

Chapter 1 : The Most Popular Immigration Issues of

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Drawing inspiration from this British model is worrisome for the immigration portfolio. As political scientist Randall Hansen has described, the UK in the 20th century has long managed immigration using its nationality legislation. Migration management was set to become a priority under the Blair government. Decades after Australia did so, it introduced a points-based system for skilled migrants. In practice, the Home Office did not anticipate the large inflow of citizens from new members of the European Union in the s. This fuelled public concerns that eventually played a crucial role in Brexit. Immigration-related Home Office activities have been mired in enforcement issues. From the s to the s, asylum applications took years to process. More recently, European citizens aiming to apply for residency in the post-Brexit UK have faced a bureaucratic nightmare. This has been criticised by the EU. It has historically been inward-looking. This was a major strategic and economic goal at the time. In Australia, both the Department of Home Affairs and the Department of Immigration have co-existed over the years, with two exceptions. From the late s to , the former disappeared as its portfolio was handed to the Department of Justice and Customs. Then, in the early s, the Whitlam government abolished the Department of Immigration, because its administrative culture was considered to still reflect the White Australia policy, which had been effectively scrapped in . The Fraser government reinstated the Department of Immigration in , this time with a strong multicultural rationale. Home Affairs disappeared again in , while Immigration expanded to become the Department of Immigration and Border Protection. It was now mainly concerned with the admission or refusal of immigrants. Settlement and multicultural affairs were transferred to the Department of Human Services. The newest name change, and its close association with the British model by Turnbull, appears as a symbolic marginalisation of the immigration portfolio. The then home secretary, Theresa May, eventually split UKBA in two following the revelation that hundreds of thousands of people had entered the UK without the appropriate checks. Critical timing The creeping invisibility of the immigration portfolio comes as the government is overseeing major changes to immigration policy, and is increasingly using the rhetoric of putting Australians first. In April, the admission of skilled migrants was overhauled with the abolition of the visa. The government shortened the list of professions for which skilled foreign workers would be eligible for a four-year visa to Australia, and subsequently for permanent residence. A citizenship reform is before parliament. It significantly extends the time permanent residents must live in Australia before they can apply for citizenship. It also introduces more stringent English-language proficiency requirements. The legislation would require citizenship applicants to demonstrate their allegiance to Australia more strongly, with a pledge to Australian values and proof of integration. It has been written that, rather than encouraging integration, these changes could result in newcomers feeling more distanced from Australia. And prospective immigrants to Australia may justifiably fear the changes will cause confusion about division of responsibilities, or a further delay in processing times. Turnbull has promised the reform will involve strong oversight mechanisms. As Amy Maguire noted, Turnbull did not make any specific reference to the rights and liberties of non-citizens living in Australia.

Chapter 2 : Australia's new "Home Office" is a worry for immigration policy

*Immigration, the crunch issues for Australia (CEDA study) [Neville R Norman] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

By Reihana Mohideen The long-held image of Australia has been that of a sparsely populated country rich in resources. Sections of the environment movement argue that to achieve ecological sustainability in Australia, there have to be immediate measures to limit increases in population. The argument that the sheer growth in human numbers is destroying the planet is rooted in the biological concept of the carrying capacity of local environments. The term was originally used to refer to the population density of a given species that a natural habitat such as a fishery or grassland could sustain indefinitely. While populationists such as US academic Paul Ehrlich acknowledge that human beings, unlike other animals, are capable of significantly changing their living environment, they still argue that the carrying capacity concept is relevant to looking at a society at a given point in history. The problem, however, is that this concept does not give adequate weight to socioeconomic factors, such as land tenureship patterns and available technologies, that exert a major influence over the size of population that an agricultural region can support. Vast tracts of fertile land held by large landowners in north-eastern Pernambuco state lie idle, while peasants farm plots too small to feed themselves and their families. Overfarming small plots exhausts the soil, prompting increasing numbers of peasants to migrate to Amazonia to carve new farmland from the tropical forests. As this pattern continues, ever larger portions of forest are destroyed. There is a similar pattern in most other Third World countries, which supposedly have large "surplus" rural populations. Given fixed, highly inequitable social structures, virtually any size of population appears "too large" for its environment. Another central assumption of the carrying capacity thesis is that a given population should obtain most or all of its food and natural resources from its local environment by ecologically sustainable methods. This notion is archaic even so far as national economies are concerned, and is still more so when the vast, interdependent world economy is considered. No human population, except for a few isolated indigenous tribes, depends entirely on its local environment to meet all its needs. A range of commodities are universally traded. It may make good economic sense to attempt to meet most basic food needs from local sources "thus assuring uninterrupted supply, lower transportation costs and so forth. But failure to do so does not prove that a region or country is overpopulated. Japan is an obvious example of an advanced economy relying heavily on world markets to meet its food and resource needs. While the assumption that poverty is a product of overpopulation may hold sway in popular consciousness, and is actively peddled by the governments of the Western capitalist nations, there is plenty of evidence to show otherwise. China has only half as much cropped land per person as India, yet Indians suffer widespread hunger while the Chinese do not. This is because both Cuba and China have, to varying degrees, addressed the socioeconomic roots of the causes of poverty and have opened opportunities to women outside the home. In a report on Our Common Future, the UN World Commission on Environment and Development reached the conclusion that "Growth in world cereal production has steadily outstripped world population growth" and that the problem of hunger flowed from the unequal access to resources. Moreover, in Third World countries where population growth has been reduced, there is no evidence of a corresponding reduction in poverty. One of the most universally observed social phenomena of modern times is the fact that low birth and death rates are results of urbanisation, adequate nutrition, improved health, education and social services and a higher social status for women, all of which accompany industrialisation. The inability of most Third World countries to achieve such development is a result of the imposition, through colonialism and postwar neo-colonialism, of a pattern of development that treats these countries as sources of cheap labour, natural resources, markets and profits for monopoly corporations of the industrialised countries. Putting population at the centre of an analysis of environmental destruction diverts attention from the socioeconomic framework in damage has arisen. The population theory is more than simply wrong. The idea that there are too many people in the world and that it would be good if there were fewer tends to devalue human life. Our world appears to be blighted by a "plague" of people, tolerance ebbs, and we confront one another with the fear and hostility of

