Citizenship and Immigration Canada
Citoyenneté et Immigration Canada

Special Study

STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND REVIEW
RECHERCHE ET EXAMEN STRATÉGIQUES

Towards a more balanced geographic distribution of immigrants

May 2001

RESEARCH UNIT
UNITÉ DE RECHERCHE

Canada
C&I-51-109/2002E

Produced by Strategic Policy, Planning and Research

For additional copies, please contact:

Communications Branch
Citizenship and Immigration Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 1L1

Fax: (613) 954-2221
Internet: http://www.cic.gc.ca

ISBN 0-662-31552-9

Aussi disponible en français sous le titre *Vers une répartition géographique mieux équilibrée des immigrants*

Towards a More Balanced Geographic Distribution of Immigrants

This study was prepared by
Citizenship and Immigration Canada,
with the Assistance of Informetrica Limited

May 2001

TOWARDS A MORE BALANCED GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS

Introduction and Overview

At the present time there is a growing interest in a more balanced geographic distribution of immigrants throughout the country. It stems from a number of developments:

- the increasing concentration of immigrants in the three largest cities, which has taxed the capacity of these cities to accommodate immigrants as the flow of immigrants has been at a sustained high level for fifteen years;
- increasing involvement of the provinces in the selection of immigrants, coupled with concern about outmigration and the size of the population in some of the smaller provinces and Quebec, and a growing interest in sharing in the perceived benefits of immigration;
- increasing emphasis on the size and quality of the labour force as a prerequisite for economic development.

This paper discusses what governments can do to promote greater dispersal of immigrants away from Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal to other large cities, smaller cities, and rural and remote areas. The discussion ranges widely, from a general way of thinking about the question to specific measures governments can take, from the experience of other countries to the receptivity of Canadians in different parts of Canada to more immigrants.

Two main perspectives run through this paper. Regional economic development is a major theme. Population movements within Canada are closely associated with differences in economic growth and employment opportunities among Canada's regions. Any efforts to disperse immigrants have to be considered in light of these economic dynamics if one wants to predict the success and ultimate effects of such efforts. The paper includes a discussion of regional economic development to place population movements and population growth in this broader context. The contribution of immigrant entrepreneurs is also examined in this context.

A second major focus is to learn from the settlement and mobility behaviour of immigrants and from past efforts to direct immigrants to particular destinations. For the most part governments have not tried to influence the choice of destination and secondary migration by immigrants. The paper reviews immigrants' behaviour to explore how it might be influenced. However, many immigrant-receiving countries including Canada have been actively involved in the choice of destination of refugees, and their approaches and experiences are examined here. The paper also gives a brief account of the involvement in immigration of subnational governments in Australia and Canada.

Finally, attitudes of Canadians towards immigration are examined from a regional perspective.

The first major theme is developed in the first three sections of the paper. Section 1 examines the link between population and regional economic development. The main message is that economic opportunity, not population, is the driving factor. This is readily illustrated by Canada's history of natural resources leading to development. Today, however, when natural resources are no longer the main engine of economic growth, one needs to ask what drives economic development, and in particular, what is the role of human resources in economic development. The paper advances the view that even today human resources are not really the leading factor in economic development. Human resources of sufficient size and quality are a necessary but not a sufficient condition for economic success. The larger cities are the engines of growth in today's economy. The most promising alternatives to the larger cities are the "second-tier" cities. But dynamic growth is not a sure thing, even for large cities. And trying to make large cities even larger when they are not creating new jobs is a recipe for frustration. The challenge for immigrant dispersal is to match the inflows with opportunities in Canada's cities.

The discussion then switches to the challenge of attracting people to small and remote places. Canada has extensive experience with single industry towns and more recently with the shortage of medical professionals in rural and remote places. Among the methods being used to attract personnel to mining towns and the north are significant financial incentives and professional training. These methods may be used with new or recent immigrants as well as with people who received their professional training in Canada. But they are tailored to meeting very specific skill needs and are probably not suitable for attracting immigrants generally to particular locations. Something is learned, however, about the special milieu of small isolated places and the reasons why people go there or do not.

The second part of the paper focuses on immigrants: their settlement and secondary migration behaviour in section 3, the destining of refugees in section 4, experience with refugee settlement in other countries in section 5, and involvement of subnational governments in immigration in section 6.

The concentration of immigrants in the largest cities derives from a very strong and increasing preference among immigrants from the world regions that have become the dominant source of immigrants to Canada. Secondary migration contributes to greater concentration, both directly and through its influence on where new immigrants settle. Analysis of immigrant mobility behaviour points to employment opportunities as the most important reason for immigrants to move. However, this factor and the influence of city size have the same effect on immigrants as on the Canadian-born. What is different about today's major new immigrant groups is a high tendency to migrate and a strong attachment to their ethnic community. This section also examines the settlement and migration behaviour of immigrant entrepreneurs, as well as the role they could play in dispersing new immigrants beyond the three largest metropolitan areas.

Government-sponsored refugees arrive all over Canada, primarily according to the availability of settlement services provided by voluntary agencies. The pattern of settlement of refugees is the most geographically dispersed of all categories of immigrants. However, these refugees are quick to move to larger urban areas, as they have no attachment to the area where they first settle. During the mid-nineties in Alberta, Calgary and Edmonton more or less maintained the number of refugees that settled there, but five other cities in Alberta lost half of their refugees within a few years. Job opportunity is the most important reason for moving, followed by education opportunities, and family ties. Single people are more prone to moving to the larger cities than families. Section 5 also takes a look at how the settlement destination of refugees is decided upon, and suggests ways to change the process to find more durable matches.

Other countries have also deliberately influenced the settlement destination of refugees, and many European countries are now attempting to direct asylum seekers away from their largest cities. The U.S. experience with Indochinese refugees after the end of the Vietnam War corresponds to the findings of section 3 as to the settlement and mobility behaviour of Canada's recent immigrants. The U.K. has been successful in creating small clusters of Bosnian refugees in various parts of the country, but had to make a considerable effort to achieve this result. Sweden is putting local governments on the front line to ensure rapid adjustment and geographic dispersal of refugees.

Section 6 discusses the current regionalization of the immigration process. In 1996, Australia began to involve states in immigration policy, and is making efforts to direct immigrants to designated areas by reducing entry requirements and through sponsorship of immigrants by employers and family members. The new programs introduced in Australia are of interest to Canada at this time.

In Canada, Quebec has administered the economic and family class for some time, and Manitoba was the first province to sign a provincial nominee agreement. Quebec has been trying to draw immigrants away from Montreal, both at entry and after initial settlement. While outcomes of these efforts are as yet unknown, it has set ambitious goals for the next three years, aiming to place one-third of the immigrants it processes in central regions of the province and in Quebec City. Over the past two years, Manitoba has aggressively recruited immigrants. Three communities of modest size that were experiencing strong demand for labour have brought in hundreds of immigrants through the provincial nominee program. This section aims to brief the reader on recent developments.

Section 7 presents what is known from public opinion surveys about regional differences in receptivity to immigrants. While there are differences between the regions and between metropolitan areas and rural and small town areas, the country as a whole is rather supportive of high levels of immigration. The size of the inflow into a city or region and the state of the economy affect attitudes toward immigrants. Resistance to high immigration has been growing in the largest centres, and is higher in second-tier cities than in smaller towns where there are fewer immigrants. The attitudes of Canadians should facilitate greater dispersal of immigrants.

The Conclusion summarizes the main findings. The current interest in where immigrants settle and live stems from concern not just about excessive concentration of immigrants, but also about lack of population growth in certain parts of the country. If Canada wants to achieve a more balanced geographic distribution of immigrants, it should target second-tier cities and other metropolitan areas rather than rural and small-town areas. Independent immigrants and refugees may be induced to settle in cities that have employment opportunities for them, and the immigration flow should be tailored to these opportunities. A range of instruments are available, including more and better information for immigrants about destinations and clustering of immigrants by country of origin.

By way of contrast to the tone and tenor of this paper, the Annex presents an example of an overly optimistic view of the contribution immigrants can make to rural development. A few comments are made to indicate that the paper that provided this example offers no sound basis for the view that immigration can reverse the decline of rural areas.

Acknowledgements

Informetrica Limited gratefully acknowledges the contribution of the following people, all public servants, who provided information and advice:

At Citizenship and Immigration Canada: Brian Ray, Fran Psutka, Neil Alexander, Michael Bradley, Craig Dougherty, Lynda Parker.

In Belgium, Thierry Loir; in the United Kingdom, Peter Ward and Duff Lesley; in Sweden, Lena Axelsson; at the Australian High Commission in Ottawa, Rose Lacey.

In Quebec, Louis-René Gagnon; in Manitoba, Deborah Barkman.

As well, Michael Saykaly, President of Optima, Consultants in Applied Social Research Inc., made helpful comments on an early draft of the paper.

None of the facts and ideas presented in this paper should be attributed to any of these persons.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Overview ..... **i**
Acknowledgements iv
Table of Contents ..... **v**
1. Regional economic development and population: Which comes first? **1**
The settlement of Canada, very briefly 1
The role of human resources in regional economic development 2
Is bigger better? Regional economic development and population size 6
Conclusion: Economic growth is a sine qua non 7
2. How to attract human resources to remote places **8**
The single industry town 8
Addressing the shortage of physicians and nurses in rural and remote Canada 10
Conclusion: Focus on the cities 14
3. Immigrant destinations in Canada **16**
Where immigrants live 16
To get is not to keep: Interprovincial migration 18
Migration between metropolitan areas 22
Immigrant entrepreneurs: challenges for dispersed settlement 23
Conclusion: Immigrants know what they want 27
4. Dispersal of refugees in Canada **29**
Where refugees settle 29
Secondary migration by refugees 30
Why refugees leave their initial destination 32
Choosing destinations for refugees 33
Conclusion: Getting the destination right 35
5. Dispersal of refugees in the U.S. and in Europe **37**
Indochinese refugees in the US, 1975-1984 37
European countries are directing asylum seekers away from the largest cities 38
6. Sub-national governments are getting involved **43**
Australia: Involvement by the states, and designated areas 43
Anywhere but Montreal: The regionalization of immigration in Quebec 46
Manitoba: First out of the gate with the nominee program 49
7. Attitudes of Canadians and the concentration of immigrants **51**
8. Conclusion: Strategies and instruments for dispersal of immigrants **55**
References **59**
Annex: A slice of rural boosterism **64**

1. Regional economic development and population: Which comes first?

The settlement of Canada, very briefly

Canada is a country of immigrants. Since the first European set foot on North America's eastern shore, Canada's development has been spurred by waves of immigrants. There was the timid beginning with Samuel de Champlain's New France, followed by the migration of the Loyalists after the American War of Independence. The greatest migration of all was the settlement of Canada's West around the turn of the twentieth century: "the filling up of an empty realm, a thousand miles broad, with more than one million people in less than one generation."[1]

Canadian history seems to show that where people go, economic activity and growth is bound to follow. In a certain sense this is true. Economic activity does arise where people live, as they try to provide for themselves. But there may be a good deal of hardship, as the first colonists found out. During the 17th and 18th century, the French colony in Quebec was mired in subsistence farming. Only the fur trade offered appreciable riches. And economic success may be slow to materialize. Decades after the loyalists settled in Upper Canada, the province "seemed a backwater, short of bridges, roads and other public works vital to a pioneer society."[2] New "English, Irish and Scottish settlers who lacked the skills or the capital to transform wilderness into productive farms"[3] were to blame, among other things.

But why did they come in the first place? Many colonists were pushed by lack of land or religious intolerance in Europe. What drew them, as well as the Loyalists, to Canada was land - free land! - in large sections. At a time when arable land was the basis for economic security of the large majority of the population, a virtual guarantee of self-sufficiency if not of wealth, free land was an extraordinary gift, a most powerful enticement.

The settlement of the Canadian West was no different. Settlers were entitled to 160 acres of land upon payment of a $10 registration fee, if they undertook to live there and do a stipulated amount of work for three years. There was also the opportunity to acquire more land at reasonable prices, as the land was plentiful. Even with that, it took deceptive propaganda about the quality of the land and the climate to draw large numbers of northern Europeans. English, Scottish and "Galician" (Polish and Ukrainian) immigrants eventually arrived in large numbers. Also numerous were experienced American farmers, who settled in Saskatchewan and Alberta and were well-prepared for the challenge they came to take up.

[1] Pierre Berton. The Promised Land, p.1. The realm was not empty; it was inhabited by First Nation people.
[2] Desmond Morton: A Short History of Canada, p.35.
[3] Ibid. p.35.

