

## Intergovernmental Relations in Immigration and Settlement

## **Introduction:**

Canada's national identity is defined in part by its philosophical approach to immigration. Canadian Immigration Minister Ahmed Hussen exemplified this in his message preceding the 2018 Annual Report to Parliament: "Thanks in great part to the newcomers we have welcomed throughout our history, Canada has developed into the strong and vibrant country we all enjoy. Immigrants and their descendants have made immeasurable contributions to Canada, and our future success depends on continuing to ensure they are welcomed and well-integrated." (Message from the Minister of Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship).

Despite the Minister's claim that immigrants are well-integrated, there is still apprehension in the literature that this is always the case. Research (Stasiulis et. Al, p. 85; Hasmath, 2018) has shown that despite the convergence of educational attainments of first-generation immigrants and their children with native-born Canadians, there is a disconnect with immigrants' and their children's labour market success.

To measure the success of an immigrant group's integration into society, settlement patterns can be studied. Further, settlement and integration are naturally a local experience (Tolley, 2011, p. 17). While the Minister's statement includes the federal government's plans to grow immigration levels, a plan the Minister's statement declares was developed in close consultation with provinces and territories, missing from this statement is any mention of collaboration with municipalities or local governments, a central player in immigration in Canada.

Constitutionally, jurisdiction over immigration is shared between the federal and provincial governments, but other actors, including municipal governments, are playing an increasing role. Determining which levels of government play a central role is an important area of study in immigration policy, considering these actors influence the direction of policies. This paper will

analyze the impact of immigrant settlement on ethnic co-operation, as well as the ways intergovernmental policy can contribute to the integration of immigrants. The involvement, collaboration, and co-operation can be a method in order to further develop the success of immigrant integration.

First, this paper will highlight the goals and patterns in Canadian immigration historically. Then, it will provide an overview of the influences and importance of settlement patterns. Finally, it will analyze how lower level governments, including municipal governments, are important actors in the settlement of immigrants, and how their involvement can increase integration.

### **Immigration and Nation-building:**

Immigration policy in Canada has been central to nation building (Kelley and Trebilcock, 2010, p. 12; Li, 2003, p. 14). In fact, the prosperity of the nation was dependent on immigrants (Kelley and Trebilcock, p. 252). Canada has three founding groups: The Indigenous Peoples, British and French. While Canada's history is one of colonialism (and arguably ongoing colonialism), the territory was still under British rule until Confederation. Kelley and Trebilcock (2010) argue that Canada post-Confederation needed a larger population and expanded markets in order to be independent from British rule and to prosper and grow economically. Opening and increasing immigration was thus the solution to help grow markets and boost the population. Later, in the 1960s, Canada was still trying to transform itself away from a country of British Commonwealth. A commission was formed of government representatives, academics, journalists, and foreign policy advisors to redefine the national interest (Reiss, 2011). This also led to the formation of a national policy on multiculturalism, and the establishment of multicultural

documents including the 1971 policy announcement, the 1982 Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and the 1988 Multiculturalism Act.

### **Background:**

While Tolley (2011, p. 17) argues that there is no single unified narrative on Canadian immigration, a brief history based on Li's (2018) four major phases of immigration will be presented, followed by a more detailed history on the multiscalar approach post-1960s.

Between 1867 and 1895, policymakers emphasized a laissez-faire immigration philosophy, with an open-door policy for especially for those of British and America origin, and European origin more broadly (Li, 2003, p. 17-18). During this time, the first Federal-Provincial agreement on immigration was signed. This agreement delegated powers to the federal government to set immigration levels and to recruit, select, admit, and naturalize immigrants. The province could voluntarily participate in the recruitment and settlements of immigrants (Tolley, 2011, p. 19-20) and to appoint immigration agents abroad (Seidle, 2010). Besides this agreement, federal and provincial governments collaborated and shared information often, as annual conferences were held on immigration (Seidle, 2010). However, Tolley (2011) notes that an immigration conference six years later found that separate action by the provinces led to waste, and the federal government would hold primary and full responsibility for the promotion of immigration.