survivalists. Hence they argue that migration to the "first world" must be reduced if immigrants are from the poorer countries. In their book *The Population Explosion*, the Ehrlichs state: Net immigration to rich countries is the rough equivalent of natural population increase in those nations. Similar views have been articulated in Australia by a range of different groups. This includes some with openly racist motives, such as *Australians Against Immigration*, but also involves others whose concerns are environmental, such as *Australians for an Ecologically Sustainable Population* and *Writers for an Ecologically Sustainable Population*. Sections of the *Australian Conservation Foundation* and the *Australian Democrats* also support this view. How many people can the continent support? There is no generally accepted scientific answer – precisely because the question is primarily social, not scientific. A simple assertion that Australia is already overpopulated in environmental terms is not convincing in a country which is one of the least densely populated countries on earth, with a population density of 22 people per thousand hectares. For the world as a whole, the corresponding figure is , while the averages for Europe and the United States are and respectively and for South America aggregate figures alone suggests that Australia is a vast "underpopulated" nation. Admittedly, large areas of Australia cannot support more than a very sparse population with any foreseeable technologies. This is one of the reasons that Australia is one of the most highly urbanised of all societies. According to figures about The average European figure is On the basis of these figures, if population were a principal problem for the environment, then the main environmental problems in Australia would be related to the urban environment. But some of the major ecological problems are non-urban: The link between population growth and these ecological problems is by no means a simple and direct one. It might be thought, for example, that soil erosion is a product of producing food for too many Australians. The state of the land resource base in Australia is largely determined by the overseas market, not by immigration and the consequent size of the Australian population. Moreover, soil degradation is directly related to fossil-fuel-based agricultural techniques, which are heavily dependent on manufactured chemicals. The cost of replacing nutrients is estimated to be, in a number of cases, well in excess of the short-term productive value of the land. In an agricultural economy oriented to profit rather than social needs, the imperative is to continue to produce in this destructive fashion. Therefore to simply equate soil degradation with population is to ignore the real nature of the problem. There are far more important technological, economic and other social factors that should be taken into account. This is true of virtually all environmental problems. In the area of non-renewable resources, Australian oil reserves are expected to be exhausted by the year But what about solar power? Vested interests in fossil fuels. The big oil companies, and the governments which back them, prevent adequate resources being allocated for solar energy research. A standard argument against solar energy is that its "commercial efficiency" is low. But the social overheads of acid rain, polluted farms and livestock, poisoned lakes and rivers and productive areas laid waste are not costed into the use of fossil fuels. Again, the problem is one of social relations, not too many people. It is highly unlikely that population growth in Australia will have a major international environmental impact: Migration distributes, rather than adding to, an increase in world population. Neither will we solve the environmental crisis by cutting ourselves off from it – there is no escaping from the greenhouse effect and the depletion of the ozone layer into a zero population growth nirvana. And if you adopt such an approach, where do you draw the line? Why limit it to Australia? Why not retreat even further, say into Tasmania? That may sound like unfair caricature – but some in the green movement actually put forward this bizarre option. An article in the September issue of the *Daily Planet*, the newsletter of the *Tasmanian Green Independents*, argues that Tasmanian population growth should be discouraged "by discouraging immigration by keeping Tasmanian incomes lower than the rest of the nation Secession from the Commonwealth is another possibility to allow Tasmania to establish immigration controls. An anti-immigration position also has serious consequences for such basic democratic rights, as the right to live where one chooses. But having that formal right is nevertheless important. The question is also posed: Should Australians be allowed to emigrate to other countries with higher population densities, such as the USA, Britain and Europe? Finally, green opponents of immigration must come to terms with the fact that their positions give a legitimacy, from a more progressive sector of politics, to the racist anti-immigration viewpoint. Racism and anti-Asian xenophobia have characterised Australian history from the beginnings of the modern Australian nation based on the brutal

suppression and dispossession of the Aboriginal peoples. For over years, until it was formally buried in , the white Australia policy was the basic tenet of immigration policy. Racism, prejudice and xenophobia still persist in contemporary Australia. Recent events in France and Germany, where racist violence against migrants is on the increase, sound a warning for us in this country. To blame immigration for a complex problem like the environment has the same logic as blaming it for other problems: It is hard to prevent a slide from an anti-immigration to an anti-immigrant argument. A progressive green position is not a matter of advocating immigration, but of supporting a non-discriminatory and humanitarian immigration policy. Any movement that claims to put forward a new politics must campaign strongly against all antisocial views: Most importantly, what would characterise a new politics in the West would be support for Third World political movements that aim to empower the mass of the dispossessed and take measures to genuinely improve their living standards. Current issue Become a supporter.