The settlers were attracted by the land, much as the earlier explorers of the vast Northwest Territory had been attracted by the fur trade. Canada's seemingly inexhaustible supply of softwood was the economic engine that drove much of the scattered settlement of the hinterland of central Canada and the middle north farther west right up to the present time. Fishing induced settlement on the coast, and mining brought scattered towns, some of which, like Sudbury, grew to a significant size. In short, it was economic opportunity in the form of vast, rich natural resources that provided the engine for the development of Canada's regions. When world demand for these products was strong, development took off, and people moved to the areas of opportunity. Riches did not always follow, as with the British Columbia gold rush of the 1850s that petered out before it really got underway, and from which virtually no permanent settlement resulted. Neither did free land always produce a comfortable living, as hundreds of overgrown farms around Ottawa attest.

Much has changed since those early days, but the fundamental driving force remains the same. There has to be economic opportunity to draw people, who have to have the capacity to exploit it. It takes skill, enterprise and capital, as well as infrastructure, access to markets, and peace, order and good government to exploit the opportunities and generate economic growth. If opportunity or capacity to exploit it is lacking, people move on.

New immigrants are boosting Canada's population in large numbers. Canadians expect that these immigrants will contribute to the future economic growth of the country, much in the way that Canadians do. There is much evidence to suggest that they will: earlier generations of immigrants have achieved economic success. But the historical account also indicates that these people went to the right places, places that had economic potential. Today, immigrants settle in the larger cities, especially in Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal. This paper aims to explore whether immigrants can be drawn to other destinations, what would be suitable alternatives, what means may be used to direct more immigrants to those places, and what economic outcomes may be expected from such policies. A good place to start is the relationship between people - human resources - and regional economic development in the contemporary, less resource-based and more global, economy.

The role of human resources in regional economic development

There is a vast literature on regional economic development. Many analysts have tried to understand differences in wealth and economic growth between countries and between regions within countries. National and regional governments have been engaged in an unrelenting search for the magical mix of ingredients that makes for full employment and rapid economic growth.

There is an almost endless variety of success stories and models, and a long history of failed or only moderately successful attempts to stimulate economic growth. It is difficult to summarize or draw general conclusions from this vast literature. In a recent review volume, Higgins and Savoie [1997] do an admirable job of reviewing the main theories,

but cannot do more than sketch in very broad strokes the history of economic development policies, and that only for very few countries and regions. They do not offer specific conclusions for policy, merely broad directions.

Most theories about regional economic development focus on the physical assets of regions, whether natural resources, favourable location, the advantages of large agglomerations, or the structure of industry. Human resources, with the exception of the special category of entrepreneurs, are rarely assigned more than a contributory role - an honourable mention, so to speak – in regional success stories. They are an enabling factor rather than a driving force. The quality of human resources is important for development, more so today than in the past. The quantity of human resources matters as well. The deep labour markets of large cities are considered a significant advantage in the competition for large, sophisticated businesses. But there is no theory that claims, nor are there examples to show, that amassing a pool of labour is an effective method of boosting economic development.

The brief account given above of European settlement stressed the role of natural resources. The history of the development of Canada is well described by the "staple theory" of Harold Innis, who saw settlement of Canada resulting from an abundance of natural resources that were in demand in the world. Resources continue to be important for Canada. However, many resource industries have reached maturity. With only modest trend growth in world demand for most resource products, and intense competition from producers in other countries, natural resources are not the engine of growth they were when Canada was a frontier society. Natural resources still can be a major force for economic development in some regions – oil and gas in Alberta and offshore in the Atlantic region, diamond mines in the north, for instance – but for the most part the regions of Canada have to look to other sources of economic growth. As Higgins and Savoie put it, the challenge of economic development for Canada, in the past few decades and at present, is to transform the economy from exploitation of natural resources to exploitation of new technologies and development of new products and services, i.e. from a natural-resource-based to a human-resource-based economy.[4] Let us review some leading contemporary models of economic development to explore the role of human resources in more depth.

Perhaps the best known and most influential of current models of economic growth is that of Michael Porter. In his book "The Competitive Advantage of Nations", Porter has focused attention on the concept of **industrial clusters**, groups of related industrial sectors that are concentrated in a region. The interactions between the members of the cluster and linkages between these firms and regional industry may generate a competitive advantage for the region and a leading role in world markets.

[4] Higgins and Savoie, Chapter 2; Geography, Culture and Regional Development. The authors note that the need for a leap from natural-resource-based to human-resource-based growth may arise when there are still significant natural resources left to exploit (p.22).

In his "diamond" framework, Porter identifies four sets of interacting forces that determine an industry's competitive success:

- The structure of the main industry, the industry cluster. An industry with a number of firms in close proximity is more likely to become internationally competitive than an industry dominated by one large company.
- Related and supporting industries can enhance the competitive advantage of the cluster and become competitive themselves on world markets.
- Industries often benefit from the presence in the region of a number of early, large or quality-conscious customers.
- Factor conditions include availability of basic inputs (raw materials), education of the workforce, transportation facilities, other infrastructure, and relevant research institutions.

Porter's analysis focuses particularly on the structure and interactions within and around the cluster that are conducive to competitiveness and growth. Human resources are just one element within one of the four segments of the diamond. Porter argues that the basic factors that have determined location of industry "for so long – a ready source of energy, literate workers, and so on – are now available anywhere in the world. A region's success in the modern economy increasingly depends on factor conditions which are man-made, specialized and the result of long-term investments. Examples include workers with uncommon expertise and research institutions specializing in key technologies. Porter refers to such factors as advanced factors..".[5]

Thus, according to Porter, the quality of human resources is of vital importance to economic success. However, it is not a high level of education in general, but specialization that matters. Specialization is developed over a period of time through the presence of industry clusters and other conditions propitious to international competitiveness.

Another leading set of ideas about economic development is the profit cycle theory of Ann Markusen. This model sees industries move through a life cycle with successive stages of birth, growth, stagnation and decline. In this theory, the location of industrial activity depends on the stage of its development. In the early stages of development of new products, an industry is necessarily concentrated in one or a few areas. Chance plays a large role in determining these areas, although regions can enhance their chance of harbouring a new industry by creating favourable conditions.

During the "super profit" stage, the industry, protected by patents and with limited competition may grow fast, with only a few regions sharing in these gains. As related firms gather to the regions where the super-profit industry is located, the industry is likely to remain highly concentrated geographically and the regions where it is located experience very rapid growth. As the industry matures, competition increases, substitute products are developed, and success depends more on cost of production. Firms would

[5] [Russ Devlin] p.4. The description of Porter's and Markusen's approaches in this section are based on Devlin's summary.

then locate in lower-cost areas or close to large markets. At some point, growth levels off and decline may set in.

Many countries and regions are vying to be the place where industries are born, as success at this brings high incomes and rapid growth. This is also known as the "first mover advantage". While human resources are an important factor in the competition for new industries, there is no suggestion that merely amassing high-quality human resources is a viable strategy.

In a recent study, Markusen and colleagues examined the growth factors for "second-tier" cities, i.e. large cities, but not the leading metropolis in industrial countries. They developed four models to analyze the growth of these cities:

- Marshallian industrial districts. The business structure is dominated by small, locally owned firms, with substantial trade within the district among buyers and suppliers.
- Hub-and-spoke districts. One or several large, vertically integrated firms surrounded by suppliers dominated these districts. The core firms are embedded non-locally, with substantial links to suppliers and competitors outside of the districts.
- Satellite industrial platforms. Large, externally owned and headquartered firms dominate the business structure.
- State-anchored industrial districts. The business structure is dominated by several large government institutions such as military bases, state or national capitals, or large universities, surrounded by suppliers and customers.

These four models were used to describe the economic structure of cities in the US, Brazil, Japan and South Korea that have experienced rapid growth. It was found that hub-and-spoke and satellite structures were most prominent, with large multinational corporations and / or state-sector facilities playing prominent roles in their evolution. The business structure typology was useful for understanding the process of economic growth, even though cities may evolve from one type of structure to another over time as growth takes place. The study also concluded that "governmental decision makers at all levels and other organized agents for change are major shapers of the evolving spatial hierarchy of cities".[6]

The study of second-tier cities concludes with six policy goals at the national and international level: equalization of sub-national finances, educational investment, constraints on tax base competition, building strong sub-national governance capability, measures to discourage corruption, more data gathering. For policy makers at the urban and regional levels, the authors espouse strategic economic development planning, encouragement of innovation and entrepreneurship, and enhancement of quality of life to attract and retain skilled residents.

[6] Ann R. Markusen, Yong-Sook Lee, and Sean Digiovanna, Editors. Second-Tier Cities. Rapid Growth beyond the Metropolis. University of Minnesota Press, 1999. The quote is from Chapter 16: Reflections on Comparisons across Countries, page 336. In the first chapter the authors comment that national governments and international agencies continue to play a very powerful role in shaping urban and regional growth patterns around the globe. Their findings, they say, cast doubt on the ability of most regions to grow their own economies. Nonetheless, they consider local and regional initiatives important (p. 17).

To sum up, modern analyses of economic development regard industry structure rather than natural resource availability as the driving force of economic growth. Human resources are important, but they are seen as an enabling factor rather than the driving force. Regions that want to be economically competitive need to have human resources of high quality, as well as good physical infrastructure. All OECD countries have such assets, and their availability therefore does not guarantee strong economic growth.

Is bigger better? Regional economic development and population size

These views of economic development emphasize industry structure and dynamics. They seem to apply to larger centres primarily. Size itself is a factor, since larger size allows for more diversity of economic activity, certain efficiencies, and cross-fertilization, known in economic science as agglomeration economies. Urban size is also regarded as a determinant of economic growth. Jane Jacobs, for instance, regards cities as the locus of innovation and hence the source of economic growth. More specifically, she sees import replacement as the engine that can generate explosive growth. Synergy and invention result from the interaction of all kinds of economic activity in close proximity. They can only take place on a sufficient scale within cities, as Jane Jacobs sees it.[7]

The idea that size and concentration of population make a difference has been a main theme of regional economic development theory and practice. Many regions lagging in economic development lack a large urban centre. Much effort has been invested in selecting and stimulating growth poles, urban centres that were to be the economic engine for the surrounding region. But this approach has not delivered the benefits anticipated. As Markusen's study of second-tier cities shows, the economic activity of cities is not always closely linked to that of the surrounding area. The major economic ties may be with other, distant cities. More importantly, it has been very difficult politically to concentrate development in growth poles over a period of time long enough to make a difference.

Population size may not matter a great deal at a national level. In a 1991 report, the Economic Council of Canada argued that for Canada as a whole, there is no relationship between population size and economic wellbeing [Economic Council of Canada 1991]. The Council considered economies of scale in production generally, and produced estimates showing that the larger scale made possible by a major increase in Canada's population would not improve productivity and the standard of living.[8]

---

[7] Jane Jacobs: The Economy of Cities, 1970. See in particular Chapter 5: Explosive City Growth.

[8] Population growth through high levels of immigration is also advocated as a remedy for the aging of the Canadian population. However, the average age of immigrants at entry is only marginally (i.e., by one to two years) below the average age of the Canadian population. Therefore, immigration has virtually no effect on the age structure of the population. Canada does not control the age of immigrants entering through the family, refugee and humanitarian categories, more than one-half of the total. Even if the age of immigrants at landing could be reduced, it would affect the age structure of the population only slowly, at current levels of immigration. For population projections, see: *Population projections for Canada, provinces and territories 2000-2026*, Statistics Canada Cat. No. 91-520-XPB.

But at the regional level, i.e. in most provinces and regions within provinces, the Council's argument does not seem very convincing. The differences in average income among Canada's regions, although they have been diminishing, are consistent with the idea that a small population and lack of a large city are a disadvantage with respect to productivity and the level of employment. Small changes in size may not have much effect, however. For lagging regions to become more dynamic and capable of more or less autonomous economic growth, a doubling or more in size may be required. And size alone does not guarantee further growth: Large cities, and even larger concentrations of population may experience stagnation and decline over long periods.

Conclusion: Economic growth is a sine qua non

Economic and population growth appear to be sought for their own sake in every part of Canada. Why regions prefer growth to stagnation or decline is no great mystery. Economists may advocate outmigration as a rational policy for areas lacking economic opportunity, and Canadians have put this idea into practice. But outmigration, it has been found, is not generally sufficient to restore full employment and high incomes. Weak economic regions may be subject to negative circular causality, a vicious circle where decline breeds further decline [Higgins and Savoie]. Conversely, growing regions may gain momentum and benefit from positive cumulative causality. Growth can also be exciting, while high unemployment and lack of growth may breed fatalistic attitudes and a culture of dependency.[9]

The appeal of immigration is clearly that it may be a way of generating population growth. It can bring about much higher economic growth for Canada as a whole over long periods of time, if not much higher average incomes, as the Economic Council has shown. For Canada's slower-growth regions, increasing their share of immigrants seems a way of offsetting outmigration.