The second phase of immigration lasted until WWI. This period saw the highest level of immigration in Canadian history (Li, 2003, p. 18). Policy during this phase focused on immigration for agricultural settlement, and preferred those of American or Northern European descent, excluding immigrants "unlikely to assimilate" from countries outside the United States and

Northern Europe. Policy at this time reiterated the prevailing right of the state, and conditional rights of immigrants to enter Canada (Kelley and Trebilcock, 2010, p. 165).

The period between 1915 and 1945 constituted the third period of immigration, where Europeans more broadly defined were accepted. Immigrants of a Jewish and non-white background were not welcomed (Li, 2003, p. 21). During this time, immigration policy was geared toward exclusion (Kelley and Trebilcock, 2010, p. 252). Specifically, dislike of immigration and immigrants accompanied WWI, WWII, recessions and the depression.

The fourth phase, the post-war period, saw a renewed emphasis on immigration and liberalized policies (Tolley, 2011, p. 24). However, ethnic origin and “undesirability” were still components of immigration policy and exclusion. This period marked further governmental development, with the 1950 creation of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. Delegation of funds occurred to non-governmental organizations, and many provinces had signed cost-sharing agreements with the federal government for hospitalization and welfare cost joint payments (Tolley, 2011, p.24).

More recently, in the 1960s, Canada’s Immigration policies changed, introducing regulations aimed at eliminating discrimination as well as introducing the points system. Further, all immigrant families were able to sponsor through family reunification policy. This period also marked the federal government’s move toward third-party delivery by non-governmental organizations, away from the federal government’s direct settlement service (Tolley, 2011, p. 25). Further delegations occurred in the 1970s, when the federal government committed to intergovernmental co-operation as well as the involvement of non-governmental groups. An intergovernmental agreement on immigration policy was signed by the federal government and

Quebec in 1978, followed by the signing of more agreements by other provinces in the 1990s up until the late 2000s.

A timeline of Canadian immigration policy is significant, as it highlights the different goals of the policy, different waves of ethnic groups, and the various actors involved. First, immigrants were brought in simply to grow the population. Later, immigrants were encouraged to fill low-skilled, manual labour positions (Hasmath, 2012, p. 17) and then high-skilled immigrants were more valued by the system. Racism also played a role throughout the goals of Canadian immigration policy, with non-minority groups being more welcomed post-1960s.

Especially with Canada's immigration system focused on highly-skilled immigrants, Canada's policy is framed on the domestic self-interest, not in the context of global relations (though this is not necessarily the case for refugee discourse). Due to the points system, Canadian immigrants are thought to contribute to the economy. This economic angle has been cited as an alleviating factor to reduce concerns that immigrants will be viewed as a drain on the welfare state (Bloemraad, 2012, p. 3). In research on Australia and the "Boat People", Mackenzie and Hasmath (2013) found that while a policy can be effective, optics and the tone of a debate matters. Specifically, political pressures driven by fear and populism can influence immigration policy, adding another dimension to the influences over policy. Therefore, both the goals of a policy and how these goals are articulated are important to the policy. Finally, as evident by this brief background on Canadian immigration policy, there are multiple actors in Canadian policy, including federal governments and provincial governments, and more recently, municipal governments and non-governmental actors.

### **Theories of Migration and Settlement:**

Theories of migration differ in how they view the autonomy and rationality of individual migrants. Neoclassical theorists argue that migration can be explained through individuals calculating the cost and benefit of moving to a higher wage and/or labour scarce area. Structuralists argue that migration can be better explained by global and national economic systems, as individuals lack the autonomy to make rational decisions as advocated by neoclassical theories. (Hasmath, 2018)

Both theories emphasize pull factors of migration. Neoclassical theorists emphasize individuals intentionally pursuing better economic opportunities, whereas structuralists would argue pull factors are more likely to be economic systems in core, highest developed countries.

