use more support services than men (IRCC, 2021, p. 33). As discussed in Chapter 4, neoliberal restructuring has impacted funding and programs in the settlement sector. These structural limitations are in direct opposition to care ethics by excluding care provisioning in funding arrangements. The independent, self-sufficient normativity in neoliberal ideology is automatically prioritized over the need for everyday care that care ethics asserts.

This neoliberal normativity is centered again in the findings on women’s employment outcomes. On Syrian refugee women’s experiences with settlement

agencies, IRCC (2021) reports that “employment services were hard to obtain and that they were pushed towards low-wage, low-skilled, precarious and feminized positions that did not reflect their education and experience” (p. 50). Additionally, more women’s work placements (72%) were unpaid than men’s (52%) (IRCC, 2021, p. 49). This finding was echoed in the 2015 report on Manitoba’s rural settlement sector, where SPO’s said that employment was easily attainable for most newcomers, but that the jobs they got were mostly low-skill, entry-level and not making use of their education and/or skills (Ashton et al., 2015, p. 12). Recent academic research on the settlement sector provides critical insight into how this may be occurring. Liu and Guo’s (2023b) work found that the neoliberal rationales in IRCC’s Settlement Program “has critically shifted ISO’s [Immigrant Serving Organizations] understanding of serving immigrants from quality to quantity to produce ‘good’ results (p.2230). In other words, the quality of supports and services provided to immigrants is less important than being able to report serving a large number of immigrants. They give the example of an employment counsellor at a settlement organization who separated clients they labelled ‘self-motivated’ and ‘unmotivated’ and focused their efforts on providing support to the former because “they could generate more value in terms of outcomes reporting” (p. 2240). Therefore, in the case that IRCC discussed Syrian refugee women’s experiences, it may be that their own outcomes-driven approaches are driving settlement workers to engage with clients in a way that is not conducive to their real needs or aspirations. This may also relate to the point above about how childcare and support services are not accounted for adequately in funding arrangements, and SPO’s are often unable to meet those needs. In Chapter 6 I discussed how the definition of newcomer success in the provincial texts is correlated

directly with economic growth and labour market outcomes, but how this definition is not well-defined at the federal level where settlement programming is administered. The default for success then seems, in these cases, to follow the neoliberal logic of independence, employment, and economic growth. From a care ethics perspective, a case for a contextually sensitive (Hankivsky, 2004, p. 32) definition of success and centering of care as a normal life experience akin to being employed, can help bridge the gap between needs and success.

IRCC (2021) acknowledges both of these potential venues for care ethics principles in this quote below:

“It is also important to remember that some newcomers do not intend to enter the Canadian labour market, and to understand the reasons why (see figure 15). Close to one fifth (18%) of the survey respondents who were unemployed were not looking for work: 13% of Settlement Program clients and 23% of non-clients. Additional survey data in future years will help to better understand the indirect economic benefits, such as caregiving for family members, volunteer hours in the community, and labour in the home, that some newcomers provide to Canada and are not captured in the traditional economic data” (p. 53).

On the surface, this acknowledgement points to an ethic of care. After all, an ethic of care “requires our political thought be based more thoroughly upon an accurate account of human life” (Tronto, 2018, p. 147) and human life is full of non-economic activities such as caregiving, domestic work and volunteering in the community. However, the use of gender-neutral language in this excerpt obscures the social differences between men and women in providing care, differences that were previously drawn out when reporting on women’s access to settlement programming being impacted by caregiving responsibilities. This difference is further demonstrated in the report’s statistics about immigrants who reported they were not looking for employment. 60% of clients who said they were not looking for employment were women, and 31% of those

women said they were not looking for work because of childcare responsibilities⁹ (IRCC, 2021, p. 53). To be clear, I am not implying that the women who reported not looking for work are only doing so because they are ‘burdened’ by childcare. Some people prefer to stay at home if possible and care for their children instead of finding other arrangements. I draw this distinction out because the report still locates care as a private activity taken up in the home which may be considered valuable only when researchers measure its economic impacts. Care is important insofar as it helps to produce economic benefits, relating to this chapter’s discussion on immigrants as solutions to nation-building problems.

The normative frameworks I traced in these policy texts were all much the same. Neoliberal values underpinned the ways in which immigrants are constructed as solutions to provincial and federal nation-building problems. The way that provinces positioned immigration in relation to their provincial goals supported Paquet’s (2019) modes of intervention, which was expected. The neoliberal conceptualization of human nature figured most strongly in the Nova Scotia policy texts, likely owing to the province’s attraction-retention mode of intervention in attracting immigrants to shore up the workforce. The lack of value statements in Ontario’s policy texts with more attention paid to delivering effective immigration programming, such as credential recognition and bridging, characterizing the reactive mode of intervention. The province does not have to work to both recruit immigrants and justify to the public and federal government that more are needed, as is the case for Nova Scotia and to a lesser extent Manitoba. Finally,

⁹ An additional 21% said they were not looking for work because they are a “homemaker”, but the report does not define “homemaker” (IRCC, 2021, p. 53).

the Manitoba texts were more closely aligned with Nova Scotia's in their description of immigrants as parts of building the provincial society, and they also were the only ones to position family reunification as part of building the provincial society in their Speech from the Throne, which shows elements of the holistic mode of intervention. However, these different modes of intervention did not produce different conceptions of care in the provinces. This may not be surprising for Ontario, because as I said, its texts mainly focused on maximizing the benefits of an existing immigrant population through specific programs. But as Nova Scotia and Manitoba positioned immigration as a solution to demographic problems, and therefore are concerned with immigrants ultimately remaining in the province, a focus on the settlement supports to help immigrants thrive in their new homes is lacking. While IRCC federally administers the Settlement Program, as I said before, provinces still provide their own funding and settlement programming, so it is somewhat surprising that strategies around this were not represented. This may be due to my small text sample size in the time frame.

In the IRCC report care is recognized as a gendered form of labour that, when not given adequate priority in policymaking, negatively impacts immigrant women's settlement experiences. Caregiving labour is also recognized as valuable in society, but only for its indirect economic contributions. It is therefore seen as both a burden and a necessity in immigration and settlement, coinciding with the neoliberal normative framework that sees immigrant success in economic terms and independence as the preferred status. Without changing the way care is conceived of in IRCC's programming, the provinces will continue to foreground the ideal immigrant as the marker of immigrants' success which may be counterproductive to, at least Nova Scotia and

Manitoba's goals for immigration to help demographic issues. In the following section, I address this by discussing how the neoliberal normative framework can be renewed with an ethic of care.