Attracting immigrants is not enough, however. Immigrants will behave like the region's sons and daughters, and leave unless they find opportunity. Regions that want to have faster population growth should also crank up their economic engine to generate jobs for a growing population. A region's success at generating economic growth ultimately determines the effect of efforts to attract and retain immigrants, not the other way around.

[9] Economic growth creates winners and losers, and it may have negative effects like congestion, urban sprawl and damage to the natural environment.

2. How to attract human resources to remote places

The single industry town

During Canada's brief history, resources have drawn people to different parts of the country. Often the resources were not along the main southern corridor, and often the places where the resources were found were, because of isolation and northern location, not suitable for further development. The one-industry town was and continues to be a typical feature of Canadian economic history. Although the towns are not as isolated as they used to be, what with good roads almost everywhere and air travel being commonplace, resource towns lack the variety that residents of large cities take for granted.

What drew people to the frontier? What did mining companies have to do to attract and retain employees? And what do they need to do today? Twenty-five years ago, the Royal Commission on Corporate Concentration published a study entitled "The Social Characteristics of One-Industry Towns in Canada". In it, author Alex Himelfarb sketches the stages of development of these towns:

- During the *construction* stage, the population is transient and predominantly male. The highly mobile population is willing to make short-term sacrifices for quick money.
- At the same time, *recruitment* of professionals and workers as company employees proceeds, from within the ranks of the company and places within Canada and overseas as needed. Professionals tend to accept mobility as a way of life, but this is less the case among production and office workers. Turnover remains high during this stage.
- During *transition*, control of the non-industrial facilities and community responsibilities are passed on from the company to the community, and a more stable community begins to emerge.
- After a number of years the community reaches *maturity*. Workers have invested money in their homes and are attached to the community. Retired employees tend to stay. As they come of age, children of the employees also begin work for the company. Many young people, however, may be forced to leave the town for lack of employment.
- To these four stages one should add *decline.* When the main employer shuts down, the workforce is left with very little. The market value of homes will be next to nothing. There is nothing left for most residents but to leave and begin all over again somewhere else, ill-prepared as they may be.

In the recruitment and transition stages, workers are brought in from the outside. This may involve bringing people in from elsewhere in Canada, and sometimes people are drawn from a single area or province in large numbers. For instance, Fort McMurray is home to the second largest concentration of Newfoundlanders after St. John's. The mine at Faro in the Yukon also boasted a large workforce from Newfoundland.

When Kitimat was built in the mid-1950s, the labour market in Canada was so tight that Alcan brought in many immigrants to operate its new smelter. In 1961, less than 40 per cent of the population of the town was of British origin, with many being recent immigrants. Twenty per cent were German, and sixteen other ethnic groups made up the remainder. The influx during 1956 included people from Portugal, Italy, Hungary, Greece and Scandinavian countries. Many of the immigrants were displaced persons, and a large proportion of these could speak no English. A language barrier continued to exist for many years. However, the Catholic Church and mixed ethnic housing were instrumental in establishing interaction between the groups and a sense of community. The fact that no single group was in the majority is thought to have helped as well.[10]

The retention rate of production workers depends on the state of the industry in the country at large. In the early seventies, when prices of natural resources skyrocketed and exploration and development exploded, there was a high rate of turnover. During the subsequent recession, the workforce at Kitimat was much more stable.[11]

According to Himelfarb, hiring in resource companies is generally decentralized, and it is accomplished not through formal corporate policies but through the informal practices of local company officers.[12] He relates this to the fact that most non-managerial jobs in these industries do not require formal qualifications. Probably this is no longer so. The resource sectors use very advanced machinery and sophisticated processes, and one suspects that employees on the whole are highly trained. However, hiring continues to be a responsibility of the local company or branch, for the most part.

Managers rotate through the various branches of a large mining company, generally staying only for a few years at any site. Like production workers, professional staff are also hired by local management, and from within the company as possible. Senior management or human resources staff at the head office may be involved in some cases. Mining engineers expect to work at production sites away from the large urban centres. Moreover, a major attraction of working at isolated sites is the wide range of professional challenges engineers encounter. This appeals to some. Even so, the industry provides incentives, which vary according to the degree of isolation.

For instance, at the Polaris mine on Little Cornwallis Island, professionals can earn up to 50 per cent over and above their regular salary through premium pay and extended hours. The company flies them in for a six-week stint and out for three weeks at home, and ensures that there are good services and food at the site. Miners have similar work and living arrangements and also do quite well financially.

[10] Kendrick, John: People of The Snow. The Story of Kitimat. 1987, chapter 9.
[11] Conversation with Mr. Utley, who was then at Kitimat.
[12] The early stage of development of a single industry town is an exception. All hiring for the initial workforce at Kitimat was done in Vancouver, for instance. Kendrick, Chapter 9.

In less isolated settings, like the Cominco mines at Trail and Kimberley, there is no difficulty in attracting a sufficient number of equipment operators and trades people. This probably reflects the typical situation in a one-industry town of long standing, and average or weak market conditions for these occupations. Specialists and professionals have more options, and some effort has to be made to attract and retain them. This does not involve extra pay; housing is much less expensive in the smaller towns than in Vancouver. The metallurgical plants at the site are state of the art, offering challenging and satisfying work for the engineers. An MBA program from Simon Fraser University is offered on site at Trail. Further, both sites offer lifestyle features that are extremely attractive: fabulous skiing, mountains galore.[13]

Addressing the shortage of physicians and nurses in rural and remote Canada

Money plays a large role in recruitment and retention of people in remote and isolated settings, but so do lifestyle preferences, amenities, level of education and access to professional development, opportunities for professional advancement. Construction workers are used to moving from project to project, and the industry may have a disproportionate share of footloose workers. Some people simply like the adventure of moving to a new area. But generally speaking, the less educated tend to be less inclined to move away from their place of origin. It is the professional class that is the most mobile.

Today, most members of the workforce have some post-secondary education and, accordingly, may be more inclined to consider migration. On the other hand, the more educated tend to be concentrated in the cities. With women participating in the workforce in almost the same proportions as men, and young women being as well or better educated than young men, urban areas may be even more attractive to the highly educated than they used to be. Small and remote places may have greater difficulty attracting professionals as they may not have suitable job openings for their spouses.

Canada is now facing a shortage of medical professionals, in particular in rural and small town settings. An emerging general shortage may be the result of cutbacks and restraint in funding for medicare and hospitals during the past ten years, job opportunities south of the border, restricted access to medical schools, and an aging workforce. In some provinces, shortages are more severe in northern and isolated communities.

All provinces are taking steps to increase the number of practicing physicians and nurses. These steps range from increasing the number of students in medical schools and advertising openings, to rich financial incentives for settlement in remote areas. British Columbia and Manitoba are shown as examples because information on these two provinces was readily available, and because they are pursuing different strategies.

[13] Based on discussions with Mr. Utley, head of human resources at Cominco, and a young mining engineer who worked at both sites in southern British Columbia.

In December 2000, the Manitoba government announced a 5-point action plan to train and keep more physicians in rural and northern Manitoba [Manitoba Government News Release]. It focuses exclusively on education and training:

- The province is to launch a campaign to encourage students from rural areas to consider a career in medicine, on the basis that students from those parts are more likely to practice in rural areas.
- Nine new positions will be funded to train family physicians in rural medicine, in addition to the existing six positions.
- Rural medicine is to be introduced in the first and second year of the undergraduate program, while previously it was addressed only in the graduate program.
- The number of positions for one-year advanced skills family medicine programs for rural practitioners will be doubled from five to ten.
- An Office of Rural and Northern Health is to be established to implement many elements of the strategy.

As regards funding, the largest item in the strategy is the increase in medical school enrolment from 70 to 85, a level that existed in the early 1990s. Nine of the fifteen new positions are for rural medicine.

By contrast, British Columbia, which claims to have a sufficient number of physicians overall, is offering significant financial incentives for physicians to practice in northern and isolated areas. These incentives vary according to the degree of medical isolation – which depends on the number of general practitioners and specialists in the community and distance from a major medical community - and distance from the lower mainland. Communities are awarded a number of points for each of the several measurable criteria. The point scores are the basis for a mark-up of fees for medical services performed, from a minimum of 4 per cent to a maximum of 30 per cent for the most remote communities which include Stewart, Fort Nelson and a number of aboriginal settlements. These higher fees for service in isolated areas have been in effect for a few years [Government of British Columbia 2000].

Most recently, under a temporary Physician Recruitment and Retention Program, the government of British Columbia is also offering an incentive payment of $10,000 for the first move to an isolated community, and from $5,000 to $30,000 per year, depending on the extent of isolation, for the first five years of practice. Physicians in isolated and northern areas also are paid for being on call for emergencies. These financial incentives are a way of compensating for lower billings due to the limited number of patients in sparsely populated areas. British Columbia also makes efforts to improve access for rural physicians to continuing medical education.

Financial incentives for practice in rural areas are found in other provinces. In Nova Scotia, for instance, rural physicians are guaranteed a minimum amount of fee income, and up to $22,000 per annum to be on call for emergencies, if emergency facilities are more than 45 km away. They also get moving expenses for up to $5,000, and a "signing

bonus" of $10,000 per year over five years for rural practice [Government of Nova Scotia]. This is very similar to what is offered in British Columbia.[14]

Little is known about the result of these measures, since they are of recent vintage. In part they are a correction to the effects of fiscal restraint on physicians' fees over the last 10 to 15 years, and an offset to the strong financial pull from south of the border. One knowledgeable person offered the opinion that, in British Columbia, the incentives have not induced a single doctor to take up practice in any of the communities concerned, as physicians do well enough in urban areas. At the moment, out of 1200 physicians positions in isolated and northern areas of British Columbia, about 200 are vacant.[15]

Provinces are also looking abroad for physicians. Access is easiest for doctors trained in the US and certain Commonwealth countries: Britain, Australia and New Zealand, and South Africa, as their training is more readily recognized. South Africa in particular has been a source of physicians to Canada. Of 55,000 physicians practicing in Canada in 1995, 649 general practitioners and 480 specialists were from South Africa, and more may have landed since then. South Africa is now beginning to object to Canada's aggressive recruiting.[16]

Both Manitoba and British Columbia are making efforts to recruit and retain nurses. There is a shortage at this time, which is projected to increase in years to come.

In 1999, the Manitoba government established the Nurses Recruitment and Retention Fund to support one-time funding costs for specific strategies or initiatives to attract and keep registered nurses, licensed practical nurses, and registered psychiatric nurses in Manitoba, and to promote nursing as a profession [Province of Manitoba].

Initiatives taken by the Fund and results as of October 30, 2000:

- Funding for relocation expenses of up to $5000 for nurses relocating to Manitoba from outside the province as of April 1, 1999. Two hundred and twenty-two nurses have received assistance.
- Financial support of 80% up to $2000 per person for nurses who are taking refresher training to assist them to re-enter the nursing profession. Twenty-eight RNs and 3 LPNs have completed training and are employed; 157 nurses have applied for assistance.

[14] The Canadian Rural Information Service website at Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada lists programs available in a number of provinces, as well as contacts, vacancies, and literature on the subject.

[15] Estimate reported to the author informally. The number of vacancies can be verified by checking the [Health Match BC] Internet site. (This may take a bit of doing since the site is not designed to calculate the number of vacancies.)

[16] In Newfoundland, it has been reported, 30 per cent of physicians are foreign-trained, with South Africa being an important source. British Columbia also has attracted doctors from South Africa recently. On February 13, 2001, CBC radio broadcast a discussion between the head of the Canadian Medical Association and a representative from South Africa who gingerly protested the exodus of trained doctors, emphasizing both her support for freedom of choice for individuals and the serious impact on the country of a shortage of physicians. The numbers cited were reported in [Levitt].

- Funding for new courses: Intensive care nursing for 45 graduates; emergency nursing by long distance education; primary care skills course for designated northern nursing stations; neo-natal /pediatric critical care course; perioperative care program.
- A budget of $160,000 for forgivable loans to students who enroll in summer nursing terms in order to graduate in less than four years.
- $3 million in funding for continuing education initiatives, distributed to continuing education committees in all regions. Continuing education is seen as a major retention factor.
- Representation at local and national job fairs, advertising featuring a "Come Home to Manitoba" campaign, information hotline.