### **Immigrants and Cities:**

Whether immigrants have autonomy in their choice of settlement or not, immigrants have a higher tendency compared to non-immigrants or native-born Canadians to settle in large urban areas (Li, 2003, p. 144), specifically cities in Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia (Edmonstron, 2016).

Cities offer immigrants more economic, social, and cultural opportunities. For example, there are more opportunities in cities in both the primary labour market and ethnic economy. Jobs in the primary labour market in a major city may be more readily available and come with higher wages. However, some immigrants may search for jobs outside the primary labour market. Light et. al (1994) differentiates between the ethnic economy and the ethnic enclave economy through clustering. Whereas an ethnic economy explains when owners and employees are co-ethnics, enclaves have an element of spatial clustering of enterprises. Immigrants may settle in an ethnic enclave as it provides a place to search for jobs, and immigrants can achieve similar wages to those

in the primary labour market (Hasmath, 2012, p. 21). Further, immigrants may have trouble accessing the primary labour market, a further reason to enter into the ethnic enclave economy. Therefore, immigrants may settle in areas where co-ethnics have already settled. However, this may create challenges for participating in the economy to the fullest extent.

### **Social/cultural:**

Social and cultural factors also influence settlement patterns. Immigrants may find emotional support from members of the same ethnic group. There may also be a strong ethnically-based social network. Family members can be located within a settlement area dominated by a shared ethnic group, especially given the family sponsorship history of Canadian immigration. Families can provide support and information to newcomers. Finally, there may be more services or institutions concentrated in an enclave, such as language services or places of worship. Hasmath (2012) explains how settlement patterns can also be explained through the ethnic-identity hypothesis. This theory finds that to maximize social interactions, members of an ethnic group may choose to settle in close proximity. Close proximity also allows for group norms and values to continue (p. 22).

### **Settlement and Integration:**

The settlement patterns of ethnic minorities is an important area of research in immigration study because of the large effect of settlement on integration. First, there is a relationship between neighbourhood and community, and an individual's life chances, including education and labour market outcomes. Neighbourhoods also help develop network capital. For example, communities may, or may not, help individuals in their job search, depending on the ties to the labour market

within a community. Strong ties, such as those between close contacts, often replicate the same information and same networks, and are not as helpful in attaining better job outcomes. However, acquaintances or other weak ties have different information and networks, therefore can help in job searches. In addition, larger networks, especially large networks of weaker ties, can help vouch for individuals in the interview process, therefore helping attain a job quicker. Ethnic minorities, considering they may live in close proximity to members of the same ethnic group, are more likely to have both strong strong ties, such as family members or extended family members, and weak weak ties. Therefore, they may not be gaining the best opportunities and participating in the primary labour market to the fullest extent.

### **Settlement and Trust:**

Second, integration involving contact with individuals beyond those of the same ethnic group builds more trust. The contact hypothesis posits that interaction between two groups, under positive conditions and sanctioned by authorities, should lead to reduced prejudice (Paluck and Green, 2009, p. 345). Gibson (2004) also found that, in a study on the South African Truth and Reconciliation process, contact matters. Whereas racial isolation makes reconciliation more difficult, more understanding and trust is developed through interaction with other races (p. 215). These findings were more impactful considering Gibson's finding suggested that the South African Reconciliation process had done little to help reconciliation, though it had also done little to harm race relations.

### **Settlement and Ethnic Co-operation:**

While it is more common for peaceful and co-operative relations instead of large-scale violence between ethnic groups (Fearon and Laitin, 1996), certain settlement patterns can be contributing factors to ethnic co-operation. In addition to building trust and integration, dispersion of ethnic groups was also found to be correlated to state survival. Hale (2004) argues that ethnofederal states are more likely to collapse when they contain a core ethnic region (p. 166). He argues that ethnic cores led to the collapse of ethnofederal states, since political elites may give in to demands from the core because of the large share of the state's citizens. The federal government must also compete for authority with the territory's leader.