CHAPTER 7 - RENEWAL WITH AN ETHICS OF CARE: DISCUSSION

This chapter continues the *Trace* method by engaging in the renewal of the neoliberal normative framework with an ethics of care. In this step, Sevenhuijsen (2004) writes that the difference it would make if care ethics values were acknowledged as relevant, and important, should be considered in discussions on the topic at hand (p.38). This line of thinking can lead to shifting ideas about responsibility and decision-making for care provisioning, or consideration of how policymakers can be attentive to the needs of public service users (Sevenhuijsen, 2004, p. 28). In my analysis, I consider the way that responsibility, and the concept of success, which was a key component of the normative framework in Chapter 6, can be renewed with a focus on the ethics of care. I then concretize the findings by identifying two specific areas where care ethics perspectives can provide insights into tangible policy changes. I begin first by discussing the way care was conceptualized in the texts.

Manitoba's 2015 Speech from the Throne acknowledges provincial responsibility in negotiating family reunification with the federal government to make the province stronger. This is an important display of the values of responsibility and responsiveness, and of centering the value of interdependency as an element of strength, rather than of weakness. The Ontario and Nova Scotia texts did not demonstrate alignment with an ethics of care. On the federal level, the IRCC Settlement Outcomes Report shows the potential for incorporating care ethics in three ways. First, and most promising, it acknowledges that the definition of success is not well-defined and involving immigrants in creating their own definition is a more realistic way to understand success, as well as “nudging” society and government to consider non-economic factors as positive markers

of immigrant outcomes (IRCC, 2021, p. 64). This demonstrates a contextually sensitive and responsive approach that takes the specificity and the complexity of people's lives into consideration (Hankivsky, 2004, p. 32) in reformulating how settlement program outcomes are measured. This may potentially change elements such as program design or availability, which could help with the issues of childcare discussed in the previous chapter. Second, the report recognizes that caregiving arrangements are gendered, and women bear the brunt of caregiving responsibilities. Recognizing this is a good starting point, but it does not provide much basis for critically assessing why caregiving responsibilities may negatively impact other activities. A care ethics perspective sees that the need for care is central to human life, and so policies that place care at the margins severely inhibit people's capacities to participate fully in life (Sevenhuijsen, 1998, p. 142). Third, the report recognizes that caregiving makes important economic contributions. This too provides a good starting point for a renewal through the incorporation of care ethics, as care is recognized as valuable. But this is a rather limited vision of why care is important to our lives and why we should value it. Nonetheless, the IRCC Settlement Outcomes Report (2021) incorporates areas where the utility of care ethics principles in producing more critical assessments of immigrant outcomes and revisioning immigrant outcomes to reflect principles of contextual sensitivity, responsiveness, and interdependency is acknowledged. In the following section, I continue the discussion on revisioning in 3 concrete areas: the responsibility for caring, the extractive nature of the provincial-federal immigration agreements, and success. I begin with the responsibility for caring.

Responsibility for care

In this section I discuss two areas where the concept of responsibility can help to renew the neoliberal normative framework with an ethics of care. First, one of the most glaring problems in immigration and settlement policies is their exclusions on certain immigrant groups from accessing settlement services. A care ethics approach to eligibility would expand rights and service access to all immigrants regardless of immigration status, as this would not only ensure people's well-being but also help foster a sense of solidarity (Smith-Carrier, 2019, p. 174). On responsibility, Hankivsky (2004) writes that "no adequate social policy can ignore the health and safety of its citizens" (p. 38), but in place of citizens I think it necessary to insert residents. There are many people with varying immigration statuses, from permanent residents to undocumented, but their health and safety should not be determined because of this distinction. As Harsha Walia (2021) states, "classifications such as 'migrant' or 'refugee' don't represent unified social groups so much as they symbolize *state-regulated* relations of governance and difference" (p. 2). These differences in governance arbitrarily decide who is deserving of supports and who is not, and the distinctions can cause real harm to people. As well as expanding eligibility criteria, some provinces fund programs and services for people excluded from federally funded programming, but this funding is generally temporary or on an ad-hoc basis or for certain projects. More often than not, it is grassroots groups, volunteer-run groups, or other social organizations that have limited to no funding providing services for those excluded by federal programming (Canadian Council for Refugees, 2018a, p. 5). Therefore, a care ethics approach would also recognize, value, and make permanent and sustainable the work of non-profit organizations, volunteer

groups and grassroots groups doing this work, many of whom are part of the settlement sector. In sum, taking responsibility for care provisioning in this sense would include removing eligibility criteria for settlement services at the federal level, or at least creating stable and permanent funding for the work that many non-profits and grassroots groups do in ensuring the health and safety of excluded residents at the federal and/or provincial level. A more politically palatable method to do this would perhaps be a greater expansion of pathways to permanent residency so that immigrants can then qualify for IRCC-funded settlement services, but the removal of exclusionary eligibility criteria would be the most expansive way of ensuring all residents have access to services.

Second, though Canada is in desperate need of workers – and in Nova Scotia’s case, the survival of the province depends on it – it shirks its responsibilities to care for them. Hankivsky (2004) writes that responsibility requires being cognizant of responsibilities that are not about ‘basic rights’ and ‘freedoms’ as they are viewed in an ethics of justice (p.39). This means that in order to see our responsibilities we must employ a contextually sensitive lens to our understanding of immigration. We can look to other perspectives on migration justice for this. For example, in Georgina Ramsay’s (2020) work on the political economy of the refugee regime, she argues that “displacement [should] be thought of more expansively as both a condition and effect of this period of global neoliberal capitalism” (p. 20). By displacement, she not only refers to forced displacement in reference to refugees, but a more general conception of displacement as people being abandoned or rejected by institutional support systems when they cannot meet the neoliberal demands of the state. Thus the ‘freedom’ that people have to immigrate is not freedom under conditions of coercion and displacement

through global neoliberal capitalism. In a similar vein, Delgado Wise and Veltmeyer (2016) argue that labour migration is a forced process of global capitalist development, not a desirable way out of poverty incumbent on individual action alone. Thus, understanding that migration is sometimes a strategy for survival may shift our interpretation of our responsibilities for migrants, especially those who are actively pursued and recruited by governments to solve domestic and provincial problems, while they may be facing precarious conditions at home. The movement of immigrants from one state to another affect both the immigrant themselves, and the receiving countries' capacity for growth, survival, and well-being, and therefore it is inadequate to understand responsibilities as lying only between states and 'citizens' (Barnes, 2021, p. 22).

However, incentivizing international governments to acknowledge their role in shaping human displacement, and respond to this displacement, would be challenging. I believe one avenue to explore in this regard is Canada's global reputation as a human rights defender (Human Rights Watch, 2019). Upholding this image may mean recognizing how displacing people through conditions of precarity is a violation of human rights, and therefore the immigration and settlement programs Canada develops can try to promote human rights by expanding family reunification limits and refugee resettlement options for starters.