In British Columbia, a major report was produced on the future supply and demand for nurses in the province [Registered Nurses Association of British Columbia]. The report projects a significant challenge, and claims that two traditional sources of supply, migration from the rest of Canada and immigration, will not be available. Hence it argues for more education in the province. As for rural and northern nursing, while the report notes that lasting vacancies may have more serious consequences than in urban areas, it is more concerned with improving rural nursing practice than with recruitment and retention. The report comments on retention as follows:

> Rural nurses can be grouped into those who have either remained or returned to the rural setting in which they were raised, have found themselves transplanted from an urban area (often due to spousal employment), or have made a conscious decision to relocate from an urban to a rural area. Research has suggested that efforts to successfully recruit nurses to rural settings are viewed as considerably more difficult than retaining them. Recruiting rural nurses may be problematic due to a decline in the rural population (including outward migration of nurses); increased competition; and the former stability of the rural nursing staff which precluded many nursing administrators from routinely engaging in recruitment efforts.
>
> Stratton et al note that much of the research on recruitment and retention in rural settings has focussed on nursing-related issues that are amenable to some degree of administrative control. They cite the most common enticements to be salary increases, overtime incentives, flexible scheduling, child care services, and tuition/education reimbursement, as well as non-cash incentives. However, they also note that job availability and lack of viable alternatives have been shown to be prominent factors for nurses practicing in rural settings. A 1993 study concluded that professional interaction was the most significant barrier and hypothesized that nurses may not want to work at a facility with a history of poor professional interaction and working relationships. They proposed that gains be made by developing strategies that facilitate improved professional interaction between nurses and other staff. [Registered Nurses Association of British Columbia, p.52]

The shortage of nurses, like that of doctors, has its origin in the severe funding restraints of the past decade or so. Regional health boards in many provinces have found it advantageous to hire nurses as casual employees, as this reduces the cost of overtime and employee benefits. This suited some nurses. Many of those who preferred permanent positions, however, have moved out of nursing or to other jurisdictions, and employers now find themselves forced to increase the number of permanent positions.

Provinces also are having recourse to immigration to fill medical vacancies. Although some of these efforts are of recent vintage, Canada has always counted medical

practitioners and nurses among its immigrants. There is a significant hurdle for these immigrants in that they have to practice in Canada and write an exam before they can obtain a permanent licence to practice medicine.[17]

Credentials of physicians who trained in the US, the UK, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa are more readily recognized by the medical authorities than diplomas and work experience in other countries. For other countries, the barrier to entry of physicians continues to be very high. Not only do immigrants need to get their foreign training and experience recognized in order to obtain a provisional licence to practice in Canada, they also have to face the risk of failing to pass an exam that is held only after the required period of practice in Canada. Pre-approval does not exist.

For nurses entry is perhaps not quite as difficult. Manitoba is in the process of admitting more than forty nurses from the Philippines through its provincial nominee program. With agreement from the provincial nurses association, it sent staff to the Philippines – a major source country for immigrants living in Manitoba - to interview and test some two hundred candidates. This marks the first time this test is conducted outside Canada. Those who were selected will have a licence to practice in Canada. They are negotiating employment contracts with regional health authorities in Manitoba and are beginning to arrive to take up these positions. If it all comes off as planned, this is a nice example of how immigration should ideally work.[18]

Conclusion: Focus on the cities

The challenge of attracting mining engineers, doctors and nurses to rural and isolated communities is probably not a good model for the challenge of drawing the general immigrant away from the three largest cities. For one thing, the shortage of medical personnel is a matter of highly specialized services. Further, there are other alternatives to Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal than remote places: Canada has twenty-two other metropolitan areas[19], and many smaller cities. As well, financial incentives are not likely to be a significant part of any strategy of dispersal of immigrants, because of their cost, but mainly because restricting such incentives to a specific group cannot be justified under the Charter.

However, the account highlights factors that are likely to play a role in the location decisions of immigrants. For instance, the nature of many jobs varies according to the size of the area. In smaller and isolated areas, professionals are likely to have to work alone, facing a greater range of issues, perhaps, while having more authority to act alone.

---

[17] The [Health Match BC] web site gives a clear statement of the hurdles immigrant physicians face to obtain a licence for practice in the province of British Columbia.

[18] As reported by Deborah Barkman, Senior Policy Consultant, Manitoba Ministry of Labour and Immigration

[19] Census metropolitan areas are urban agglomerations of more than 100,000 inhabitants. Apart from Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver, there are 22 CMAs in Canada: Victoria, Edmonton, Calgary, Saskatoon, Regina, Winnipeg, Thunder Bay, Sudbury, Windsor, London, Kitchener-Waterloo, Hamilton, St Catherines-Niagara, Oshawa, Ottawa-Hull, Trois Rivières, Quebec City, Chicoutimi-Jonquière, Sherbrooke, St. John, Halifax, and St. John's.

In smaller communities, professionals are more in the public eye. Smaller cities may not provide the opportunities for professional development and advancement that many professionals seek, and they may lack sufficient job opportunities for spouses.

3. Immigrant destinations in Canada

The focus now shifts from regional development to the decisions of immigrants as to where to live in Canada, and how these decisions may be influenced. Sections 3 and 4 give an overview of where long-established immigrants, recent immigrants, and refugees live, the number who stay in their initial destination, and their interprovincial migration behaviour. In section 3, the settlement and migration behaviour of business immigrants is highlighted in relation to strategies aimed at distributing immigrants beyond Canada's three largest metropolitan areas. Whereas generally governments have not tried to influence the location decisions of immigrants, the Canadian government and governments abroad have involved themselves in settlement of refugees and asylum seekers. Their experience in this regard is reviewed in sections 5 and 6.

Where immigrants live

The geographic distribution of immigrants is far more skewed than that of the Canadian-born. In 1996, 60 per cent of immigrants lived in Canada's three largest metropolitan areas, and only 14 per cent lived outside the 25 census metropolitan areas. By contrast, only 27 per cent of those born in Canada lived in the three largest cities, and 43 per cent lived in non-CMA areas (Table 3.1).

Immigrants who landed during the five and one-half years before the 1996 census (recent immigrants) showed an even greater geographic concentration. Seventy-four per cent lived in Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal. Thirteen per cent lived in Edmonton, Calgary, Winnipeg, Hamilton and Ottawa, the same share as for the Canadian-born. Only 6 per cent made their home in non-metropolitan parts of Canada.

Table 3.1: Place of residence of Canada's population by immigrant status, 1996 (percentage distribution)

	Three largest cities	Next five large cities	Other CMAs	Non-CMA areas	Number ('000)
Canadian-born	27%	13%	18%	43%	23,390
Immigrants	60%	15%	10%	14%	4,971
Recent immigrants	74%	13%	7%	6%	1,039

The three large cities are Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal. The next five large cities are Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Ottawa (not including Hull) and Hamilton. The numbers pertain to the population of the CMA (Census Metropolitan Area) rather than just the municipality. Other CMAs include Halifax, Quebec City, Sherbrooke, Trois Rivières, Oshawa, St. Catharines-Niagara, Kitchener, London, Windsor, Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Regina, Saskatoon, and Victoria. Non-CMA areas include all rural areas and urban agglomerations of less than 100,000 inhabitants, as well as the CMAs of St. John's, Saint John, Chicoutimi-Jonquière, and Hull. Source: [Statistics Canada 2000].

The settlement pattern of recent immigrants varies in a major way by country of birth. Immigrants born in northern and western Europe and the U.S. tend to disperse throughout Canada. Recent immigrants from some of these countries live outside metropolitan areas in larger proportions than persons born in Canada, as do recent immigrants from Mexico. Their numbers are small, however (Table 3.2). Recent immigrants from eastern Europe settle primarily in the larger cities, and those from the major source countries in Asia have an even stronger tendency to congregate in the largest urban centres.

Immigrants are increasingly concentrated in the larger cities because

- new immigrants from many countries of birth increasingly choose to live in the largest cities; and
- the countries of birth whose immigrants to Canada show a strong tendency to settle in the larger centres account for an increasing share of new immigrants.

Table 3.2: Place of residence in 1996 by place of birth, immigrants who landed during 1991-1996

Place of residence	Three largest cities	Next five large cities	Other CMAs	Non-CMA areas	Number ('000)
Canadian-born	27%	13%	18%	43%	23,390
Immigrants	74%	13%	7%	6%	1,039
Immigrants born in:					
US	41%	14%	16%	29%	29
UK	44%	17%	13%	25%	25
Germany	34%	12%	13%	41%	8
Netherlands	18%	14%	5%	61%	3
Switzerland	23%	7%	3%	65%	3
Italy	69%	13%	10%	8%	3
Portugal	81%	8%	7%	4%	9
Yugoslavia	54%	19%	19%	7%	22
Russian Federation	77%	14%	4%	5%	11
Poland	64%	17%	13%	5%	37
Bosnia/Herzegovina	45%	23%	27%	6%	9
Hong Kong	89%	8%	2%	1%	109
China	78%	13%	5%	3%	88
India	75%	12%	4%	9%	71
Philippines	72%	19%	4%	4%	71
Jamaica	83%	11%	4%	2%	21
Mexico	30%	8%	9%	53%	8

Even so, two million immigrants live outside the three largest cities. Of these, 750,000 live in the five second-tier cities, 500,000 in other CMAs, and 700,000 in non-CMA areas. In 1996, more than one-quarter of a million recently-arrived immigrants did not

live in Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal: the five second-tier cities were home to 130,000, other CMAs to 70,000, and the rest of the country to 60,000 of these new immigrants.

It is also clear from Table 3.2 that there is considerable diversity in origins of immigrants in each of the four types of areas. Indeed, each of the eight large cities has a rich mixture of immigrants. But the same is true for places that attract only small numbers of recent immigrants. In the smaller cities and in non-metropolitan parts of provinces, it is quite common to find just a few families from many countries, rather than larger groups from a small number of countries. Ethnic diversity among immigrants is not only seen in the largest metropolitan areas.

Saint John, New Brunswick is home to 245 immigrants who landed during 1991-1996. Sixty-five immigrants were born in the US, and the same number in the UK. Other recent immigrants were born in other countries in the following numbers: Portugal - 10; Poland – 20; Philippines – 10; Netherlands – 10; Mexico – 10; Iraq – 10; Germany – 10; China – 10; All other countries of birth – 25. Chicoutimi-Jonquiere, with 285 immigrants who landed between 1991 and 1996, does not show the same variety, but it does count 20 persons born in Kenya and 10 from Taiwan among its residents.[20]

To get is not to keep: Interprovincial migration

The number of immigrants living in any part of the country differs from the number that identified that part of the country as their destination at the time of landing. In Canada as a whole, the number of immigrants who land during a given period declines as time passes because of outmigration and deaths. The rate of attrition due to these factors may vary from one region to another. As well, some immigrants move to a different part of Canada after landing.

In 1996, 85 per cent of immigrants who landed after 1980 still lived in Canada. The loss of 15 per cent is largely a result of emigration. Among the provinces, with the Atlantic provinces taken as a group, Saskatchewan had the lowest number of immigrants compared to those who intended to settle there: 50 per cent. The Atlantic region lost almost half of its immigrants because of emigration and migration to other parts of Canada (Table 3.3).

[20] The numbers are randomly rounded to a multiple of 5 by Statistics Canada. Source: Same as for Table 3.1.

The number of immigrants drops sharply in the few years after landing, and declines at a more modest rate after that.[21] Eighty-eight per cent of those who landed after 1990 were still living in Canada in 1996. The rates of retention[22] of the most recent immigrants vary considerably between provinces. Apparently, immigrants are prone to moving between provinces in the years immediately following arrival. Differences in retention among the regions may also reflect different tendencies to leave Canada.

Ontario and British Columbia are the only provinces to have a higher immigrant retention rate than Canada as a whole. These two provinces are favoured by immigrants as an initial destination and also after initial settlement. The preference for these two provinces after landing is shared by all three five-year immigrant cohorts. In the case of British Columbia this preference is strong enough to more than offset any attrition of new immigrants destined there after 1985.

Table 3.3 Number of immigrants living in a province in 1996 as a percentage of the number giving the province as destination at time of landing, by period of landing.

Period of landing	1981-1985	1986-1990	1991-1995	1981-1995
Canada	78%	84%	88%	85%
Atlantic region	57%	54%	51%	53%
Quebec	71%	65%	75%	71%
Ontario	88%	90%	90%	90%
Manitoba	58%	64%	82%	68%
Saskatchewan	37%	43%	67%	50%
Alberta	63%	76%	81%	74%
British Columbia	86%	107%	104%	101%
Territories	86%	76%	77%	79%

Source: [Statistics Canada 2000] and [CIC 200C].

While we can only guess at the migration patterns of the most recent immigrant cohort (those who landed after the previous census), the census does give information about migration for earlier cohorts of immigrants and the Canadian-born. Specifically, the census reports whether people lived at a different address five years before the census, and if so, whether in a different census division or province. In 1996, immigrants (i.e.