Chapter 3 : The Crunch by Ethan and Patrick on Apple Podcasts

Australia's humanitarian program Since , when the first federal immigration portfolio was established to administer Australia's post-war migration program, million people have settled hereâ€”including over , refugees and other humanitarian entrants.

War and violent conflict are mentioned in just eight of ninety articles in all three newspapers, a very low figure when compared with the thirty-seven articles discussing the relatively minor issue of asylum seeker accommodation. Macro issues that might embarrass powerful state-corporate interests are also ignored or neglected. Two major examples include the impacts of the arms trade and economic trade liberalisation. The former receives no mention at all, while the latter is hinted at indirectly in one piece in the Guardian. The majority of articles that discussed human rights as a theme covered the same issue, about UK considering withdrawing from the European Convention on Human Rights in order to justify the exclusion of certain asylum seekers. Yet, while a human rights issue, it is placed in the context of exclusion policies and bogus asylum applicants. This limits to just three articles any mention of human rights abuses in the country of origin â€” abuses that might have caused the original application to be made, and which cast a far less negative light on the subject of asylum and immigration. In looking at the media coverage, an interesting observation was made: An interesting, perhaps ironic, footnote to the thematic results involves the eight references made to media coverage. Both the Guardian and the Independent provide a number of articles denouncing what they describe as the essentially racist coverage of tabloid and right-wing newspapers, including the third news outlet in this case study, the Daily Telegraph. The latter does not follow this theme and has no articles mentioning media coverage. Matthew Randall, *Asylum and Immigration; Comparing the Daily Telegraph, The Guardian and The Independent*, Media Lens, December 8, While a full third of the case studies afforded view points from non-governmental organizations NGOs politicians being afforded the most coverage giving the sense of balance, Randall notes that, a closer analysis shows that politicians remain overwhelmingly the agenda-setters in these articles with NGO representatives very seldom initiating the subject of the news item. Their role is very much confined to reaction and comment. This general trend reveals how view points representing those who have influence are the ones that typically make it into mainstream discourse. Analysis of media sourcing demonstrates that UK newsgathering has a strong symbiotic relationship with political elites ensuring that a substantial number of articles are formed around government press releases and statements of policy. Groups without recourse to large public relations resources â€” such as asylum seekers, refugees and the predominantly small NGOs that represent them â€” tend not to set the agenda for issues under discussion. We therefore get a strange situation whereby ideologically distinct newspapers focus on aspects of immigration and asylum that concur with the priorities of the political elite The significant avoidance and omission of important themes and issues that should form regular and central points of reference leads to a support of an agenda of the political elite, even if that is not the intention. Opinions reflect hype â€” especially during election time Almost a year and a half since the above was written, the hype has remained. And as the British elections have drawn closer, the issue of immigration and asylum has been one of the issues discussed out of an extremely small number of issues, it has to be added. Just 21 of them were allowed to claim benefits 0. But targeted screening at Heathrow airport found just cases in , tests in 0. The British Medical Association said it has seen no evidence of a health tourism phenomenon. For a long time, but increasingly during election times, spear-headed by right-wing parties such as the Conservatives and tabloid media, scares of immigration being out of control are returning. For sure, there have been isolated incidents that cause much concern, such as the recent case of a failed asylum seeker killing a police officer and conspiring to create the deadly poison ricin though it seems police foiled that in time. However, using terrorism to add to the asylum and immigration hysteria just creates more fear and animosity. In effect, it also suggests that almost all especially brown-skinned asylum seekers and immigrants are potential terrorists. It has even got to the point where I know some fellow Asians in UK who also say that immigration is out of control, though they talk not of people from their own ethnicities and backgrounds of course, but of others. These other problems not only

affect British people, but also have a significant impact on other parts of the world. Notably, there has almost been nothing discussed on these other issues during the same election campaign, in either a national or international context. Instead, immigration has been publicized as a more important issue.

Back to top

United Europe

The European Union has had policies to control immigration from non-member countries. Spain for example seems to be facing a larger number of immigrants from Morocco and other North African countries where people want to escape their politically conflict-torn countries and seek a better standard of living in Europe. However, many people are dying trying to achieve this. The preceding paragraph was written some 8 years ago, in September, similar issues still exist. Inter Press Service reports on many issues continuing today. For example, Spain recently threatened to deport illegal immigrants residing within its borders. In addition, The British government says it is considering restricting access to nationals of Bulgaria and Romania "if and when the two countries gain admission to the EU. As the European Union has grown, it is common to hear concerns in UK for example, at the rising number of people from East Europe. The fear is the threat to job security and downward pressure on wages, which are understandable concerns. The underlying context of what makes this possible "the corporate drive for a more open, free market system within the EU, that will see winners and losers, and that also tends towards the lowest common denominators" is hardly discussed. At the same time, Western Europe is now more inclined to hire Eastern Europeans both for skilled and unskilled jobs than Asians and Africans. Some human rights activists say that the European restrictions need to be modified or African nations need to overcome their under-development in order to alleviate some of these problems.