Non-extractive and contextually relevant success

Following the principle of responsibility discussed in the previous section, I now turn to the renewal of the extractive lexicon found in the policy texts. As discussed in Chapter 6, the objectives of the provincial immigration agreements are to recruit and utilize immigrants as workers, to fill a population gap, or both. They also state that each

province and the federal government have a mutual interest in maximizing immigrant contributions, with the federal texts saying that immigrants will ultimately ‘benefit’ Canada once they are successfully settled. In Chapter 6, I discussed how the true meaning of this success in the texts is economic success, self-sufficiency, and independence. This language sees immigration and settlement through a business lens, with humans reduced to a resource that can be maximized to its fullest potential. To be clear, employment is understandably at the top of some newcomers’ settlement priorities (Türegün et al., 2019, p. 2) and so it can be an important indicator of success for newcomers. However, I argue that the extractive lexicon found within the policy texts foregrounds employment as the most important marker for immigrant success, which the IRCC Settlement Outcomes Report showed had negative impacts. For example, as discussed in Chapter 6, IRCC’s report revealed that Syrian refugee women who used settlement employment services were often pushed into low-wage and precarious work, and immigrant women in general often had more unpaid ‘work’ experiences than men did. Part of a care ethics renewal that prioritizes responsibility includes the concept of responsiveness. This is because, in immigration and settlement policies, the people directly affected by policy choices – migrants, especially those without a permanent legal status – are not generally included in the decision-making process. Tronto (1995) writes that processes of responsiveness can create a shift in what counts as knowledge in making political judgements. The experiences of Syrian refugee women in the IRCC report demonstrate a clear example of how a lack of responsiveness by settlement sector agencies caused by narrow outcomes-focused approaches can cause harm to those who are receiving care. Settlement policies that are explicit about understanding how refugee women experience care would mean

that people in positions to provide care, whether through direct service or decision-making (settlement workers, policy makers, etc.) meaningfully consider the vulnerability of their situations and give space for their voices to articulate this vulnerability. Pressures to find employment, send home remittances, bring over loved ones, or care for children and other family members, can affect how refugee women experience care compared to others. Refugee women, like all people, are embedded in relationships with others and these relationships affect the opportunities and motivations that they navigate in their lives. Therefore, when the relationship between immigrants and the provinces, or federal government, is not preoccupied with extracting economic benefits, other, sometimes more important considerations may become clear. This may also lead to a more expansive understanding of what successfully settled immigrants look like.

How can these understandings be concretized? There are two ways I have identified in which ethics of care can be given effect in these policy texts. The first is through the conception of success. IRCC's report states that they want to refine the definition of success which may involve newcomers defining their own success. This could account for a variety of positive outcomes that are currently not necessarily captured in the outcomes-driven approach of the Settlement Program (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2021; Liu & Guo, 2023b, 2023a). In Türegün et. al's (2019)'s study on immigrant settlement in Ontario, one service provider's vision for success discussed a variety of relevant outcomes:

“I don't think I can define success for settlement because I think that varies with each individual. I would define success for settlement as when they say that they feel active, productive, connected, accepted, able to earn a living for themselves and their family and live without fear in their community. But I cannot define how will it be for each person, each one of them will have different ways in that they feel that I cannot define it as a generic statement” (p. 5).

This kind of contextually sensitive approach to envisioning success is well-within the reach of policymakers to access through incorporation of settlement workers' perspectives and of course those of immigrants themselves. On an individual level, capturing ideas about success could include settlement sector organizations disseminating surveys that ask about things such as feeling productive, connected, accepted, capable of handling challenges, etc. On a macro level concerning policy texts, we can look to Manitoba's Settlement Annex (2003) language as a model for reconceptualizing success. Instead of trying to foster 'self-reliance', 'personal-commitment' or 'self-sufficiency' as soon as possible, the objectives could look like 'community-belonging' or 'equitable engagement in social, cultural and economic endeavours'. As I stated previously, incorporating immigrants' and settlement workers' experiences as political knowledge opens up a host of possibilities for understanding what success means in practice.

Second, caregiving arrangements and support services could be foregrounded in settlement policies through a care ethics lens, and therefore be more contextually sensitive to the needs and experiences of immigrant women, as discussed in Chapter 6. The 'self-sufficient' immigrant who does not need transportation or childcare, for example, would not be upheld as the ideal immigrant. Instead, immigrants embedded in family and community relationships with responsibilities and commitments to other people would be seen as the norm. As Sevenhuijsen (1998) writes, the "opportunity to provide care should be included in the economic arrangements and social policies which structure people's life-plans" (Sevenhuijsen, 1998, p. 142). Through this lens, core program delivery and core funding arrangements would include services to support and value interdependency. This would work to resolve the findings in the IRCC Settlement

Outcomes Report that childcare and support services were underfunded and inadequate to support immigrant women's needs. Ultimately, an ethics of care would center the supports that immigrant women need by creating programming that recognizes relations, responsibility, and networks of kinship as normal human activities that should be nurtured.

In conclusion, the integration of an ethics of care into the neoliberal normative framework of immigration and settlement policies offers a transformative lens for redefining success, challenging exclusionary eligibility criteria, and integrating caregiving arrangements in policies and programs. These potential changes based on care ethics still align with the nation-building goals of the provincial governments and the federal government, while at the same time more realistically attend to the complexity of immigrant's daily lives and experiences.

CHAPTER 8 – CONCLUSION

The research question guiding this thesis is: *How is care conceptualized in immigration and settlement policies in Manitoba, Nova Scotia and Ontario?* To answer my question, my thesis had two central aims: to uncover the normative frameworks underpinning immigration and settlement policy texts and to analyze this framework against an ethic of care. I analyzed each provincial-federal immigration agreement, and other relevant texts, such as government reports and Speeches from the Throne between 2015-2019 to further contextualize the policies. Using the *Trace* method of normative policy analysis, I found that a neoliberal normative framework underpinned all of the policy texts, provincial and federal. In Chapter 4, I engaged with the existing scholarly literature on neoliberalism in Canadian immigration policy at the federal level and drew out the tensions with care ethics. With these federal trends in mind, I discussed the case studies and their process of federalization in Chapter 5. Each case study's history and modes of provincial intervention on immigration were quite different but were similar in that political elites mobilized action on immigration and there was a consensus among different political parties on the importance of immigration. I hypothesized that Manitoba and Nova Scotia may have more expansive, and well-rounded, approaches to settlement because their modes of intervention are more focused on attracting immigrants to stay in the province than Ontario's. In Chapter 6, I found that the neoliberal normative framework discussed in relation to federal policy permeated all of the provincial policy texts. This framework was not conducive to the more expansive and well-rounded vision of settlement I had hypothesized for Nova Scotia and Manitoba and seemed to be counterproductive to their goals of retaining immigrants. I also found that, generally, 1)

each province reduced immigrants as tools for nation-building problems, and 2) independence through economic participation and self-sufficiency was the key marker of success as well as indicative of the underlying conception of human nature that informed the ontological assumptions of the policy framework. On the federal level, the IRCC Settlement Outcomes Report conceptualized care in relation to caregiving and gender, articulating it as both a burden on immigrant women and a necessity for the economy. It also demonstrated some promising indications of care ethics principles, recognizing the importance of self-determining the concept of success for immigrants by taking into account their voices and perspectives in the articulation of the concept.