[21] Strictly speaking, this may not be correct as Table 3.3 does not give information as to when immigrants who landed prior to 1991 left the country or moved. We assume, however, that immigrants who landed during the first and second half of the 1980s had a rate of attrition in 1986 and 1991 that is similar to that shown for the 1991-1995 cohort in Table 3.3.

[22] "Rates of retention" refers to the percentages in Table 3.3. Strictly speaking, the rates for provinces measure more than retention, since the number of immigrants living in a province includes not only those who stayed since landing, but also those who moved to the province from elsewhere in Canada.

immigrants who landed more than five years before the census) were slightly less likely than Canadian-born persons to have moved to a different province (3.0% compared to 3.2%; Table 3.4). It can be shown that immigrants were also less likely to have made a major move within their province of residence: 7 per cent of immigrants lived in a different census division within the same province than five years before, compared to 9 per cent of the Canadian-born.

Table 3.4 Interprovincial migration during five years prior to the 1996 census, in thousands, as a share of the population, and percentage distribution

	Moved to province	Left province	Net migration	Population 5 years earlier	Moved to province	Left province	Net migration	Moved to province	Population
	(in thousands of persons)				(as a share of the population)			(percentage distribution)	
Canadian-born									
Newfoundland	15	37	-22	557	3%	7%	-4%	2%	2%
PEI	8	7	1	125	6%	5%	1%	1%	1%
Nova Scotia	44	46	-2	850	5%	5%	0%	6%	4%
New Brunswick	33	32	1	698	5%	5%	0%	4%	3%
Quebec	60	75	-14	6,305	1%	1%	0%	8%	27%
Ontario	146	200	-54	7,834	2%	3%	-1%	20%	34%
Manitoba	39	52	-14	961	4%	5%	-1%	5%	4%
Saskatchewan	45	59	-14	929	5%	6%	-1%	6%	4%
Alberta	139	133	5	2,215	6%	6%	0%	19%	10%
British Columbia	199	87	112	2,621	8%	3%	4%	27%	11%
Territories	14	13	1	86	16%	16%	1%	2%	0%
Canada	740	740		23,182	3.2%	3.2%		100%	100%
Immigrants who landed before mid-1991									
Newfoundland	0.7	1.8	-1.0	8	9%	21%	-13%	1%	0%
PEI	0.5	0.4	0.1	4	12%	8%	3%	0%	0%
Nova Scotia	3.3	4.0	-0.7	38	9%	11%	-2%	3%	1%
New Brunswick	2.1	1.9	0.2	23	9%	8%	1%	2%	1%
Quebec	8	28	-20	586	1%	5%	-3%	7%	14%
Ontario	38	37	1	2,340	2%	2%	0%	30%	55%
Manitoba	3	9	-6	125	3%	8%	-5%	3%	3%
Saskatchewan	3	7	-4	50	7%	14%	-7%	3%	1%
Alberta	18	24	-6	360	5%	7%	-2%	14%	9%
British Columbia	48	13	36	693	7%	2%	5%	38%	16%
Territories	1.2	1.4	-0.2	6	20%	23%	-3%	1%	0%
Canada	127	127		4,232	3.0%	3.0%		100%	100%

Source: [Statistics Canada 1998]. Population 5 years earlier is calculated as the population in 1996, plus those who left the province less those who came to the province, and less those who came from outside Canada, all migration in the five years prior to the census only. This population number excludes persons not living in private households in Canada and all those who died during the five years prior to the 1996 census. Population is calculated separately for Canadian-born and immigrants. Immigrants do not include new immigrants, i.e. those who landed within the last five years before the 1996 census. Persons under 5 years of age are not included among interprovincial migrants.

If overall the propensity to migrate is not all that different between immigrants and the Canadian-born, there are striking differences province by province. As regards outmigration, immigrants not living in Ontario or British Columbia were far more likely than the Canadian-born to leave their province. Among these immigrants, the rate of outmigration during 1991-1996 ranged from 5 per cent in Quebec to 21 per cent in Newfoundland (Second column of middle panel in Table 3.4). Among their Canadian-born counterparts, the number of outmigrants reached a maximum of only 7 per cent (in Newfoundland) and was as low as 1 per cent (Quebec).

Immigrants are less likely than the Canadian-born to leave Ontario and British Columbia. This pattern of outmigration is found among immigrants from all continents. It is more pronounced among immigrants from Asia, Latin America and Africa than among immigrants from Europe and the U.S., i.e. the former show a higher rate of outmigration from the smaller provinces.

Turning now to the destination of interprovincial migrants, immigrants favour Ontario and especially British Columbia as destinations (right panel in Table 3.4). Canadian-born interprovincial migrants also have such a preference, but it is not as strong. Two-thirds of the immigrant population who move to another province go to these two provinces, compared to less than one-half of the Canadian-born. When the distribution of destinations of interprovincial migrants is compared with the distribution of the population in the province of destination, it becomes clear that Alberta and British Columbia are especially popular destinations with both the Canadian-born and the immigrant population.

These movements have an effect on the geographic distribution of the population. Almost all provinces lose population as a result of migration by Canadian-born persons and immigrants (to repeat, immigrants who landed during 1991-1996 are not included here). British Columbia is the only province to gain large numbers of both groups. Ontario experienced net outmigration of Canadian-born persons during the 1991-1996 inter-censal period, and, although many immigrants chose to move to Ontario, an equal number moved out of the province.

All these figures are for the period 1991-1996, and they may or may not be representative of other periods. With regard to Ontario, it is probably significant that the province was very hard hit by the economic downturn of the early 1990s. There were fewer jobs in Toronto in 1995 than in 1990, for instance. Ontario may draw more interprovincial migrants at other times than it did during that period. More recently, especially with higher oil and gas prices, Alberta is probably pulling in much larger numbers of Canadian-born persons, and its interprovincial migration flow of the foreign-born may have become positive as well.

Migration between metropolitan areas

In an interesting paper, Eric Moore, Mark Rosenberg and Brian Ray (1989, 1990) have explored the reasons for the differences in migration rates and patterns between immigrants of various origins and the Canadian-born. Their study compares location of residence in 1981 and 1986, i.e. 10 years earlier than the data in Table 3.4, but the findings of the study are plausible and probably also apply at the present time. As in the above discussion of migration, this study considers only immigrants who were living in Canada at the time of the first, i.e. the 1981 census, and not those who arrived between the two censuses.

The geographic detail used in the study is particularly apt for immigrants, as it consists of 11 CMA areas, with smaller CMAs being lumped together, and a single non-CMA category, where almost one-half of the Canadian-born but only about one-sixth of immigrants live.

The study finds that in metropolitan areas, immigrants born in Asia and in the Caribbean generally are more likely to migrate than the Canadian-born, except in Toronto and Vancouver-Victoria. Immigrants from southern Europe, however, are significantly less likely to migrate than the Canadian-born. In non-metropolitan Canada all immigrants are far more likely to migrate, i.e. to move to a metropolitan area, than the Canadian-born.

In the case of immigrants from Asia and the Caribbean, these patterns are closely associated with the relative size of the specific immigrant group: the larger the group the immigrant belongs to, the less likely the immigrant is to move away. People of Asian and Caribbean origin have a much higher tendency than other immigrants to leave an area, but ethnic concentration holds them back. Immigrants from southern Europe have a low tendency to migrate compared to the Canadian-born, and this tendency is even lower with ethnic concentration. As regards immigrants from the U.S., the U.K. and western, northern and eastern Europe, ethnic concentration does not clearly influence their decision to leave or not leave an area.

Immigrants are considerably more likely than the Canadian-born to move to a CMA, whatever their initial place of residence, except immigrants from the U.S., the U.K. and western, northern and eastern Europe. The CMAs of choice are Toronto and also Montreal and Vancouver, except that people of Asian origin are not likely to move to Montreal, and those of Caribbean origin avoid Vancouver. Ethnic concentration in the destination affects those from the Caribbean in a major way, and Asians somewhat less so. Immigrants from the old source countries are similar to the Canadian-born in choice of destination.

To sum up, the migration behaviour of immigrants from several different parts of the world varies and is different from that of the Canadian-born. Economic conditions and the size of the city where people live affects the rate of migration of different groups in the same way, and conditions in the destinations also affect the migrants' choice of destination in the same way, regardless of the origins of each group. The apparent

tendency of immigrants from Asia and the Caribbean to concentrate in the largest cities derives from a higher tendency to migrate and from the value they attach to being part of a large community of people with the same origin. Immigrants from southern Europe also like to be with their own kind, but they are much less inclined to migrate.

Immigrant entrepreneurs: challenges for dispersed settlement

As a conclusion to this discussion, we turn to the settlement and migration behaviour of immigrant entrepreneurs. Given the structure and objectives of the Entrepreneur Immigration Program, we examine the efficacy of using entrepreneurs as key 'nodes' or 'poles' around which to encourage new immigrants to settle outside of the country's three largest metropolitan areas. If immigrant entrepreneurs create employment opportunities in regional locales, can they contribute to the socio-economic integration of new immigrants in these areas?

Development of small businesses and training of entrepreneurs is a major thrust of contemporary regional and community economic development efforts. As it is difficult and very expensive to attract large businesses to a region to overcome chronic unemployment, regional economic development policy has focused increasingly on enhancing local capacity to generate economic activity. Stimulating entrepreneurship among the population and assisting small businesses is one of the key elements of such a strategy.

Attracting entrepreneurial talent from outside the region has not been a major preoccupation in regional economic development strategies in Canada. To our knowledge, provinces have not been competing for domestic entrepreneurial talent (although they have been competing for footloose businesses). The federal economic development agencies ACOA and WED have not looked outside Canada for entrepreneurs. More recently, however, provinces are exhibiting an interest in immigrant entrepreneurs.

Results of the entrepreneur program

The Entrepreneur Immigration Program, a component of the business category of immigration, represents Canada’s effort to import entrepreneurial talent. To qualify, the entrepreneur immigrant has to establish a business and have at least one employee other than a member of his family within two years of admission. The Department advises the would-be immigrant that selection is based on the qualities of the applicant, not on the business proposal [Citizenship and Immigration 2000A, p.12].

These qualities are assessed on the basis of seven selection criteria. Out of a maximum of 87 points for these criteria, the entrepreneur must have a minimum of 25, not a very high standard. Knowledge of English or French rates a maximum of 15 points and thus is not considered an essential requirement. Nor is a high level of education. One-half of the

28.2 thousand principal applicants who landed under the entrepreneur program during the 1990s had no post-secondary education, while 48 per cent did not speak either official language.[23] Experience rates a maximum of 8 points. Experience may include jobs in management or business financing; it is not necessary for the immigrant to have operated his own business.

The attrition rate for entrepreneurs is higher than for other immigrant groups. During a program evaluation conducted in the summer of 1989, 29 per cent of entrepreneur immigrants who landed during 1986 and 1987 could not be found, in spite of an intensive search [Employment and Immigration Canada 2000]. Based on a rudimentary calculation of immigrants overall, the attrition rate after 1 to 5 years is 12 per cent, and after 6 to 10 years it is 16 per cent.[24] Of entrepreneur immigrants who were contacted in Canada during the 1990 evaluation of the program there was a 63 per cent response rate.[25]

The 1990 survey found that 83 per cent of respondents had established a business, and 50 per cent fully met the requirements of the program. Three out of five entrepreneurs who had a business had started it; two-fifths had taken over an existing firm. Taking account of attrition and non-responses, however, the 1990 evaluation found that less than one-quarter of the entrepreneurs admitted to Canada had fully met the requirements of the program.

What about the types of businesses immigrants operate? The program aimed to attract manufacturing ventures. The 1990 review found that 31 per cent were manufacturing businesses. This early performance was not maintained in later years. Between 1993 and 1995, manufacturing accounted for 15 per cent of intentions of immigrant entrepreneurs at landing.

Among principal applicants in the entrepreneur category who landed between 1980 and 1995 and filed an income tax return for the year 1995, 38 per cent had earnings from paid employment, and 21 per cent had earnings from self-employment (Table 3.5). Total income averaged only $11,789. That the income of those who arrived during the 1990s was rather low is probably due to them still being in the process of establishing a business or finding good jobs in Canada. Earnings and income of entrepreneurs who landed before 1990 are indeed higher (right panel of table), while the proportion of tax filers reporting earnings from paid employment and from self-employment is also slightly higher for this group. Income of spouses and dependants in the business category averaged $8,836 in 1995, and for spouse and dependants who landed during the 1980s it was $12,940.