Back to top

Economics, Poverty and Immigrant Scapegoats

It is generally believed that those immigrants who have had the courage to leave one country and move to another are often enterprising and entrepreneurial, even if poor. As such, in many countries, immigrants often set up small businesses. They however, become easy targets when the general economic conditions in that host country worsen. In other cases, people become immigrants because they have fled worsening conditions or persecution. In that situation, although they may live in another country, it may initially be quite difficult to adapt and change practices and customs. In such situations immigrants are clearly seen as different and in worsening economic times can be seen as sapping away resources that could otherwise have been used for local populations. In the 60s and 70s, Indian and Pakistani immigrants in the UK for example faced constant racist harassment and jokes about their small businesses. Many Indian and Pakistani communities escaping turmoil in East Africa were technically allowed to come to the UK but very quickly local populations became concerned and held numerous protests. While these communities have managed to weather this and many are now quite successful, the new wave of immigrants, Polish in particular it seems, face a new wave of hostility. During the global financial crisis at the end of the 2000s, East Asia was particularly affected. This resulted in a wave of anti immigrant sentiments, for example in Indonesia there was a wave of violence against Chinese immigrants. In May 2008, South Africa saw a wave of anti immigrant violence, as extremely poor South Africans turned against thousands of immigrants from other parts of Africa, killing some 50, and forcing thousands to leave. In these and many other situations not mentioned here, anti-immigrant sentiment typically comes to the fore when economic conditions deteriorate. They are an easy target and either lies or exaggerations can contribute to fear, anxiety and ultimately hatred. As discussed earlier mainstream media coverage in some countries, even places like Britain, makes it easy to stir up hysterical stories about immigration which helps direct the conversation and policies towards who can be toughest on immigration. When economic conditions get harder, these views are easier to digest and adopt and deeper causes, of why people immigrate in the first place, are less discussed. As a result, empathy and understanding for the situation and conditions immigrants face is easily lost. There are indeed cases where some immigrant groups may come to countries like Britain under the mistaken and exaggerated understanding that if you cannot find work the government will pay for you to live. I remember on various vacations in developing countries being asked if this is true! This may be tempting for some groups that face much hardship, but it will be understandable in that case that local populations will not look too kindly on this attempt to get a free ride. Where this happens, it is unfortunately too easy for populist anti-immigrant sentiment to exaggerate that all immigrants want this. Other times, policy does indeed seem to favor struggling immigrants over struggling local populations; it could be argued that local populations have

had more opportunity than immigrant populations, and so the latter may benefit from some temporary assistance, but local populations are not going to accept that easily leaving policy makers feel they have little choice but to appear tough on immigration. Related articles and sections There are a number of articles and related sections from other parts of this web site, including:

Chapter 4 : Immigration to Australia - Wikipedia

Despite frustrating Senate intransigence and a revolving door of federal MPs tripped up by citizenship issues, many more Australians have found work and non-mining business investment is turning.

By Stephen Bartos Updated September 26, For our politicians and the press gallery the asylum seeker issue has assumed a significance way beyond what it actually deserves. Darren Marsh Darren Marsh A visitor to Australia with any more than minimal interest in media and politics would be forgiven for thinking that our paramount policy problem is asylum seekers. For our politicians and the press gallery the issue has assumed a significance way beyond what it actually deserves. It is more often than not the lead story both on the front pages of print and in the electronic media. In terms of both international comparisons and our own migration program, the numbers of so-called unauthorised arrivals are tiny. The problem does warrant attention. It involves hurt and vulnerable people, most of whom are genuine refugees that is, they have a well-founded fear of persecution. So our policy is important not only for the people seeking asylum but for our view of ourselves as a nation. However, developing policy generally involves considered reflection on the evidence, and working through options to come up with something sensible. Instead the public debate seems to lurch from one knee-jerk reaction to another under an intense media spotlight. A very senior bureaucrat lamented to me recently that there were so many more important issues of concern that deserved attention from our parliamentarians and media. Asylum seeker policy was vexed and difficult, but not overwhelming. I took this comment as a challenge “to list at least 10 policy problems more important to Australia than asylum seekers. Not counting climate change. It, at least, has the intense political and media attention that it warrants. So besides climate change, are there 10 other policy issues more important than asylum seekers? Preparing for a breakdown in global finances. I have commented elsewhere that it is premature to declare a global financial crisis II. But there is a chance that a collapse in banking and investor confidence if for example more European governments default on their debts will cause global equities and bond markets to implode. Someone in Government surely has contingency plans in place for what we would do if that happened. Those could be shared with us. The Prime Minister and Opposition Leader had a hyped-up meeting on asylum seekers without - predictably - reaching agreement. Could they have used their time better agreeing on a bipartisan strategy for how best to respond in the event of a global crisis? Or will financial catastrophe become another political football? The impact of the mining boom on the services industries especially, tourism and retail and manufacturing. The symptoms are well known. High wages in mining distort the labour market, the high dollar makes imported goods cheaper than those manufactured or sold here. Is this a problem like the weather one that everyone talks about but nobody does anything about? Most commentators missed a key argument for a resource rent tax as proposed in the Henry tax review - it would have helped rebalance our economy and allowed us to bank more of the proceeds from the boom. Economic purists argue that the pressures of the high dollar simply mean other industries have to become more productive and competitive, but what if instead they just go under? We need ways to help non-mining industries cope with the pressures of structural adjustment, not via subsidies, but through skills formation, new opportunities, and better connectivity. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians remain far more likely than anyone else to live in poverty, die young, be imprisoned, and in many other ways lose out see *Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage* released by the Productivity Commission last month. Governments continue to press on with programs of dubious effectiveness based on past failed models. Rarely is the diversity of Indigenous experience recognised or local level success stories mentioned. Lessons from what succeeds could be identified and copied accepting that such lessons may be hard to apply, given huge differences across Australia. Where success has proven elusive, governments should try something different. The inevitable counter argument - that this is a longstanding problem that will take decades to solve - is a counsel of despair. That we have tolerated this disadvantage for too long should be an argument for greater, not less, urgency to find new approaches. One of the most worrying figures produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics shows that productivity in Australia has been static or has fallen over recent years. Of the many sources of