As discussed in Chapter 3, there were some limitations to this research project. First, there was a limited number of texts during the 2015-2019 period to analyze. Second, the scope of my project was at times challenging for a single researcher using *Trace*, given that Sevenhuijsen recommends undertaking *Trace* as a group. I found that the method could be challenging to implement because of the length of time it requires to do it comprehensively, as well as the required background knowledge of care ethics theory, which again is likely because it is recommended to undertake *Trace* as a group. On a conceptual level, because there were a few limitations to the documents I could analyze, this research does not offer an exhaustive overview of how care is conceptualized in each provincial context, nor in the federal context itself. However, the provincial-federal immigration agreements form the basis for immigration policy in each province, and the Settlement Program and Logic Model are the basis on which settlement programming is administered and therefore are widely influential documents on the immigration and settlement landscapes in their respective jurisdictions. This research

offers a partial view of the serious limitations of the neoliberal normative framework, and how care is conceptualized and articulated in each province.

This thesis provides numerous examples of where and how care ethics can be applied to the policy texts to create more responsive and contextually sensitive immigration and settlement policies. As such, there are several avenues for future research. First, a single provincial case study could provide deeper insights into provincial attitudes towards immigrants and care, as more documents over a longer period of time could be traced. Second, an analysis of the post-COVID-19 immigration and settlement literature could investigate how, and if, care was transformed in the wake of major societal and political changes. Third, conducting interviews with settlement workers, immigrants, or even policymakers could reveal important insights not captured in policy frameworks. This kind of study would align very well with an ethic of care as the actual practice of caring could be uncovered and may prove quite different from how it is formally conceptualized in policy documents. Overall, this research contributes to a new and growing body of scholarship that seeks to center care concerns in policy realms not usually associated with caring. It also provides a jumping-off point for the development of further work grounded in a care ethics analyses using *Trace*, especially in immigration and settlement, and contributes to Sevenhuijsen's (2004) emphasis on the method's continuous construction and adaptability to different contexts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbas, S. (2022). Balancing Resettlement, Protection and Rapport on the Frontline: Delivering the Resettlement Assistance Program during COVID-19. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 38(1), 78–87. <https://doi.org/10.25071/1920-7336.40847>
- Abu-Laban, Y., & Gabriel, C. (2002). *Selling Diversity: Immigration Multiculturalism, Employment Equity, and Globalization*. University of Toronto Press.
- Abu-Laban, Y., Tungohan, E., & Gabriel, C. (2023). *Containing diversity: Canada and the politics of immigration in the 21st century*. University of Toronto Press.
- Arat-Koc, S. (1999). Neo-liberalism, State Restructuring and Immigration: Changes in Canadian Policies in the 1990s. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 34(2), 31–56. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcs.34.2.31>
- Arya, N., Redditt, V. J., Talavlikar, R., Holland, T., Brindamour, M., Wright, V., Saad, A., Beukeboom, C., Coakley, A., Rashid, M., & Pottie, K. (2021). Caring for refugees and newcomers in the post-COVID-19 era: Evidence review and guidance for FPs and health providers. *Canadian Family Physician*, 67(8), 575–581. <https://doi.org/10.46747/cfp.6708575>
- Ashton, W., Pettigrew, R., Galatsanou, E., & Wilkinson, L. (2015). *Immigration Settlement Services and Gaps in Citizenship and Immigration Canada's Western Region: Manitoba Provincial Report*. Immigration Research West and Rural Development Institute. <https://www.brandonu.ca/rdi/files/2015/09/Manitoba-Provincial-Report.pdf>
- Auditor General of Ontario. (2017). *2017 Annual Report: Chapter 2.13: Settlement and Integration Services for Newcomers*. <https://www.auditor.on.ca/en/content/annualreports/arbyyear/ar2017.html>
- Bahn, K., Cohen, J., & Van Der Meulen Rodgers, Y. (2020). A feminist perspective on COVID-19 and the value of care work globally. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 27(5), 695–699. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12459>
- Banerjee, R., Kelly, P., Tungohan, E., Cleto, P., de Leon, C., Garcia, M., Luciano, M., Palmaria, C., & Sorio, C. (2018). From “Migrant” to “Citizen”: Labor Market Integration of Former Live-In Caregivers in Canada. *ILR Review*, 71(4), 908–936. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0019793918758301>

- Banting, K. (2012). Canada. In C. Joppke & L. Seidle (Eds.), *Immigrant Integration in Federal Countries* (pp. 79–113). MQUP.
- Barnes, M. (2011). Abandoning Care? A Critical Perspective on Personalisation from an Ethic of Care. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 5(2), 153–167.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2010.484265>
- Barnes, M. (2012). *Care in everyday life: An ethic of care in practice* (1st ed.). Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt9qgvc9>
- Bascaramurty, D. (2017). *Canada aims for immigration boost to buttress economy as population ages*. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/canada-to-admit-40000-more-immigrants-a-year-by-2020-under-liberals-new-three-year-plan/article36800775/>
- Bauder, H. (2005). *Labor movement: How migration regulates labor markets*. Oxford University Press.
- Bauder, H. (2008). The Economic Case for Immigration: Neoliberal and Regulatory Paradigms in Canada's Press. *Studies in Political Economy*, 82(1), 131–152.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19187033.2008.11675067>
- Bhuyan, R., Jeyapal, D., Ku, J., Sakamoto, I., & Chou, E. (2017). Branding 'Canadian Experience' in Immigration Policy: Nation Building in a Neoliberal Era. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 18(1), 47–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-015-0467-4>
- Billingsley, B. L. (2016). Racialized and Classed Contexts: Shifting Audiences and Changes in Emotional Labor Among Restaurant Servers. *Sociological Inquiry*, 86(4), 641–657. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12135>
- Bond-Taylor, S. (2017). Tracing an Ethic of Care in the Policy and Practice of the Troubled Families Programme. *Social Policy and Society*, 16(1), 131–141.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746416000439>
- Boston, J., Bradstock, A., & Eng, D. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Public policy: Why ethics matters*. ANU E Press, The Australian National University.
- Braun, J., & Clément, D. (2018). *Immigrant and Refugee Settlement in Canada*. University of Alberta.