[23] CIC landing data for 1991-2000.
[24] Calculated as the share of those who landed during 1991-1995 and 1986-1990 who were not counted as living in Canada according to the 1996 census.
[25] Further evidence is gleaned from the IMDB. Of business class immigrants (principal applicants and family members) who landed between 1980 and 1995, 38 per cent filed an income tax return in 1995, compared to about 50 per cent of immigrants overall. Included in these statistics are immigrant investors, who account for about one-third of business category landings and who may be more likely than other groups to reside outside Canada.

By comparison, principal applicants in the self-employed category reported an average 1995 income of $18,286, while investors had $14,675 on average. Entrepreneurs clearly have the lowest income of the three categories of principal applicants in the business category. This ranking remains when the more recent arrivals, some of whom may still be experiencing start-up losses, are excluded. Among principal applicants who landed during the 1980s, the income was $16,434 for entrepreneurs, $17,743 for the self-employed, and $20,361 for investors.[26]

Table 3.5: Income of entrepreneur immigrants for the 1995 taxation year

	Landed 1980-1995			Landed 1980-1989		
1995 tax year	Number reporting income	Per cent of total filers	Average income reported	Number reporting income	Per cent of total filers	Average income reported
Earnings from paid employment	6,705	38%	$18,646	2,760	42%	$23,567
Self-employment income	3,750	21%	$4,714	1,510	23%	$9,048
Total income	17,850	100%	$11,789	6,640	100%	$16,434

Source: [CIC 1998] Disc 1. Includes all immigrants who landed during 1980-1995 as principal Applicants in the Entrepreneur Category, filed an income tax return in 1995 and were captured in the IMDB.

Compared to the Canadian-born, people in general, immigrant entrepreneurs have very modest incomes. In 1995, the income of men aged 15 and over born in Canada averaged $29,700, and their female counterparts reported $17,400. Ninety per cent of the principal applicants in the entrepreneur category were men, so their average income as reported in Table 3.5 should be compared with the higher of these amounts. Furthermore, 71 per cent of Canadian-born women and 79 per cent of Canadian-born men reported earnings from employment (paid employment and/or self-employment) in 1995, while 65 per cent or less of immigrant entrepreneurs - principal applicants who landed during the 1980s - did so.[27] These numbers may not point to a low-income problem, as the immigrant entrepreneurs may have income from business activities outside Canada. But they suggest that these immigrants face considerable difficulty in getting established in business or employment and earning a living for their families in this country.[28]

[26] In this section, all income data for immigrants is from the IMDB, the same source as for the table. Information about Canadian-born persons is from the 1996 census.

[27] We do not know to what extent persons with earnings from paid employment (42% or the total) and with self-employment earnings (23%) overlap. It would be interesting to compare the immigrant entrepreneurs with Canadian–born "entrepreneurs" or small-business owners.

[28] Business people may earn business income and not pay it out as earnings or dividends. To the extent that immigrant entrepreneurs do this, the comparisons made in the text may not reflect their true relative income situation.

The relatively low earnings and small size of businesses established point to immigrant entrepreneurs as weak employment 'poles' around which other immigrants might gravitate and a regional immigration program developed. Moreover, as is true of immigrants overall, entrepreneurs demonstrate a strong predilection for settlement in the largest metropolitan centres in Canada, even if they initially settle outside of Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal.

Immigrant investors and self-employed immigrants

Besides the entrepreneur program, the business category of immigration has two other components: the immigrant investor program and the self-employed immigrant program. The immigrant investor program has been designed to attract investment funds but not the investors themselves to Canada's provinces. The money was allocated to economic development, without the direct involvement, and regardless of the settlement destination, of the immigrant investor. What has been accomplished in terms of regional economic development with the capital provided by immigrant investors is a matter that is outside the scope of this inquiry.

As far as we know, there have been no attempts to influence the choice of destination of immigrant investors. Immigrants cannot be held to settling in their chosen destination, and can freely settle anywhere they choose right after landing or at a later time. From 1986 to 1996, Quebec obtained 39 per cent of subscriptions from immigrant investors, while only 16 per cent of principal applicants intended to settle in the province [Citizenship and Immigration 1997]. More than one-half of investors intended to settle in British Columbia, which received only 10 per cent of the funds.[29]

In recent years, Quebec has operated its own immigrant investor scheme. The immigrant, it seems, generally is aware of his right to settle anywhere in Canada, and entry through the Quebec program does not mean that more immigrants are making a home in Quebec.

The immigrant investor probably has a more or less unique approach to choice of location in Canada. Employment is not as vital a concern for the average immigrant investor as for other immigrants. Many immigrant investors may, however, want to be in places where they can attend to their Canadian or foreign businesses or investments.

We have not examined the self-employed immigrant program. The number of immigrants admitted is small, and the program probably is not of strategic interest with respect to settlement and economic development outside the large centres.

Secondary migration of business immigrants

[29] In 1999, Quebec accounted for 75 per cent of the subscriptions and 44 per cent of intended destinations of the immigrant investors. British Columbia's share of destinations had dropped to 35 per cent, and its share of the funds to 1 per cent. As of April 1, 1999 Quebec required that the province be the destination of investors being admitted through the Quebec program.

Existing research on migration after landing is available only for the business class as a whole. This is a serious drawback, since we are interested primarily in entrepreneurs, as these are admitted for the contribution they can make to the local economy. The migration behaviour of entrepreneurs may be different from that of other business class immigrants. As we have seen, there is little connection between the destination of the funds provided by immigrant investors and the place where they settle, while the intended destination reported at landing may be closely tied to the destination of the funds, as is the case with the Quebec program most recently. Thus, if secondary migration is measured by comparing place of residence with intended destination at landing, we are likely to find a high rate of outmigration from the province of Quebec for the most recent immigrant investors. Apart from that specific instance, immigrant investors may exhibit a lower rate of interprovincial migration than other immigrants, as a large share settle in Vancouver, and another large proportion in Toronto immediately upon landing.

Of 84,980 business immigrants (principal applicants and family members) landed over the period 1980-1995 and captured in the 1995 tax statistics, 21,420, more than 25 per cent, had moved out of their province of initial destination. This is the highest rate of interprovincial mobility of the major immigrant classes [Citizenship and Immigration 2000B].

The pattern of interprovincial migration of business immigrants was similar to that for immigrants generally:

- Only Ontario and British Columbia experienced a net inflow of business immigrants as a result of secondary migration.
- By 1995, the Atlantic provinces taken together were left with less than one-half of the number of business immigrants destined there during the 15 preceding years, as a result of a large outflow and very little migration in the opposite direction.
- Quebec lost almost one-half of its business immigrants, more than 10,000. Only 800 business immigrants moved to Quebec.
- Ontario and British Columbia each gained 7,000 business immigrants in addition to the 25,000 destined there at landing.
- Manitoba and Saskatchewan each lost 800 business immigrants and gained about 100. This left Saskatchewan with some 400 business immigrants, and Manitoba with 1,400.
- Alberta saw 2,000 business immigrants leave out of 5,400 who landed, and welcomed 1,000 from other parts of the country.

Conclusion: Immigrants know what they want

These days, the Canadian population is regarded as being highly urbanized, and a lament about the loss of population in rural Canada is often heard. In these matters, immigrants are in a class of their own. They have a much stronger preference for cities, especially the largest cities, than the Canadian-born, perhaps because they come mainly from large cities and tend to have a cosmopolitan outlook. The immigrant from western and northern Europe, the U.K and the U.S. is much like the Canadian-born in his choice of residence. But immigrants from elsewhere, who now make up the large majority of immigrants,

move to the large cities immediately upon landing or shortly after. To them, the attraction of communities of people with the same origin is strong. Attempts to disperse immigrants should take account of these tendencies and bend them rather than try to resist them.

4. Dispersal of refugees in Canada

For smaller cities and smaller provinces, the challenge about refugees is how to retain them. At landing, refugees settle throughout the country, more so than any other immigrant group. But refugees have been quick to move to other places. This section explores what motivates refugees to move. It goes on to examine how the settlement destination of refugees is determined, with a view to exploring possible changes that may result in better matches of refugees and destinations, and greater retention in smaller cities and provinces.

Where refugees settle

The settlement pattern of refugees is somewhat more dispersed than that of immigrants generally. Over the past two decades, the three prairie provinces were the destination of 18 per cent of refugees landing in Canada, compared to 13 per cent of all immigrants. Quebec also took a larger share of refugees than of all immigrants: 19 per cent compared to 17 per cent. British Columbia was the destination of 9 per cent of refugees and 17 per cent of all immigrants (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Province or region of intended settlement of immigrants at landing, percentage distribution, 1980-1999

	Refugees		Other immigrants		Total	
Atlantic	10,937	2%	51,765	2%	62,702	2%
Quebec	93,949	19%	454,706	16%	548,655	17%
Ontario	251,596	52%	1,459,935	52%	1,711,531	52%
Manitoba	22,861	5%	67,244	2%	90,105	3%
Saskatchewan	14,009	3%	27,969	1%	41,978	1%
Alberta	49,832	10%	233,802	8%	283,634	9%
B.C.	41,751	9%	524,289	19%	566,040	17%
Territories	175	0%	3,298	0%	3,473	0%
Canada	485,969		2,827,172		3,313,141	

Source: [Citizenship and Immigration 2000C].

Although Ontario was the destination of slightly more than one-half of refugees and other immigrants (52%), refugees did not concentrate in the Greater Toronto Area (31%) to the same extent as other immigrants generally (39%). Vancouver took 7 per cent of refugees and 14 per cent of all immigrants, while 14 per cent of refugees and of other immigrants

chose Montreal. One quarter of refugees settled outside 13 large cities, compared to only 15 per cent of all immigrants.[30]

The destination refugees report at landing is probably a good indicator of where they initially settle, more so than is the case with business immigrants. The destination of government-sponsored and privately sponsored refugees is determined abroad with involvement of government officials. Arrangements are made for these immigrants to travel to their destination, and they are welcomed there. For asylum seekers the intended destination is perhaps not as reliable.

Secondary migration by refugees

Refugees have the second highest rate of interprovincial mobility among immigrants in the years following their admission to Canada, after business immigrants. They exhibit a very pronounced geographical pattern of migration, which nullifies their initial larger presence in Quebec and the Prairie provinces. As a result of secondary migration, Ontario ends up with a larger share of refugees than of other immigrants, and British Columbia with a smaller share.

Although Table 4.2 covers only part of immigrants who landed in the past two decades, the distribution of initial destinations in column 4 of this table is very similar to that for all landings reported in Table 4.1, both for refugees and for other immigrants. By 1995, however, immigrants and refugees alike are more concentrated in Ontario and British Columbia than immediately after landing. The greater share of refugees claimed by the smaller provinces and Quebec at landing simply disappears. Compared to other immigrants, refugees particularly tend to favour Ontario as a destination after initial settlement. Canada's largest province ends up with more than 60 per cent of refugees, compared to 54 per cent of other immigrants. Although British Columbia is the second major destination of refugees after initial settlement, that province's share of refugees remains rather low compared to its share of all immigrants.

The outmigration rates of refugees from the smaller provinces are quite high: 73 per cent for the Atlantic region, 68 per cent for Saskatchewan. Clearly, if these parts of Canada want to be home to a larger share of immigrants, retention of refugees could make a significant difference. To a lesser extent the same is true for Manitoba, Alberta and Quebec.

Regrettably, we cannot present information on migration of the Canadian-born in the same manner as for immigrants. In principle, this information could be generated from income tax data, but this has not been done. A comparison of interprovincial migration by immigrants and by the Canadian-born was presented earlier (Table 3.4). That information is based on the 1996 census, which does not give the immigration category of immigrants (i.e. does not distinguish refugees and other immigrants).

[30] These 13 metropolitan areas are: Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal; and from west to east Victoria, Calgary and Edmonton, Regina and Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Hamilton and Ottawa, Quebec City and Halifax. Source of numbers quoted in text: LIDS, special tabulation.

Table 4.2: Interprovincial migration rates of immigrants landing between 1980 and 1995 who filed a tax return in 1995 by destination at landing, and geographic distribution in 1995

	Rates			Distribution	
	Out migration	In migration	Retention	At landing	In 1995
Refugees					
Atlantic	73%	8%	34%	2%	1%
Quebec	25%	7%	83%	18%	15%
Ontario	7%	19%	112%	54%	61%
Manitoba	48%	6%	58%	5%	3%
Saskatchewan	68%	5%	38%	3%	1%
Alberta	32%	17%	85%	10%	9%
British Columbia	19%	62%	143%	8%	11%
Other immigrants					
Atlantic	42%	14%	72%	2%	1%
Quebec	20%	6%	86%	17%	14%
Ontario	6%	10%	104%	52%	54%
Manitoba	29%	7%	78%	3%	2%
Saskatchewan	50%	13%	63%	1%	1%
Alberta	24%	13%	89%	9%	8%
British Columbia	9%	24%	115%	17%	19%

Source: [Citizenship and Immigration 2000B], Table 4. Included are all immigrants who filed a tax return in 1995 and were captured in the IMDB.