productivity, the only one that seems to get a guernsey in public debate is labour markets. A more important and more sustainable driver, innovation, is hardly mentioned. We have a whole department and a statutory authority for it and more reports than you can poke a stick at, but how much of this investment is actually flowing through to increased productivity? Precious little if you believe the ABS. And how do we fix the problem? The gap between city and rural Australia. More and more rural and remote Australians are feeling left out of national debates and resentful of the city. It is in some ways a downside of productivity. Despite the previous point, one of the few Australian industries that has seen sustained productivity growth is agriculture. This is good, it keeps farmers in business. But it also means that with fewer people needed to farm larger areas, small rural towns grow even smaller. Moreover, agriculture is far less important to Australia than it was in previous generations - now less than 3 per cent of the economy compared with 30 per cent in the s. The NSW coat of arms still features wheat and sheep - but in reality NSW would be better represented by a fistful of dollars for the finance industry and a real estate sign. This decline in rural economic clout has been accompanied by reduced policy influence. A logical conclusion, but logic does not enter into it. The resentment felt by rural Australia is about emotion. It hurts to lose status and hurts even more to lose communities. However, as with the gap between mining and other industries, if the city-country divide is addressed only through subsidies and handouts we will have failed. Sustainable solutions based on better infrastructure, wider distribution of urban centres and employment diversity are required. Another five would include: How, in a country as wealthy as Australia, can 1 in every 100 Australians need to use government-funded specialist homelessness services last year? I chair a group trying to set up a project modelled on Common Ground to deal with homelessness in Canberra, so may feel more strongly about this than some readers. The glass ceiling. Despite decades of feminism, female pay is still around 25 per cent less than male pay for similar jobs, and there are fewer women in senior board and CEO positions here than in almost any other comparable country. Although we think of Australia as a dry country, it is the wettest continent on Earth if measured per head rather than per kilometre. We have extensive water resources even in the south of the continent, but continue to misallocate them, as shown time and again in National Water Commission reports. It could be seen as a short-term problem solving itself by around 2050, but for most Australians 40 years is a pretty long time to have a policy problem hanging around. Greater participation by older people in the workforce is one solution, but most employers are still reluctant to take on older workers. Mental health, one of our fastest growing health problems. More money has been provided with largely bipartisan support and services have been ramped up. The budget signals that it is a policy priority, so why is there a dearth of serious in-depth media analysis? Others that could have gone in include; management of Commonwealth-state relations, soil degradation, transport systems, childcare, our relationship with Asia, urban planning and a myriad more. I also excluded those where people are divided on whether we have a problem or not population, food security or those that are of major importance, but do not affect the entire country the Murray-Darling Basin, the Great Barrier Reef. Most of these problems are more important in the long run than the issue of how to deal with people currently arriving by boat to Australia seeking asylum. There were 6, boat arrivals last year the largest annual number to date, compared with a migration and humanitarian program of 13, places respectively in 2015. The asylum seeker policy problem is not trivial; it involves real people, lives can and have been lost. The policy process could however be conducted in a more thoughtful way, as suggested by Immigration department secretary Andrew Metcalfe to a parliamentary inquiry recently. That suggestion got little support. Solving the 10 policy problems above requires complex thought across shades of grey. Heaven forbid, on many of the policy issues listed above all sides of politics might even agree - if they were ever able to escape the media cycle long enough to have thinking time. It would be a different framing of what policy is about; meeting the needs of the country rather than a meaningless sporting contest. The relative neglect of important long-term policy issues is a product of the destructively co-dependent relationship between media and politicians. It is an environment inimical to thoughtful, careful, long-term working through of policies. There is one ray of hope: It may be false hope. So far, the online world has enabled better information, but not fundamentally changed the policy debate. The mainstream media continue to be the agenda setters. He is an expert in governance and risk. First posted September 26,

Chapter 5 : Immigration issues for Australia's humanitarian program – Parliament of Australia

The new immigration policy changed where a noncitizen could apply for Australian protection. Until then, Australia's migration zone, as this is known, stretched to its territories of thousands.