Hale defines a core ethnic region as a territory that is intentionally associated with a specific ethnic category that has an outright majority of the population, or the territory's population comprises of at least 20 percent more of the entire country's population compared to the second largest state (p. 169). Although the author does not specify, it is assumed Hale was referring to Quebec<sup>1</sup> and Nunavut, both a province and territory defined by distinct groups. In Canada, Ontario has the largest population, and is not a province defined or associated with a specific ethnic category.

In a more extreme circumstance, if the federal government decided to redraw provinces and make separate territories for areas more populated by ethnic groups, this could, as argued by Hale, lead to state collapse if the territory's population is large enough. Though this occurrence is an improbable example, municipalities and mayoral candidates have mused secession, including Toronto Mayoral candidate Jennifer Keesmaat in 2018 (Twitter, Jen\_keesmaat, 2018).

---

<sup>1</sup> The author specifies that while some believe that such linguistic differences should not be counted as ethnic, others argue there are distinct Anglophone and Francophone identities in the example of Cameroon (Hale, 2004 p. 180)

While this consequence of settlement patterns requires further action from political elites and is not solely based on the place of settlement and residence of immigrants, it also shows the importance of dispersed settlement. To summarize, the disunity and dispersed settlement of immigrants over Canadian history, combined with a lack of a majority of Canadian states built on ethnic identities, is a contributing factor to ethnic co-operation in Canada.

### **Immigration in intergovernmental relations:**

As evident by the research and readings on immigration and ethnic co-operation, settlement patterns affect a multitude of opportunities and challenges for immigrant integration and trust, as well as affecting, on a larger scale, issues such as co-operative ethnic relations and state survival. Because of such implications, it is important to look at the government actors who play a large role in immigration settlement.

As outlined by the background section of this paper, jurisdiction over immigration is divided between the federal government and provincial governments. Increasingly, there are a multitude of other actors involved in immigration policy, both within government and outside government. For example, at the Federal level, there is the department of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, but other departments such as Canadian Heritage are also responsible for the official languages and multiculturalism portfolio. Further, departments such as Human Resources and Social Development Canada, Health Canada, and the Status of Women, to name a few, are all involved in immigrants' successful transition. However, there is not just horizontal co-ordination within levels of government, but vertical co-ordination as well.

Provincial governments have intergovernmental agreements with the federal government on immigration. While Quebec is unique in that it has greater power over immigration and more

funding with the 1991 Canada-Quebec accord, the federal government developed the Provincial Nominee Program, allowing provinces or territories to “identify a limited number of economic immigrants to meet specific regional needs and/or to receive priority attention for immigration processing” (Seidle, 2010). The importance of this is the power given to provincial governments to have more influence on the selection of people with the educational and labour capital that they need.

While the federal government may still be in charge of the policy at the philosophical levels as well as the higher, strategic policy level, multiculturalism and immigration at the demographic level is thus being more decentralized. In other words, the control over the composition of immigration is now more shared.

The implications of this are important. One major implication is the greater channel flows of information. In Canada’s current immigration policy, highly-skilled immigrants are not able to find work in Canada that fits with their educational and human capital. For example, there is the devaluation of immigrants’ educational credentials, creating barriers for employment. This causes many high-skilled immigrants, who do not end up in the ethnic enclave economy, to take low-skilled work. This disconnect between the immigrant selection process, an action that is directed by the federal government, and immigrant settlement, where the impact is felt by municipal governments, can be a source of frustration for immigrants (Janzen et. al, 2012). Though this may have benefitted Canada in the long run, as it filled a void that was needed in the low-skilled economy, it is unlikely this was an intended outcome of Canada’s immigration policy. Lower, decentralized levels of government may have been able to see this outcome sooner than if only the federal government was overseeing immigration settlement.