In addition to migration between provinces, there is also movement within provinces. One is tempted to think that the dominant flows are from rural and smaller urban areas to the largest metropolitan centres, but we cannot confirm this specifically for refugees. However, migration of refugees who settled in seven cities in Alberta has been documented in a recent study [Baha Abu-Laban et al]. This study, conducted during the summer of 1998, examines the mobility behaviour of refugees who landed and settled in Alberta from 1992 to 1997.

Over one-third of these refugees arrived during 1996 and 1997; 44 per cent during the preceding two years, and 19 per cent in 1992 and 1993. As the time of landing and the time of the survey in the summer of 1998 are not far apart, this survey reveals high mobility shortly after landing among refugees (Table 4.3). At the time of the survey, 40 per cent were no longer living in the city of initial destination, and 25 per cent no longer

in Alberta.[31] More than one-half of those who left the province went to Ontario (126), and about one-sixth moved to British Columbia (43).

Table 4.3: Migration by refugees destined to seven Alberta cities

Current residence	Initial destination: Edmonton	Calgary	Lethbridge	Red Deer	Medicine Hat	Grande Prairie	Fort McMurray	Total current residence
Edmonton	**163**	7	1	7		16	7	201
Calgary	10	**178**	49	17	6	3	3	266
Lethbridge		4	**85**					89
Red Deer	1			**60**				61
Medicine Hat			1		**68**		3	72
Grande Prairie						**14**		14
Fort McMurray	2				2	2	**8**	14
Other Alberta		3			1			4
Ontario	37	14	22	20	22	9	2	126
British Columbia	3	14	18	3	5			43
Other	1	1	8	3	6			19
Not located	19	10	12		5	1		47
Total	**236**	**231**	**196**	**110**	**115**	**45**	**23**	**956**
Erosion rate	69%	77%	43%	55%	59%	31%	35%	60%
Retention rate	85%	115%	45%	55%	63%	31%	61%	75%

Source: Adapted from [Prairie Center of Excellence] Volume 1, Table 5-1. The data pertain to a random sample of government and privately sponsored refugees landing between 1992 and 1997. The row "Other" includes other destinations in Canada, 6 persons who left the country, and 2 who died. The erosion rate pertains to the number of refugees initially destined to a city who are still living in that city at the time of the survey. The retention rate also includes refugees who were initially destined to any of the other six cities.

As for moves within Alberta, Calgary drew 88 refugees from the other cities, Edmonton 38. Taken together, Calgary and Edmonton maintained the number of refugees in the sample that they originally received (467), while the five smaller cities lost almost one half of their initial allocation (489 destined there, 250 living there during the survey). Clearly, this survey gives evidence of large movements of refugees within Alberta from the smaller to the larger cities. This along with the interprovincial data shown earlier indicates that smaller cities as well as smaller provinces face a major challenge if they want to retain refugees.

Why refugees leave their initial destination

Little is known about why refugees migrate in such large numbers after arrival in Canada. Only the Alberta study has traced refugees who moved away from their initial destination, and explored the reasons for their move and their subsequent experiences.

[31] These rates of loss of refugees are higher than those shown above for the province of Alberta. The difference is probably mainly due to the fact that the data for Alberta only include persons who file taxes in 1995. Attrition through emigration and deaths, and failure to find immigrants are ignored in that data. Note that five per cent of the Alberta refugees (47) were not found in the survey.

Of 135 refugees destined to seven cities in Alberta who had relocated,

- More than one-half (54%) mentioned insufficient or inadequate employment and education opportunities as a major reason for leaving.[32] Mostly this was with reference to themselves, but sometimes with respect to their children.
- Fourteen per cent mentioned a desire to be closer to family and friends or to others from the same ethnic origin.
- About one in five responses emphasized quality-of-life factors like the size of the community (too small), the reception received from residents, the cost or quality of housing, or the climate.
- Eleven per cent mentioned inadequacy or lack of settlement and ESL services.

The first two reasons may be regarded as "pull" factors, the authors of the Alberta study suggest, and these are dominant compared to the latter two reasons, "push" factors both. It is noteworthy that refugees do not at all give as reasons hostility to their presence or widespread experience of racism or discrimination. The large majority of refugees who had moved from their initial destination felt they had made the right decision.

If this sample of refugees is representative of refugees generally, then small cities may not be capable of influencing the rate of out-migration of refugees in a major way, since only a small fraction of the answers directly points to matters they have some control over. Places where refugees are sent cannot change the "pull" of Toronto and Vancouver, or of other large cities like Calgary. Cities are not capable of drastically changing their size, the number and range of job vacancies, the range of educational institutions, or the cost of housing in the short to medium term, and are at the mercy of their climate. Cities could make efforts to be more welcoming and provide good services, and be more selective with regard to ethnicity of their immigrant community. But the latter strategies would not influence the majority of refugees, if one accepts the interpretation of the Alberta study of their reasons for leaving.

Choosing destinations for refugees

A target is set every year for the number of government-assisted refugees to be landed in Canada (currently 7300), and a range for privately sponsored refugees (2800 to 4000). An annual plan called the Pre-Approved Plan indicates how many government-assisted refugees are to be sent from each major refugee processing mission abroad to listed destinations in Canada. This plan is developed through consultations with stakeholders in Canada. Smaller missions do not have destination targets but request destinations for their refugees from the Matching Centre in Ottawa.[33]

[32] The question was open-ended. A total of 184 reasons were given by the 135 respondents.

[33] Privately-sponsored refugees are sent to their sponsors, and live with them or in the same community. Most private sponsors are relatives or friends of these refugees. The settlement pattern of privately-sponsored refugees reflects and reinforces the existing pattern of dispersal of refugees with the same geographic and ethnic origins.

The annual Plan combines source and destination and therefore implicitly distributes refugees by world region of origin, and thus also by ethnic origin, across Canada. Decisions about the destination of individual refugees and their families are made within the framework set by this plan. The refugees themselves are involved in the decision, but often they have but limited knowledge of Canada, and are more focused on getting away from their camp than on choosing where to go. The overseas immigration officer thus plays a major role in the decision, as does the Matching Centre for cases it handles.

Missions are supplied with Community Profiles to assist them in selecting a destination for refugees. The departmental manual for refugee processing describes the process as follows:

> Successful matching is in the best interest of both the refugee and the community to which they are destined. There is a myriad of considerations that needs to be taken into account when matching a refugee to an appropriate community. Some of the factors considered include the existence of family or other members of the same or similar cultural or ethnic group, prospects for employment and any special needs requirements. Community profiles assist in the matching process by providing information on Canadian communities. For example, community profiles provide information on population and climate, unemployment rate, skills in demand, language and job training availability, access to professions and trades, housing availability and average monthly rent, immigrant populations, where refugees have and have not settled well in particular communities, availability of special needs services and the identification of sponsor group interest, etc.[34]

The community profiles are one to four pages in length. Most profiles follow a standard format with some statistics about the climate, employment (unemployment rate, list of skills in demand, one or two sentences on language and job training, access to professions and trades), availability of housing and monthly rents, and the make-up of the community. They offer some relevant information, but one wonders how much of this is conveyed to refugees, and whether it really enables refugees to participate in the settlement decision (See box "Community profiles"). Most refugees do not know Canada's official languages, and they may have difficulty using the information provided as they have little sense of what life in Canada is like.

It is not difficult to conceive of a recommendation, as in the Alberta study, to give refugees more information and to encourage them to express a preference for a location. But it is difficult to do this well, and to ensure good matches.

The Alberta study also recommends that immigrants who come from large cities, and people with specific professional credentials be sent to larger cities. But doing so means giving up on dispersal for a large share of refugees, and limiting the number and quality of refugees going to smaller centres.

Age and marital status may have something to do with successful adaptation in smaller communities. According to the community profiles for Regina and Saskatoon, young single persons are likely to leave the city (See Text Box). Regrettably, the Alberta study

[34] Chapter IP31 In-Canada Processing of Convention Refugees Seeking Resettlement and Members of Humanitarian Designated Classes. Draft – August 14, 2000, section 2.1.3, page 18.

does not consider family status in its analysis of secondary migration. However, it seems plausible that young single people are drawn to the larger urban centres, a phenomenon not unknown among the Canadian-born.

Text box: Community profiles

The community profiles vary in depth and tone. Some profiles are frank about problems like credentials recognition and outmigration, others ignore these difficult matters.

"In general, accreditation is extremely difficult to attain, depending on the profession and the demand. Whenever possible, retraining is offered to provide newcomers with new skill sets. Licensing exams for professions may be expensive and usually require a sound command of English to pass successfully." This warning in the Charlottetown profile is unusually blunt. The Saskatoon profile advises that "Certification is, in general, very difficult". Ontario refers the reader to a website with information by profession. Many profiles give no information at all.

As for secondary migration, the Red Deer profile states: "About one-half of Government Assisted Refugees (GARs) destined to Red Deer move away to other centres. Those that migrate do so because they prefer to live in a larger centre or because they wish to move to a place where they have friends or relatives. Those that stay do fairly well, find employment and become involved in the mainstream economy." This does not say why people move to larger centres, but it is frank about the size of the exodus. The same cannot be said for the Saskatoon profile: "Single Ethiopians tend to move away, as do families with ties elsewhere" and the Regina profile: "Most secondary migrants are single people hoping both for more job opportunities in larger cities or looking for the company of other singles. Most go to larger centres such as Calgary and Toronto."

Conclusion: Getting the destination right

Is it possible to reform the process of selecting destinations for refugees in such a way as to reduce outmigration from the smaller centres? There are practical difficulties. At any point in time there are certain refugees ready to land and certain places where they can be accommodated. There may be good reasons, and a preference on the part of the refugees or the voluntary agencies in the Canadian destination, to make the matches that present themselves in this way and move on, rather than hold out for a better match. There is competition for high-quality refugees between receiving countries. If the immigration officer in a mission abroad makes the process of selecting a destination in Canada too involved, he runs the risk of having the candidate turn away and choose another country.

Information about destinations in Canada can be improved. The community profiles vary in scope and quality. Even the better profiles are dry fact sheets, giving no idea of the richness and complexity of the Canadian environment. Matters like access to professions and trades could be dealt with at a provincial or even a national level, and there should be some standard for the information presented. Reference to sources of information like web sites should be encouraged, provided access to the sites (and assistance with language) is available in posts abroad.

What should be priority concerns for matching? As the Alberta study has shown, employment is the most important consideration. To the extent that there is sound

information about vacancies and skills, it should be brought to bear on the choice of destination. Family relations should be high on the list. Existence of a related refugee community or, failing that, sending larger groups of refugees from a particular area to a single destination within a short time span ("clustering") can also be important contributors to successful adjustment.

5. Dispersal of refugees in the U.S. and in Europe

Geographic concentration of immigrants is not unique to Canada, and other countries have tried to influence the settlement choices of refugees in particular. In the U.S., settlement of Indochinese refugees was handled in a way very similar to Canada's refugee settlement policy, and the end result was a high concentration of refugees in a few areas. European countries have found that asylum seekers tend to settle in the major cities, and they are making intensive efforts to direct them to other places. This section reviews the experience of the U.S. and three European countries.

Indochinese refugees in the US, 1975-1984

In a 1985 paper, Jacqueline Desbarats examined the geographic settlement pattern of Indochinese refugees in the U.S. [Desbarats]. The first wave of refugees resulted from an emergency evacuation of South Vietnam upon the fall of Saigon in 1975. After a lull of two or three years, admissions were increased as a response to swelling camp populations in South East Asia and the “boat people” problem. This second wave was much larger than the first and lasted for two to three years. In total, 750,000 refugees were admitted between 1975 and 1984.

Geographic dispersal, motivated by a desire to speed up their assimilation and to reduce the economic impact on states and local communities, was a high priority with the first wave of refugees. Voluntary agencies, both religious and secular, implemented resettlement, and the refugees were widely dispersed. There was as yet no Indochinese community of sufficient size to influence resettlement patterns.

By 1980, however, 28 per cent of the first wave had moved to a different state, and the movement was generally from northern and northeastern states to southern and southwestern states, and later also to the Midwest and out of Texas and Washington State. California received over two-thirds of refugee interstate migration between 1975 and 1980, compared to less than one-tenth of all interstate migration. The new wave of refugees then settled in the concentrated pattern that resulted from the secondary migration of the earlier refugees. The majority of refugees in the second wave were family reunion cases. By 1983, 40 per cent of the refugees lived in California.