Certain nationalities are highly concentrated in this state: Victoria, the second most populous state, also has the second largest number of overseas-born persons 1., Western Australia, with, overseas-born residents has the highest proportion of its population being foreign-born. The state attracts Queensland had, overseas-born residents, and attracted the greatest proportion of persons born in Papua New Guinea Impacts and concerns[edit] There is a range of views in the Australian community on the composition and level of immigration, and on the possible effects of varying the level of immigration and population growth. In, a CSIRO population study commissioned by the former Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, outlined six potential dilemmas associated with immigration-driven population growth. The Sustainable Population Australia SPA argues that climate change will lead to a deterioration of natural ecosystems through increased temperatures, extreme weather events and less rainfall in the southern part of the continent, thus reducing its capacity to sustain a large population even further. Given the significant influx of foreigners coming to work or study in Australia in recent years, it seems highly likely that short-stay visitor movements may have added to the demand for housing. However, the Commissions are unaware of any research that quantifies the effects. The former Federal Treasurer, Peter Costello has said that Australia is underpopulated due to a low birth rate, and that negative population growth will have adverse long-term effects on the economy as the population ages and the labour market becomes less competitive. In a research paper entitled Population Futures for Australia: If net migration rate is, per year, the proportion of the population aged over 65 would reduce by 3. As of during the leadership of John Howard, the net migration rate was, per year. Currently, around 85 per cent of migrants are aged under 40 when they migrate to Australia, compared to around 55 per cent for the resident population. Only 2 per cent of permanent immigrants are 65 or older, compared with 13 per cent of our population. These people too, will age, thus requiring an even larger migration intake in subsequent years to look after them. Rather, immigration decreased unemployment. Immigration could worsen the labour market outcomes of people who work in sectors of the economy that have high concentrations of immigrant workers. As well, Birrell argues that a slowdown in labour force growth would require employers to pay greater attention to training, wages and conditions of workers. There was, overall, an upward trend in the number of immigrants to Australia over the period of the Howard Government – The Rudd Labor Government elected increased the quota again once in office.

Chapter 6 : How Canada Is Using AI To Help Decide Immigration Cases - Worldcrunch

Australia's new 'Home Office' is a worry for immigration policy July 19, pm EDT Immigration-related Home Office activities have been mired in enforcement issues. From the s.

S; the wrongful deportation, in the UK, of 7, foreign students accused of cheating on a language test; racist or sexist discrimination based on a social media profile or appearance. What do these seemingly disparate examples have in common? Algorithms and artificial intelligence AI are increasingly being used in immigration and refugee systems, and Canada is no exception, according to research carried out in partnership with Citizen Lab. Since , Canada has been introducing automated decision-making experiments in its immigration mechanisms, most notably to automate certain activities currently conducted by immigration officials and to support the evaluation of some immigrant and visitor applications. Recent announcements signal an expansion of the uses of these technologies in a variety of immigration decisions that are normally made by a human immigration official. These initiatives may place highly vulnerable people at risk of being subjected to unjust and unlawful processes. What constitutes automated decision-making? Our analysis examines a class of technologies that augment or replace human decision-makers , such as AI or algorithms. An algorithm is a set of instructions, a "recipe" designed to organize or learn data quickly and produce a desired outcome. These outcomes can include recommendations, assessments and decisions. While these are new and emerging technologies, the ramifications of using automated decision-making in the immigration and refugee space are far-reaching. Hundreds of thousands of people enter Canada every year through a variety of applications for temporary and permanent status. The nuanced and complex nature of many refugee and immigration claims may be lost on these technologies, leading to serious breaches of human rights in the form of bias, discrimination and privacy breaches, as well as issues of due process and procedural fairness. These systems will have real-life consequences for ordinary people, many of whom are fleeing for their lives. Where the responsibilities of private-sector actors are concerned, the report is informed by the United Nations Guiding Principles on Businesses and Human Rights. We also analyze similar initiatives occurring in Australia and the United Kingdom. Setting a dangerous precedent Marginalized and under-resourced communities such as residents without citizenship often have access to less robust human rights protections and lesser legal expertise with which to defend those rights. Adopting AI without first insuring responsible best practices and building in human rights principles at the outset will exacerbate preexisting disparities and lead to rights violations. We also know that technology travels. AI in the immigration space is already being explored in various jurisdictions across the world, as well as by international agencies that manage migration, such as the UN. Canada has a unique opportunity to develop international standards that regulate the use of these technologies in accordance with domestic and international human rights obligations. It is particularly important to set a clear example for countries with weaker records on refugee rights and rule of law, as insufficient ethical standards and weak accounting for human rights impacts can create a slippery slope internationally. Canada may also be responsible for managing the export of these technologies to countries more willing to experiment on non-citizens and infringe the rights of vulnerable groups. It is crucial to interrogate these power dynamics in the migration space, where private-sector interventions increasingly proliferate, as seen in the recent growth of countless apps for and about refugees. However, in the push to make people on the move knowable, intelligible and trackable, technologies that predict refugee flows can entrench xenophobia, as well as encourage discriminatory practices , deprivations of liberty, and denial of due process and procedural safeguards. Fundamental human rights must hold a central place in this discussion. With the increasing use of technologies to augment or replace immigration decisions, who actually benefits? While efficiency may be valuable, those responsible for human lives should not pursue efficiency at the expense of fairness — fundamental human rights must hold a central place in this discussion. Immigration and refugee law is also a useful lens through which to examine state practices, particularly in times of greater border control security and screening measures, complex systems of global migration management, the increasingly widespread criminalization of migration and rising xenophobia. Immigration law operates at the

nexus of domestic and international law and draws upon global norms of international human rights and the rule of law. Canada has clear domestic and international legal obligations to respect and protect human rights when it comes to the use of these technologies, and it is incumbent upon policymakers, government officials, technologists, engineers, lawyers, civil society and academia to take a broad and critical look at the very real impacts of these technologies on human lives.