- Burstein, M. (2010). *Reconfiguring Settlement and Integration: A Service Provider Strategy for Innovation and Results*. Canadian Immigrant Sector Alliance.
- Bushell, R., & Shields, J. (2018). *Immigrant Settlement Agencies in Canada: A Critical Review of the Literature through the Lens of Resilience*. Ryerson University. <https://bmrc-irmu.info.yorku.ca/files/2018/10/ISAs-A-Critical-Review-2018-JSRB-edits-Oct-9-2018.pdf>
- Campbell, R. M., Klei, A. G., Hodges, B. D., Fisman, D., & Kitto, S. (2014). A Comparison of Health Access Between Permanent Residents, Undocumented Immigrants and Refugee Claimants in Toronto, Canada. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 16(1), 165–176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-012-9740-1>
- Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. (2016). *Stronger Together: Nova Scotia Alternative Budget 2016*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - Nova Scotia. <https://policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/Nova%20Scotia%20Office/2015/12/Alternative%20Provincial%20Budget%202016.pdf>
- Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. (2017). *Building Inclusive, Green, Thriving Communities: Nova Scotia Alternative Budget 2017*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - Nova Scotia. https://policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/Nova%20Scotia%20Office/2017/04/NS_Alt_Budget_2017.pdf
- Canadian Council for Refugees. (2000). *Canadian National Settlement Standards Framework*. <https://ccrweb.ca/sites/ccrweb.ca/files/static-files/standards.htm>
- Canadian Council for Refugees. (2018a). *Evaluating Migrant Worker Rights in Canada*. https://ccrweb.ca/sites/ccrweb.ca/files/reportcards_complete_en.pdf
- Canadian Council for Refugees. (2018b). *Provincial Report Card: Manitoba*. https://ccrweb.ca/sites/ccrweb.ca/files/mb_reportcards_en.pdf
- Canadian Council for Refugees. (2018c). *Provincial Report Card: Nova Scotia*. https://ccrweb.ca/sites/ccrweb.ca/files/ns_reportcards_en.pdf
- Caregivers Action Centre, Caregiver Connections Education and Support Organization, Eto Tayong Caregivers, GABRIELA Ontario, Migrant Workers Alliance for Change, Migrante Ontario, & Vancouver Committee for Domestic Workers and Caregivers Rights. (2018). *Permanent Status on Landing: Real reform for Caregivers*. https://www.migrantworkersalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Caregiver-Reform-Submissions_April-2018.pdf

- Carter, T., Clement, G., & Vineberg, R. (2014). Manitoba's Experience with Settlement Programming and Delivery (1999-2013). *Canadian Diversity*, 11(1), 60.
- Caulford, P. (2006). Providing health care to medically uninsured immigrants and refugees. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 174(9), 1253–1254. <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.051206>
- CBC News. (2019). *\$3.1M from provincial nominee fees going to newcomer support programs*. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/manitoba-newcomer-provincial-nominee-1.5095996>
- Chang, G. (2004). From the Third World to the “Third World Within”: Asian Women Workers Fighting Globalization. In G. G. Gonzalez, R. Fernandez, V. Price, D. Smith, & L. Trinh Võ (Eds.), *Labor Versus Empire* (1st ed., pp. 195–211). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203327180-14>
- Chase, L. E., Cleveland, J., Beatson, J., & Rousseau, C. (2017). The gap between entitlement and access to healthcare: An analysis of “candidacy” in the help-seeking trajectories of asylum seekers in Montreal. *Social Science & Medicine*, 182, 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.03.038>
- Chekki, D. (2006). *Immigrant and refugee serving organizations in a Canadian city: An exploratory study*. Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration.
- Clark Miller, S. (2010). Cosmopolitan Care. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 4(2), 145–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2010.484258>
- Collins, S. (2015). *The Core of Care Ethics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cottrell, B., Dobrowolsky, A. Z., & Tastsoglou, E. (Eds.). (2015). *The Warmth of the Welcome: Is Atlantic Canada a Home Away from Home for Immigrants?* Cape Breton University Press.
- Daly, M. (2022). COVID-19, Social Policy and Care: A Complex Set of Processes and Outcomes. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 6, 808239. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2021.808239>
- Delgado Wise, R., & Veltmeyer, H. (2016). *Agrarian change, migration and development*. Fernwood Publishing.

- Dobrowolsky, A. (1998). Of “Special Interest”: Interest, Identity and Feminist Constitutional Activism in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 31(4), 707–742. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423900009616>
- Dobrowolsky, A. (2011). The Intended and Unintended Effects of a New Immigration Strategy: Insights From Nova Scotia’s Provincial Nominee Program. *Studies in Political Economy*, 87(1), 109–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19187033.2011.11675022>
- Dobrowolsky, A. (2012). Nuancing Neoliberalism: Lessons Learned from a Failed Immigration Experiment. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-012-0234-8>
- Dobrowolsky, A., & Ramos, H. (2014). *Expanding the Vision: Why Nova Scotia Should Look Beyond Econocentric Immigration Policy*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - Nova Scotia.
- Duguay, A. L. (2012). “The School of Life”: Differences in U.S. and Canadian Settlement Policies and Their Effect on Individual Haitian Immigrants’ Language Learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(2), 306–333. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.23>
- Ellermann, A. (2020). Human-capital citizenship and the changing logic of immigrant admissions. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(12), 2515–2532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1561062>
- Elson, D. (1998). The economic, the political and the domestic: Businesses, states and households in the organisation of production. *New Political Economy*, 3(2), 189–208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13563469808406349>
- Esses, V., McRae, J., Alboim, N., Brown, N., Friesen, C., Hamilton, L., Lacassagne, A., Macklin, A., & Walton-Roberts, M. (2021). Supporting Canada’s COVID-19 resilience and recovery through robust immigration policy and programs. *FACETS*, 6(1), 686–759. <https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2021-0014>
- Fernandez, L., & MacKinnon, S. (2019). *The Pallister government shifts into high gear: Explaining the transition from “regressive” incrementalism to more sweeping social, economic and energy policy reforms*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. <https://policyalternatives.ca/publications/monitor/pallister-government-shifts-high-gear>