While provincial governments have signed intergovernmental agreements with the federal government, the first Federal-Provincial Immigration Agreement to include municipal government specifically was the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement (COIA), which was signed in November 2005 (Andrew and Hima, 2011, p. 51).

While not uniform across the country due to political ideology or resource concerns, political leaders at the municipal level understand the significance of immigrant settlement in their cities or communities. For example, the Mayor of Edmonton promoted and tried to attract skilled immigrants to the city in his 2008 eight-day trip to Central and Eastern Europe. Saskatchewan mayor Don Atchinson also went in 2008 to Southeast Asia to recruit nurses, foreign students and business investors.

Especially in Ontario due to the COIA, new program initiatives are the result of municipal involvement. Programs such as the local immigration partnership (LIPS) brings together municipal and non-governmental bodies so that both can work together in improving services and access to services that facilitate immigrant settlement and integration (Andrew and Hima, 2011, p. 62).

Municipalities are the levels of government closest to the people. Mayors and councillors understand the culture of their city or region, and know best about the local organizations operating in their wards. Municipalities are also closer to the everyday needs of citizens, especially immigrants. They administer programs essential to settlement processes, such as libraries, recreational and cultural programming, and cultural festivities. For example, the City of Toronto supports many cultural festivals (Hasmath, 2012, p. 25-26). A portion of the municipal workforce are also planners, who are subject matter experts in neighbourhoods, zoning, and transportation (Young, 2011, p. 316). While education is under provincial authority, where schools are placed in

neighbourhoods also involves planners. School trustees are also more connected to city-level politicians.

However, municipal involvement can still be improved. This is because municipal involvement in immigration policy varies substantially across provinces. The federal government is still viewed as the main actor over immigration policy due to the state's control over borders. Municipalities are on the front-lines, along with non-government actors in helping with the settlement and integration of immigrants, yet intergovernmental agreements between the municipalities and federal government and provincial governments are lacking, since it is outside municipalities main jurisdiction. However, this lack of information flows and agreements can lead to consequences such as the disconnect between the policy of accepting high-skilled labour, and having these immigrants work in low-skilled jobs. Due to the large number of actors involved in immigration, including co-ordination horizontally across multiple governmental departments, as well as vertically with governments and non-governmental actors, greater collaboration in the form of intergovernmental agreements specifying areas of focus and funding would be beneficial for immigrant settlement and integration.

### **Conclusion:**

While the federal government is still viewed as the primary actor in immigration policy, in reality, this is not always the case. Municipalities are the level of government closest to the everyday needs of the people. Lower levels and the provincial government should have a greater role to play in immigration policy. Though this is already occurring in some areas, such as Toronto, this process is not universal. Due to the importance of settlement on immigration integration and educational and labour success, more collaboration is needed.

References:

- Andrew, C. and Hima, R. (2011). Federal Policies on Immigrant Settlement. In E. Tolley and R. Young (Eds.). *Immigrant Settlement Policy in Canadian Municipalities*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- 2018 Annual Report to Parliament. Government of Canada.  
<https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/corporate/publications-manuals/annual-report-parliament-immigration-2018/report.html#matters>
- Biles, J., Burstein, M. and Frideres, J. (Eds.). *Immigration and Integration in Canada in the Twenty-first Century*. Kingston: School of Policy Studies.
- Bloemraad, I. (2012). *Understanding 'Canadian Exceptionalism' In Immigration and Pluralism Policy*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Edmonstron, Barry. (2016). Canada's Immigration Trends and Patterns. *Canadian Studies in Population* 43(1-2), 78-116
- Fearon, J.D. and Laitin, D. (1996). Explaining Interethnic Cooperation. *American Political Science Review*, 90(4), 715-735
- Gibson, J. L. (2004). Does Truth Lead to Reconciliation? Testing the Causal Assumptions of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Process. *American Journal of Political Science*, 48(2), 201-207
- Hale, H. (2004). Divided We Stand: Institutional Sources of Ethno-Federal State Survival and Collapse. *World Politics* 56(2), 165-193.
- Hasmath, R. (2012). Chapter 1 Introduction. *The Ethnic Penalty: Immigration, Education and the Labour Market*. Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate.
- Hasmath, R. (2012). Chapter 2 Immigration. *The Ethnic Penalty: Immigration, Education and the Labour Market*. Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate.
- Hasmath, R. (2018). *Lecture Seven – Immigration* [Powerpoint slides]. Retrieved from [https://eclass.srv.ualberta.ca/pluginfile.php/4625803/mod\\_resource/content/1/Lecture%20Seven%20-%20Immigration.pdf](https://eclass.srv.ualberta.ca/pluginfile.php/4625803/mod_resource/content/1/Lecture%20Seven%20-%20Immigration.pdf)
- Hasmath, R. (2018). *Lecture Eight – Ethnic Settlement and Human Capital*. [Powerpoint slides]. Retrieved from [https://eclass.srv.ualberta.ca/pluginfile.php/4625802/mod\\_resource/content/1/Lecture%20Eight%20-%20Ethnic%20Settlement%20and%20Human%20Capital.pdf](https://eclass.srv.ualberta.ca/pluginfile.php/4625802/mod_resource/content/1/Lecture%20Eight%20-%20Ethnic%20Settlement%20and%20Human%20Capital.pdf)
- Janze, R., Walton-Roberts, M. and Ochocka, J. (2012). Waterloo Region. In Andrew, C., Biles, J., Burstein, M., Esses, V.M. and Tolley, E. (Eds.). *Immigration, Integration, and Inclusion in Ontario Cities*. Kingston: School of Policy Studies.
- Jen\_keesmaat. (2018). Secession. [Twitter Post] Retrieved from [https://twitter.com/jen\\_keesmaat/status/1022674165063733249?lang=en](https://twitter.com/jen_keesmaat/status/1022674165063733249?lang=en)

- Kelley, N. and Trebilcock, M. (2010). *The Making of the Mosaic: A history of Canadian Immigration Policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Li, P. S. (2003). *Destination Canada: Immigration Debates and Issues*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Light, I. Sabagh, G., Bozorgmehr, M. and C. Der-Martirosian. (1994). Beyond the Ethnic Enclave Economy, *Social Problems* 41(1): 65-81
- Mackenzie, J. and Hasmath, R. (2013). Deterring the 'Boat People': Explaining the Australian Government's People Swap Response to Asylum Seekers. *Australian Journal of Political Science* 48(4), 417-430.
- Paluck, E. L. and Green, D. P. (2009). Prejudice Reduction: What works? A Review and Assessment of Research and Practice. *Annual Review of Psychology* 60, 339-367
- Reiss, S. (2011). Immigration, Race and the Crisis of National Identity in Canada. In R. Hasmath (Ed.), *Managing Ethnic Diversity: Meanings and Practices from an International Perspective*. Burlington, VT and Surrey, UK: Ashgate.
- Seidle, L. F. (2010). Intergovernmental immigration agreements and public accountability. *Institute for Research on Public Policy*.  
<http://policyoptions.irpp.org/magazines/immigration-jobs-and-canadas-future/intergovernmental-immigration-agreements-and-public-accountability/>
- Stasiulis, D., Hughes, C. and Amery, Z. (2011). From Government to Multilevel Governance of Immigrant Settlement in Ontario's City Regions. In E. Tolley and R. Young (Eds.). *Immigrant Settlement Policy in Canadian Municipalities*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Tolley, E. and Young, R. (Eds.). (2011) *Immigrant Settlement Policy in Canadian Municipalities*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Young, R. (2011). Conclusion. In E. Tolley and R. Young (Eds.). *Immigrant Settlement Policy in Canadian Municipalities*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.