Chapter 7 : Immigration – Global Issues

Immigration is also now geared to the needs of the Australian labour market. 68% of all arrivals now come under the skilled migrant category of the permanent immigration program.

Alamy In politics, optics trump metrics. Its language is Home Office repressive. The proposed bureaucracy, the burrowing down into the records of every employer and every landlord, is gargantuan. It recalls the regulatory chaos of state incomes control in the s. It would need an inspector in every building. The stifling of foreign access to the labour market is old-fashioned syndicalism. To be generous, departments are entitled to prepare private options for ministers to consider – though it would be reassuring if they embraced alternatives. The proposals do not alter safeguards for EU nationals currently working in Britain. They suggest a continuance of visa-free access for a transitional period, with possible residency afterwards. This is similar to worker regulations in other EU countries. The proposals also reflect existing controls on non-EU citizens, though these are starkly ineffective. Non-EU migrants actually outnumber EU migrants by about 18, a year. In a London cafe you are as likely to be served by a Canadian, a Colombian or an Eritrean as by a Pole or a Portuguese. May must know this. She glaringly failed to curb non-EU migration when at the Home Office. Migrant labour flows have long reflected not public policy but economic growth and exchange rates. That is why net EU migration slowed dramatically after the collapse and again with the slump in the pound after the Brexit vote. Is this really what the Brexiters want? It would probably be just an open invitation to labour agents and gangmasters to game the system. If the metrics are mad, what about the optics? Here we go carefully. The deafness of the British establishment to the cries of non-metropolitan England over immigration is what got us to the present pass. On Wednesday in parliament, Corbyn was reluctant to raise the immigration document at all, while his home affairs shadow, Diane Abbott, and the chair of the home affairs committee, Yvette Cooper, were equally equivocal in their responses. Suddenly, the pleas of the business community are so much blowing in the wind, while the silence of the provinces speaks volumes. Hovering over Brexit are the two crunch issues: Yes, the referendum result was for leave, but the subsequent polling consensus is that a majority want soft Brexit rather than hard. That applies even to immigration. Take back control, but then decide what control really means. There must be experts who can find a sum on which compromise is possible, away from the grandstanding. Being in control implies the freedom not to control, the freedom to welcome and to employ. But the regions voting most strongly for Brexit were those with least immigrants. Have Whitehall economists not noticed that joblessness is far higher in low-immigrant areas, such as the north-east? The most serious damage to British community identity, other than in small pockets, comes not from immigration but from social deterioration. Brexit was a cry not of xenophobia but of neglect. If May really wanted to respond to the anti-migrant sentiment of the referendum, she would do everything to encourage economic growth away from the south-east and towards the Midlands and the north. She would answer the concerns of the left-behinds, the emptying neighbourhoods and vulnerable communities in those parts of the British Isles not luxuriating in the benefits of cheap foreign labour. She would declare the Don Valley an enterprise zone and the Farne Islands a tax haven. As it is, her immigration measures will just mean London sucking ever more skilled labour from the provinces and widening the geographical wealth gap. That should cover any immigration crisis that may erupt in the future. The rest is just politics, nasty politics. Non-EU migrants outnumber EU migrants by about 18, a year, not, a year as originally stated.

Chapter 8 : Immigration and the environment: is Australia overpopulated? | Green Left Weekly

switch to the Australia edition Britain can control immigration. What drives this debate is nasty politics Hovering over Brexit are the two crunch issues: the divorce bill and immigration.

Messenger The face of Australia is changing - and it starts at our borders. Immigration is also now geared to the needs of the Australian labour market. Australia remains a cosmopolitan nation, truly the world in one country. But the new immigration figures continue over a decade or so long trend: Australia has now changed from a settler immigration county to one where guest workers are arriving in large and increasing numbers. Facts and figures A government report released this week highlighted the pace and changing ethnic composition of contemporary Australian immigration. The permanent migrant intake of , - or just over , when the humanitarian refugee intake is added - is one of the largest on record. New Zealanders remained the biggest group of arrivals to Australia in , with nearly 45, crossing the ditch. However, they can come to Australia at will " and are thus not counted under the migration program - because of the Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition Arrangement. Temporary migrant numbers However, the impact of immigration is significantly greater when the temporary immigration program is also considered. India and China also fill the top two places in the temporary migration program. In the past year temporary immigrants , outnumbered permanent immigrants , by a ratio of around three to one. Some , of these were foreign students, with working holiday makers , and temporary long stay business visas , , mostly on visas, taking up most of the other temporary migrant places. The dramatic increase of temporary immigrant arrivals in the past decade is the biggest change in over six decades of Australian immigration policy. The guest worker debate It is amazing that this dramatic change to Australian immigration policy has slipped under the radar. There has been little debate about temporary immigration until the past few years when concerns about the exploitation of temporary skilled immigrants on visas have been prominent in the media. Aside from New Zealanders, Indians now make up the largest number of permanent migrants to Australia. The evidence from other countries is not good in this regard. The Turkish gastarbeiter or guest workers who arrived in Germany in the s and s are still there, with their children and grandchildren. Temporary workers have a tendency to want to stay. But temporary immigrants do make good permanent immigrants. In Australia many temporary immigrants transform into permanent immigrants.