- FitzGerald, M. (2020). Reimagining Government with the Ethics of Care: A Department of Care. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 14(3), 248–265.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2020.1746819>
- Francisco-Menchavez, V. (2018). *The Labor of Care: Filipina Migrants and Transnational Families in the Digital Age*. University of Illinois Press.
- Gabriel, C. (2014). Migration and Globalized Care Work: The Case of Internationally Educated Nurses in Canada. In R. Mahon & F. Robinson (Eds.), *Feminist Ethics and Social Politics: Toward a New Global Political Economy of Care*. UBC Press.
- Gagnon, A., & Larios, L. (2021). The Politicization of Immigration and Integration at the Subnational Level: Electoral Campaigns in Ontario and Quebec. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 54(3), 696–716.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423921000469>
- George, U. (2002). A needs-based model for settlement service delivery for newcomers to Canada. *International Social Work*, 45(4), 465–480.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00208728020450040501>
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Harvard University Press.
- Go, A. (2016). A Race-Based Analysis of Canada's Immigration Policy. In S. Pashang (Ed.), *Unsettled settlers: Barriers to integration* (3rd edition, pp. 15–31). De Sitter Publications.
- Government of Canada. (2019). *Settlement logic model*. Government of Canada.
<https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/corporate/partners-service-providers/funding/resources/settlement-logic-model.html>
- Government of Canada. (2022a). *Canada's response to the conflict in Syria*.
https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/issues_developpement-enjeux_developpement/response_conflict-reponse_conflits/crisis-crisis/conflict_syria-syrie.aspx?lang=eng
- Government of Canada. (2022b). *Cultural Diversity in Canada: The Social Construction of Racial Difference: 3. Changing Immigration Pattern and the Emergence of "Visible Minorities."* [https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/csj-sjc/jsp-sjp/rp02_8-dr02_8/p3.html#:~:text=Changes%20in%20immigration%20regulations%20in,\(P.C.%201967%2D1616\).](https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/csj-sjc/jsp-sjp/rp02_8-dr02_8/p3.html#:~:text=Changes%20in%20immigration%20regulations%20in,(P.C.%201967%2D1616).)

- Government of Canada. (2023a). *Economic Mobility Pathways Pilot*.
<https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/refugees/economic-mobility-pathways-pilot.html>
- Government of Canada. (2023b). *Immigrate through Express Entry*.
<https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/immigrate-canada/express-entry.html>
- Government of Manitoba. (2023). *MANITOBA GOVERNMENT ANNOUNCES MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC IMMIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT*.
<https://news.gov.mb.ca/news/index.html?item=60027&posted=2023-07-13>
- Government of Nova Scotia. (2016). *Speech from the Throne: Third Session of the 62nd General Assembly of the Nova Scotia Legislature*.
- Government of Nova Scotia. (2013). *Statement of Mandate*.
<https://novascotia.ca/neweconomy/statement-of-mandate.asp>
- Government of Nova Scotia. (2023). *NOVA SCOTIA QUARTERLY POPULATION ESTIMATES AS OF APRIL 1, 2023*.
https://novascotia.ca/finance/statistics/archive_news.asp?id=18999&dg=&df=&dt=0&dti=3
- Government of Ontario. (2012). *Ontario Developing “First-ever” Immigration Strategy: McGuinty Government Establishing An Expert Roundtable On Immigration* [https://news.ontario.ca/en/release/20409/ontario-developing-first-ever-immigration-strategy].
- Government of Ontario. (2023). *Ontario Demographic Quarterly: Highlights of second quarter*. <https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontario-demographic-quarterly-highlights-second-quarter>
- Halperin, S., & Heath, O. (2020). *Political research: Methods and practical skills* (Third edition). Oxford University Press.
- Hande, M. J., & Nourpanah, S. (2022). *Putting Continuity in Continuing Care: Reimagining the Role of Immigration in the Recruitment and Retention of Healthcare Workers in Nova Scotia*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - Nova Scotia.
<https://policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/Nova%20Scotia%20Office/2022/01/Puttingcontinuityincontinuingcare.pdf>

- Hankivsky, O. (2004). *Social Policy and the Ethic of Care*. UBC Press.
- Hankivsky, O. (2006). Imagining ethical globalization: The contributions of a care ethic. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 2(1), 91–110.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17449620600677338>
- Hankivsky, O. (2014). Rethinking Care Ethics: On the Promise and Potential of an Intersectional Analysis. *American Political Science Review*, 108(2), 252–264.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055414000094>
- Held, V. (2006). *The ethics of care: Personal, political, and global*. Oxford University Press.
- Helps, L., Silvius, R., & Gibson, R. (2020). *Supporting Newcomers and Migrants in Rural Canada During and After COVID-19*. Canadian Rural Revitalization Foundation. <https://km4s.ca/wp-content/uploads/Supporting-Newcomers-and-Migrants-in-Rural-Canada-During-and-After-COVID-19-2020.pdf>
- Hochschild, A. R., & Machung, A. (1990). *The second shift*. Avon books.
- Human Rights Watch. (2019). Canada: Events of 2019. In *World Report 2020*.
<https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2020/country-chapters/canada>
- Imbeau, L. M., Landry, R., Milner, H., Pétry, F., Crête, J., Forest, P.-G., & Lemieux, V. (2000). Comparative Provincial Policy Analysis: A Research Agenda. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 33(4), 779–804.
- Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. (2021). *First Biennial Settlement Outcomes Report*.
- Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. (2003, June 6). *ARCHIVED – Canada–Manitoba Immigration Agreement, June 2003, Annex A [Policies]*.
<https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/corporate/mandate/policies-operational-instructions-agreements/agreements/federal-provincial-territorial/manitoba/canada-manitoba-immigration-agreement-june-2003/annexa.html>

- Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. (2007, September 19). *Canada-Nova Scotia Co-operation on Immigration [Policies]*. <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/corporate/mandate/policies-operational-instructions-agreements/agreements/federal-provincial-territorial/nova-scotia/canada-nova-scotia-cooperation-immigration-2007.html>
- Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. (2017, November 23). *Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement – General Provisions 2017*. <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/corporate/mandate/policies-operational-instructions-agreements/agreements/federal-provincial-territorial/ontario/immigration-agreement-2017.html>
- Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. (2018). *Mandate—Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada*. <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/corporate/mandate.html>
- Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. (2020). *Government of Canada announces plan to support economic recovery through immigration*. <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/news/2020/10/government-of-canada-announces-plan-to-support-economic-recovery-through-immigration.html>
- Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. (2022). *An Immigration Plan to Grow the Economy*. <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/news/2022/11/an-immigration-plan-to-grow-the-economy.html>
- Jayaraman, S., & Bauder, H. (2013). *Niche Employment or Occupational Segmentation? Immigrant Women Working in the Settlement Sector in Germany and Canada*. Ryerson University.
- Jeram, S., & Nicolaidis, E. (2019). Intergovernmental relations on immigrant integration in Canada: Insights from Quebec, Manitoba, and Ontario. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 29(5), 613–633. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13597566.2018.1491841>
- Kennedy, J., Alcantara, C., & Armstrong, D. (2021). Do governments keep their promises? An analysis of speeches from the throne. *Governance*, 34(3), 917–934. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12548>
- Klaver, K., Elst, E. V., & Baart, A. J. (2014). Demarcation of the ethics of care as a discipline: Discussion article. *Nursing Ethics*, 21(7), 755–765. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969733013500162>