Chapter 9 : The Economics of Immigration: Market-Based Approaches, Social Science, and Public Policy

The Trump administration's pledge to modernize the nation's temporary agriculture worker visa program could face new obstacles if it's dependent on broader immigration reform.

Detailed Summary Highlights Immigration policy, like the issue of war and peace, is one of vital importance to millions of lives across the globe. Over one billion want to seek temporary work abroad. If everyone could migrate to their country of choice, the population of many nations would be utterly transformed. Haiti would lose half its population. Australia, Singapore, and New Zealand would more than double. Immigrants are not a major fiscal drain on the federal treasury. Some careful studies find a slight fiscal gain from immigration. Others find a slight fiscal drain. But taken together, the estimated fiscal impacts of immigration are clustered around zero. Social scientists disagree about what is a desirable immigration policy. But their disagreements are very different from those heard in popular discourse. Reflecting this diversity, *The Economics of Immigration* offers a variety of empirically grounded reform proposals for the United States. One recommendation would increase immigrant flows but would allocate permits via auction. Another would halve the number of legal immigrants takes in annually while legalizing undocumented immigrants already in the country. A third proposal would adopt a policy of open borders. An entire chapter weighs in on recommendations made by six of the most influential immigration scholars. In some parts of the world, the discord has gone beyond mere shouting matches, as people have vented their frustration and anger by throwing rocks or destroying property. Yet despite the controversies, social scientists that study immigration largely agree about its effects, whatever differences they may have about how a nation should change its policies. Their findings, however, are usually buried in academic journals accessible only to other scholars. Fortunately, readers can now learn the substance of this vast body of research, thanks to the publication of *The Economics of Immigration*: Not only does the book discern and assess the scholarly consensus where one exists, but also it does this without encumbering the reader with foreboding social science jargon. Its unique combination of rigor and readability makes *The Economics of Immigration* an invaluable resource for the general public and policymakers, as well as academic specialists. Perhaps the most immediate benefit readers will gain from the book is a stronger ability to root out conflicting generalizations and unsupported claims that politicians and pundits seem especially prone to make during election seasons. Readers who absorb the lessons of *The Economics of Immigration* will be well equipped to dispel everyday myths and to contribute high-quality discussion in the public square. With this book in their hands, no one who spreads misinformation about immigration will have the excuse that reliable sources were out of reach. *The Economics of Immigration* is designed to make it easy for readers to quickly learn about the aspects of immigration that interest them the most. Part I summarizes and evaluates the literature on immigration and wages, employment, economic growth, government spending and revenues, cultural and civic assimilation, and work visas, with each chapter assessing the strengths and weaknesses of various studies, highlighting the best scholarship currently available, and discerning the overall scholarly consensus on each topic. Chapter 2 addresses questions about the economic effects of international labor mobility: How does immigration affect wealth creation, commerce, and compensation in the host nations? Does it make developed countries more like the third world? Do newcomers tend to depress the wages of native-born workers? How does immigration affect the countries of origin? Many people who might otherwise welcome more foreigners into their country believe that the government provision of social services for newcomers makes immigration a bad bargain for taxpayers. In chapter 3, Alex Nowrasteh looks at how immigration affects government spending and revenues, welfare, schooling, and Medicaid. Fears that immigration threatens American cultural and civic institutions are also pervasive. Is this worry well grounded in historical experience? In chapter 4, Jacob Vigdor examines various indicators of assimilation to assess the robustness of American institutions and traditions in response to immigration. Countries have handled legal access to their labor market in a variety of ways. What can we learn from them? Their chapter therefore acts as a bridge from purely factual issues to the realm of value-laden policy recommendations. Public Policy In recent years, immigration reform in the United States has died a

thousand deaths in the halls of Congress. Vedder would expand the number of annual immigrant permits to their peak levels in the 20th century, but he would have those permits auctioned off to the highest bidder. Vedder counters this objection by suggesting ways to integrate currently undocumented immigrants and temporary workers into the auction system. In chapter 7, he proposes policies he hopes would help newcomers better assimilate. An open borders policy is always best, they argue, because the estimated benefits would overwhelm most of the feared negative consequences. Moreover, they claim, every major moral philosophy argues for the free flow of people across national boundaries. In chapter 9, Benjamin Powell concludes *The Economics of Immigration* by surveying alternative policy perspectives, especially those of six prominent scholars: George Borjas, Paul Collier, and Victor Davis Hanson who have generally argued against increased immigration ; and Gordon Hanson, Lant Pritchett, and Michael Clemens who have generally supported increased legal immigration. This is an excellent book and a must-have for anyone interested in the movement of people around the world. The first half is a rigorous, hardheaded overview of the best evidence we have on the economic and fiscal effects of immigration. It takes research seriously, but is written in terms anyone can understand. The second half is a rich policy debate, giving fair hearing to sharply opposed views and innovative proposals. The world needed a book like this and Powell provided it. *The Economics of Immigration* is especially recommended for college and public library Economics Studies shelves.