- Koo, J.-H., & Hanley, J. (2016). Migrant Live-In Caregivers: Control, Consensus, and Resistance in the Workplace and the Community. In A. Choudry & A. Smith (Eds.), *Unfree Labour?: Struggles of Migrant and Immigrant Workers in Canada*. PM Press.
- Laslett, B., & Brenner, J. (1989). Gender and Social Reproduction: Historical Perspectives. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15(1), 381–404.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.15.080189.002121>
- Lee, J.-A. (1999). Immigrant Women Workers in the Immigrant Settlement Sector. *Canadian Woman Studies/Les Cahiers De La Femme*, 19(3).
- Lionais, D., Murray, C., & Donatelli, C. (2020). Dependence on Interprovincial Migrant Labour in Atlantic Canadian Communities: The Role of the Alberta Economy. *Societies*, 10(1), 11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc10010011>
- Liu, J., & Guo, S. (2023a). Constructing workplace subjectivity: Exploring workplace learning of immigrant settlement workers in Canada. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2023.2222584>
- Liu, J., & Guo, S. (2023b). The making of ideal immigrant settlement workers: Examining the technologies of ruling power in Canadian immigrant service organisations. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 49(9), 2229–2246.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2022.2158791>
- López-Farjeat, L. X., & Coronado-Angulo, C. (2020). Group Asylum, Sovereignty, and the Ethics of Care. *Social Sciences*, 9(8), 142.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci9080142>
- Macklin, A. (1994). On The Inside Looking In: Foreign Domestic Workers in Canada. In W. M. Giles & S. Arat-Koç (Eds.), *Maid in the market: Women's paid domestic labour* (pp. 13–39). Fernwood Pub.
- Mahon, R., & Robinson, F. (Eds.). (2011). *Feminist ethics and social policy: Towards a new global political economy of care*. UBC Press.
- Manitoba Bureau of Statistics. (2023). *Demographic Estimates Quarterly: April 2023*.
https://www.gov.mb.ca/mbs/publications/mbs305_pop_bulletin_2023_m04.pdf
- McLaren, A. T., & Dyck, I. (2004). Mothering, human capital, and the “ideal immigrant.” *Women's Studies International Forum*, 27(1), 41–53.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2003.12.009>

- Meyer, C., & Syed, F. (2018). *Federal Immigration Minister Ahmed Hussen wants Doug Ford's Ontario to continue working with Ottawa* [Canada's National Observer]. <https://www.nationalobserver.com/2018/07/05/news/federal-immigration-minister-ahmed-hussen-wants-doug-fords-ontario-continue-working>
- Migrant Workers Alliance for Change. (2019). *Temporary Foreign Workers Program in Canada Migrant Worker Priorities 2019*. https://migrantworkersalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Final_-Migrant-Worker-Policy-Priorities-May-2019.pdf
- Mukhtar, M., Dean, J., Wilson, K., Ghassemi, E., & Wilson, D. H. (2016). "But Many of These Problems are About Funds...": The Challenges Immigrant Settlement Agencies (ISAs) Encounter in a Suburban Setting in Ontario, Canada. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 17(2), 389–408. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-015-0421-5>
- Murphy, M. F. (2017). The ethics of care and the Newfoundland Paid Family Caregiver Program: An assessment. *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, 77(77), 1–16.
- Murray, C., Skelding, H. S., & Lionais, D. (2021). "He Never Wants to Leave. I Would Leave in a Second." Examining Perceptions of Rural Life and its Impact on Families who Migrate for Employment and Those who Stay Behind in Atlantic Canadian Communities. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 6, 578647. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2021.578647>
- Nasol, K., & Francisco-Menchavez, V. (2021). Filipino Home Care Workers: Invisible Frontline Workers in the COVID-19 Crisis in the United States. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 65(10), 1365–1383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642211000410>
- Nicholson, L., Hande, M. J., & Migrante Manitoba. (2023). *Justice for Im/Migrant Home Care Workers in Manitoba*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - Manitoba. <https://policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/Manitoba%20Office/2023/07/Justice%20for%20Im%3AMigrant%20Home%20Care%20Workers%20in%20Manitoba.pdf>
- Niraula, A., Triandafyllidou, A., & Akbar, M. (2022). Navigating Uncertainties: Evaluating the Shift in Canadian Immigration Policies during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Canadian Public Policy*, 48(S1), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cpp.2022-010>
- Nova Scotia Department of Labour, Skills and Immigration. (2022). *Settlement Services Research & Review | Phase II*. <https://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/23911265/departement-of-labour-skills-and-immigration-settlement-services-research-review-phase-ii.pdf>

- Office of the Prime Minister. (2015). *Diversity is Canada's Strength*.
<https://www.pm.gc.ca/en/news/speeches/2015/11/26/diversity-canadas-strength>
- Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants. (2015). *Gatherings and other such things—Executive Director's Message*. <https://ocasi.org/gatherings-and-other-such-things>
- Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants. (2022). *Show Us The Money*.
<https://ocasi.org/show-us-money>
- Papademetriou, D. G., & Sumption, M. (2011). *Rethinking Points Systems and Employer Selected-Immigration*. Migration Policy Institute.
- Paquet, M. (2014). The Federalization of Immigration and Integration in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 47(3), 519–548.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423914000766>
- Paquet, M. (2019). *Province-building and the federalization of immigration in Canada* (H. Scott, Trans.). University of Toronto Press.
- Pashang, S. (Ed.). (2016). *Unsettled settlers: Barriers to integration* (Third). de Sitter.
- Power, K. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic has increased the care burden of women and families. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 16(1), 67–73.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2020.1776561>
- Ramos, H., & Yoshida, Y. (2015). From Away, But Here to Stay? Trends in Out-migration Among a Cohort of Recent Immigrants to Atlantic Canada. In B. Cottrell, A. Z. Dobrowolsky, & E. Tastsoglou (Eds.), *The Warmth of the Welcome: Is Atlantic Canada a Home Away from Home for Immigrants?* (pp. 37–60). Cape Breton University Press.
- Ramsay, G. (2020). Humanitarian exploits: Ordinary displacement and the political economy of the global refugee regime. *Critique of Anthropology*, 40(1), 3–27.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0308275X19840417>
- Richmond, T., & Shields, J. (2005). NGO-government relations and immigrant services: Contradictions and challenges. *Journal of International Migration and Integration / Revue de l'integration et de La Migration Internationale*, 6(3–4), 513–526. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-005-1024-3>

- Robinson, F. (2011). *The ethics of care: A feminist approach to human security*. Temple University Press.
- Root, J., Gates-Gasse, E., Shields, J., & Bauder, H. (2014). Discounting immigrant families: Neoliberalism and the framing of Canadian immigration policy change. *Ryerson Centre for Immigration & Settlement (RCIS) Working Paper No, 7*.
- Rummery, K., & Fine, M. (2012). Care: A Critical Review of Theory, Policy and Practice: Care: A Critical Review of Theory, Policy and Practice. *Social Policy & Administration, 46*(3), 321–343. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9515.2012.00845.x>
- Sadiq, K. (2004). *The Two-Tier Settlement System: A Review of Current Newcomer Settlement Services in Canada*. CERIS: The Ontario Metropolis Centre.
- Satzewich, V. (2016). *Points of Entry How Canada's Immigration Officers Decide Who Gets in* (Online-ausg). UBC Press.
- Saulnier, C., Sawler, J., & Nova Scotia Alternative Budget Working Group. (2023). *Nova Scotia Alternative Budget 2023: Leave No One Behind*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - Nova Scotia. <https://policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/Nova%20Scotia%20Office/2023/03/NSAB-2023Final.pdf>
- Schertzer, R. (2015). Intergovernmental Relations in Canada's Immigration System: From Bilateralism towards Multilateral Collaboration. *Canadian Journal of Political Science, 48*(2), 383–412. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000842391500027X>
- Seidle, L. (2010). *Intergovernmental immigration agreements and public accountability*. <https://policyoptions.irpp.org/magazines/immigration-jobs-and-canadas-future/intergovernmental-immigration-agreements-and-public-accountability/#:~:text=Under%20the%20Constitution%20Act%2C%201867,authority%20to%20legislate%20on%20immigration>
- Sevenhuijsen, S. (1998). *Citizenship and the Ethics of Care: Feminist Considerations on Justice, Morality, and Politics* (Gerhard Boomgaarden, Ed.). Taylor & Francis Group / Books.
- Sevenhuijsen, S. (2004). Trace: A Method for Normative Policy Analysis from the Ethic of Care. In S. Sevenhuijsen & A. Švab (Eds.), *The Heart of the Matter: The Contribution of the Ethic of Care to Social Policy in some new EU Member States* (pp. 13–46). Mirovini Institut.

- Shields, J., & Abu Alrob, Z. (2020). *COVID-19, Migration and the Canadian Immigration System: Dimensions, Impacts and Resilience*. York University. <https://km4s.ca/wp-content/uploads/COVID-19-Migration-and-the-Canadian-Immigration-System-Dimensions-Impact-and-Resilience-2020.pdf>
- Shields, J., Drolet, J., & Valenzuela, K. (2016). *Immigrant Settlement and Integration Services and the Role of Nonprofit Service Providers: A Cross-national Perspective on Trends, Issues and Evidence*.
- Simm, K. (2004). The Contested Site of Human Nature: Applying Trace to the Strategic Action Plan of the Estonian Ministry of Social Affairs, 2000-2010. In S. Sevenhuijsen & A. Švab (Eds.), *The Heart of the Matter: The Contribution of the Ethic of Care to Social Policy in some new EU Member States* (pp. 83–103). Mirovini Institut.
- Statistics Canada. (2022). *Immigrants make up the largest share of the population in over 150 years and continue to shape who we are as Canadians*. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/221026/dq221026a-eng.htm>
- Stensöta, H. O. (2015). Public Ethics of Care—A General Public Ethics. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 9(2), 183–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2015.1005551>
- Sullivan, M. J. (2016). Legalizing Parents and Other Caregivers: A Family Immigration Policy Guided by a Public Ethic of Care. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 23(2), 263–283. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxu026>
- Tannock, S. (2011). Points of Prejudice: Education-Based Discrimination in Canada's Immigration System. *Antipode*, 43(4), 1330–1356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2010.00864.x>
- Tastsoglou, E., Abidi, C. B., Brigham, S. M., & Lange, E. A. (2014). (En)Gendering Vulnerability: Immigrant Service Providers' Perceptions of Needs, Policies, and Practices Related to Gender and Women Refugee Claimants in Atlantic Canada. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 30(2), 67–78. <https://doi.org/10.25071/1920-7336.39620>
- The Canadian Press. (2018). *Canada to increase annual immigration admissions to 350,000 by 2021*. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/canada-immigration-increase-350000-1.4886546>
- The Canadian Press. (2019). *Cuts to Legal Aid Ontario will cause hearing delays, Immigration and Refugee Board warns*. CBC News. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/refugees-legal-aid-ontario-1.5213558>

- The Care Collective, Chatzidakis, A., Hakim, J., Littler, J., Rottenberg, C., & Segal, L. (Eds.). (2020). *The Care Manifesto: The Politics of Interdependence*. Verso Books.
- The Nova Scotia Commission on Building Our New Economy. (2014). *Now or Never: An Urgent Call to Action for Nova Scotians*.
- Tronto, J. C. (1993). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. Routledge.
- Tronto, J. C. (1995). Care as a Basis for Radical Political Judgments. *Hypatia*, 10(2), 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.1995.tb01376.x>
- Tronto, J. C. (2018). Care as a Political Concept. In N. J. Hirschmann & C. Di Stefano (Eds.), *Revisioning the political: Feminist reconstructions of traditional concepts in western political theory* (pp. 139–157). Routledge.
- Tungohan, E. (2019). Global care chains and the spectral histories of care migration. *International Journal of Care and Caring*, 3(2), 229–245. <https://doi.org/10.1332/239788218X15411704809877>
- Tungohan, E. (2023). *Care Activism: Migrant Domestic Workers, Movement-Building, and Communities of Care*. University of Illinois Press.
- Türegün, A. (2013). Immigrant Settlement Work in Canada: Limits and Possibilities for Professionalization: Immigrant Settlement Work in Canada. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne de Sociologie*, 50(4), 387–411. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cars.12025>
- Türegün, A., Bhuyan, R., Mandell, N., & Shields, J. (2019). *The Immigrant Settlement Ecosystem in Canada: An Ontario Case Study*. <https://ocasi.org/sites/default/files/iwys-primary-research-composite-final-report.pdf>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2023). *Global Refugee Statistics*. <https://www.unhcr.ca/in-canada/refugee-statistics/>
- Villegas, P. E., & Blower, J. (2019). “Part of Being Canadian Is Having Access to Healthcare”: Framing the Boundaries of Healthcare Deservingness for Non-Citizens through the Interim Federal Health Benefits Program. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 44(1), 69–88. <https://doi.org/10.22230/cjc.2019v44n1a3280>

- Walia, H. (2021). *Border and Rule: Global Migration, Capitalism and the Rise of Racist Nationalism*. Fernwood Publishing.
- Williams, F. (1989). *Social policy: A critical introduction: issues of race, gender, and class*. Polity Press ; Blackwell.
- Williams, F. (2021). *Social policy: A critical and intersectional analysis*. Polity Press.
- Young, R., & Tolley, E. (Eds.). (2011). *Immigrant settlement policy in Canadian municipalities*. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Zahid, S. (2021). *Immigration in the Time of COVID-19: Issues and Challenges*. Report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.
<https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/432/CIMM/Reports/RP11312743/cimmrp05/cimmrp05-e.pdf>
- Zhu, Y. (2016). Immigration Policy, Settlement Service, and Immigrant Mothers in Neoliberal Canada: A Feminist Analysis. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 48(2), 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2016.0017>