Using regression techniques, Desbarats then shows that the pattern of initial settlement reflected most of all the distribution of voluntary agencies in the first wave and sponsors during the second wave, and also employment opportunities as this was also a target of settlement policy. As for secondary migration, refugees left rural states and states where they became ineligible for benefits or where benefit levels were reduced,[35] and moved to states with high incomes and a strong labour market. Climate also played a role. Both initial settlement and secondary migration were highly sensitive to the size of the Asian

[35] The proportion of Indochinese refugees receiving cash assistance increased over time and exceeded 50 per cent by 1981.

community, but secondary movement reflects a dominant concern with economic survival – employment and public assistance.

Desbarats describes a circular and cumulative process, by which states that do not reach a critical density of refugees gain fewer refugees and lose more refugees, while states above a critical threshold take off in a cycle of self-sustained growth. The critical densities were 900 refugees per 100,000 inhabitants in 1976, and 1700 per 100,000 population in 1981.

Desbarats' notion of concentration leading to accelerated growth seems to fit the increasing concentration of immigrants - not just refugees - in Toronto and Vancouver. Secondary migration of refugees is not, according to the Alberta study, much motivated by a desire to be part of a larger ethnic concentration, but rather by economic motives. As well, the majority of refugees in that study were from eastern Europe, and few were born in Asia. Climate may also have something to do with the increasing concentration of immigrants in Canada's two major cities. On the other hand, it is not clear that the secondary migration of refugees in Canada has been influenced by the availability and level of government services. Major medical services, of course, are publicly funded throughout the country, and differences in insured services between the provinces are probably too small to affect location choices. Social assistance rates vary, but landed immigrants have access to such benefits in all provinces.

Desbarats' study does not indicate how dispersal policies can be made more effective. Rather, the merit of her work is that it gives a plausible description of the process that leads to growing concentration and of the strength of the forces at work.

European countries are directing asylum seekers away from the largest cities

In recent years, Europe has been faced with a large number of asylum seekers, many from eastern Europe. Several countries have found it difficult to handle these flows. In the face of large numbers of applicants who flocked to the largest cities, increased resort to appeals that caused serious backlogs, court decisions that expanded assistance to asylum seekers, lack of suitable housing, and resistance among the population, countries have revised their treatment of asylum seekers. Generally they have sought to streamline the approval process and disperse applicants away from the largest cities.

Belgium: new measures

As recently as 1988, less than 5,000 persons applied for asylum in Belgium. Since then the number has increased to 26,000 in 1993 and between 10,000 and 15,000 for the next four years. It then increased again to reach 36,000 in 1999 and more than 40,000[36] in the year 2000.

[36] Estimate based on 34,000 applicants from January through October.

In December 2000, the government introduced a bill that drastically revised the process governing asylum seekers. Pre-clearing or determination of acceptance of a claim was to take no more than five days, with limited and time-constrained avenues for appeal. Approval or determination of validity was to be accomplished within a few months.

After pre-clearing, asylum seekers are referred to welcome centres, one in each province. If they require housing, they are placed in facilities (vacant vacation resorts, prisons, etc.) near the welcome centre. If they do not require assistance, they can live anywhere they choose. After being accepted as refugees, they can also settle anywhere they want.

The policy is of too recent a vintage to evaluate its effect on the settlement choices of refugees. However, a Belgian official[37] volunteered the opinion that it is not working as hoped; refugees still flock to the largest cities.

Britain: success with Bosnian refugees

The most recent policy in Belgium seems to have the same thrust as measures introduced by Britain in April 2000. The new policy, delivered by the National Asylum Support Service (NASS), aims to provide support to destitute asylum seekers while deterring those who use the asylum process to evade immigration controls and are attracted to the economic benefits of coming to Britain. The three principal elements of the policy are:

- Accommodation is provided, mainly outside London and the South East, on a no choice basis;
- Support provided is mainly in kind, with only a small cash element (this is also a key element in the Belgian strategy);
- A significant reduction in the time it takes to process an asylum claim.

Asylum seekers who cannot afford their own accommodation are sent to towns and cities in various parts of the UK that have been designated as cluster areas. Cluster areas are chosen on the basis of availability of suitable accommodation and support for the asylum seekers from voluntary and community groups. Each of the clusters has been allocated a number of languages, and asylum seekers are sent to a cluster where their language is spoken. Regional consortia have been established to deliver support, and one-stop services have been introduced in some areas.

This seems to be a concerted effort to expedite the settlement process, conducted in close co-operation with the voluntary sector. While there are statistics on the number of asylum seekers sent to the various welcome centres, nothing is known about settlement after acceptance of the refugee claim.

This most recent policy in Britain seems to build on success achieved with settlement of a limited number of Bosnian refugees during the mid-1990s. About 2,585 Bosnians arrived in the UK between November 1992 and March 1996, many of them young single males.

[37] Mr. Thierry Lhoir, Department of Employment and Labour, Brussels, Belgium.

As described in detail in a recent article in the International Migration Review, the policy aimed to settle the Bosnians in six cluster areas, each consisting of a minimum of 50 to 60 families, or 200 to 300 persons [Vaughn Robinson and Caroline Coleman 2001]. The location of the clusters was determined by availability of support services and housing. As there were no pre-existing Bosnian communities in the country, the choice of locations was quite open. Six reception centres were established, each in a cluster area, so that refugees could settle close to the centre where they initially stayed.[38]

London became the largest cluster, with 700 Bosnians, mainly because more refugees were expected than eventually arrived, and London was supplied first.[39] The other clusters were West Midlands with 380 refugees, east Midlands with 370, West Yorkshire with 350, Scotland with 200 and the North East with 185. Two non-cluster communities developed, one in Essex and one in Hertfordshire/Bedforshire, because of delays in implementing the resettlement program and decisions to locate ill and injured refugees near particular hospitals.

The article does not discuss whether refugees participated in any way in the selection of the reception centre where they were first sent, an important choice given the intention to settle the refugees in the same area. The amount of choice in the second stage varied, and was in any event considerably restrained by the availability of housing.

Secondary migration was limited. It was estimated that by the end of 1997 fewer than 200 Bosnians had relocated, and some of these moves were within a cluster, in search of better accommodation, and to other clusters. There was, however, a flow of refugees into London, which at one point was estimated at 25 persons over a seven-month period, a rate thought to be representative of a longer period.

The entire settlement program cost the central government more than £10 million. Considerable amounts were made available for long-term community development. The government established "mid-term support teams" in each cluster area, funded these fully until 1995, and phased out funding until it ceased in March 1998. The teams consisted of case workers who offered advice and advocacy on health care, welfare benefits, housing, visa renewals and other matters, and language services (not training). The midterm teams were assisted by six development officers whose role was to raise awareness of the needs of the Bosnians among service providers, and to provide information to Bosnians in their own language (via a newsletter, for instance). Among the reasons for the mid-term (i.e. beyond six months) approach was the lack of existing communities of Bosnians and the compressed period of arrival which made impossible reliance on earlier arrivals.

[38] The authors refer to a body of literature that indicates that the location of welcome centres has a significant influence on later settlement patterns.

[39] The government had wanted to avoid London as a destination altogether, but this was resisted by the Refugee Council. Eventually the government accepted some settlement in London, while the Refugee Council offered to make major efforts to prevent this as possible. Many elements of the resettlement policy came about as a result of negotiations between the government and the Refugee Council.

Sweden: local governments take on the job

Sweden has found that persons given immigrant status as refugees or in humanitarian classes (refugees for short) tend to concentrate in the large cities. Refugees from Bosnia were settled all over Sweden under the "All Sweden" policy, but many moved to the cities in years following. Lack of employment growth during the 1990s may have contributed to this concentration of refugees in the largest urban centres. In 1994, Sweden allowed refugee claimants to stay with friends or family, and after a few years the result was a further concentration of refugees in Stockholm and the other two major cities, Göteburg and Malmö. Stockholm simply did not have the housing to accommodate the large numbers of immigrants that flocked to the city. Dispersal of refugees, to reduce pressure on the cities, recently became a policy priority.

After being granted immigrant status, refugees are assisted to facilitate their adjustment to Swedish society. They have access to income support, language training and job search assistance. These services are provided and financed by local governments, which accordingly have an interest in seeing the immigrant adjust rapidly and become economically self-reliant. There are certain standards for language training - a certain number of hours of instruction, a national fluency test which employers generally insist on, However, it is the fact that municipalities pay for assistance to immigrants that tends to ensure that assistance is effective and leads to employment.[40]

The central government has concluded agreements with local governments regarding immigrant settlement. The agreements specify the flow of refugees, the services to be provided, and the role of the municipality in refugee selection (e.g. right of refusal on the basis of lack of suitable accommodation for, say, a large family or special needs cases). Currently, agreements are in place with about one-half of the 286 local governments in the country. A participating municipality is paid a basic grant of Kr 500,000 to enable it to organize support services. This grant is more attractive to smaller municipalities than to larger ones, and this is one way of encouraging smaller municipalities to accept refugees.

A municipality then receives Kr 154,000 (at the current exchange rate about $23,000) per adult refugee, and Kr 94,500 per child under 16. The funds are paid in quarterly installments over two years, and are always fully paid out, whether the refugee remains in need of assistance or not. The funds are redirected if the refugee moves to another part of the country.

Sweden is also providing more information about settlement choices to refugees abroad and in reception centres. For instance, refugees may opt for Stockholm or a large city to access post-secondary education, as they may not know about Sweden’s decentralized university system. As well, the central government is encouraging municipalities that are interested in having more refugees (e.g. because of job vacancies) to provide information. Internet sites are being developed for interested municipalities. As the location of

[40] The voluntary sector does not play a role in refugee settlement. Neither does Sweden have private sponsorship of refugees.

reception centres affects settlement choices, the government is also arranging to have more centres in areas it favours for settlement.

As these measures are of very recent vintage, little is known about how effective they are. [41] According to very recent figures, 5 per cent of asylum seekers who settle in Stockholm are moving elsewhere after being provided with information.

[41] As an aside it may be of interest to note that Sweden has been experimenting with an "introductory payment" for refugees who agree to devote themselves full-time to language training and work experience. The municipality arranges a job placement, generally in the private sector. Typically the refugee then takes language training for one-half day, and work the other half. This payment is in lieu of social assistance payments and is designed to encourage the refugee to be more self-reliant from the outset, and to avoid reliance on social assistance.

6. Sub-national governments are getting involved

This section describes the involvement of state and territorial governments in immigration in Australia, and of the provinces in Canada. Involvement of sub-national governments in these two countries is a relatively recent phenomenon. It is bound to increase the attention given to the destination and migration behaviour of new immigrants, and not only with respect to their choice of state or province. Both in Australia and in Canada, attempts are being made to direct immigrants away from large cities to particular areas within provinces or states. In Canada, regional and local governments are beginning to play a role in immigration.

Australia: Involvement by the states, and designated areas

Australia is a step or two ahead of Canada, with the exception of Quebec, in involving sub-national governments in the immigration process. Since 1996, states and territories have played a role in immigration of skilled immigrants through regional variants of national immigration programs. Contrary to many other countries, Australia is not making efforts to direct refugees and asylum seekers away from the large cities.

The Australian approach has two general features that set it apart from the approach taken in Canada with respect to involvement of the provinces. First, most immigrants under regional categories are sponsored. Employers, state and territorial governments, and family members can sponsor immigrants. Family members have been the dominant sponsors, accounting for seven out of ten immigrants admitted through regional programs. Next in importance are employers sponsoring skilled workers, with one quarter of the total (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1: Visas granted under state-specific migration mechanisms, Australia

Category	Sponsor	1996 - Jan. 2000 Number	Share
Regional Linked & Skilled Regional Sponsored (incl. previous Skilled Australian-Linked)	Family members	7,949	71%
Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme	Employers	2,701	24%
State/Territory Nominated Independent	States & territories	223	2%
State Sponsored Business Skills	States & territories	287	3%
Regional Established Business in Australia	States & territories	28	0.3%
Total SSMMs		11,188	100%

Source: Data supplied by Australian High Commission, March 2001.

Second, most of the programs apply only to designated areas and are intended to increase the number of skilled immigrants settling in those areas. These areas have not attracted many skilled immigrants in the past, although they may have received family class immigrants and refugees. The areas are selected on the basis of consultation between the states and the department of immigration. Entry requirements are reduced under these regional variants of national programs. The State/Territory Nominated Independent scheme, which is similar to the Canadian provincial nominee program, is not limited to parts of the state.

The regional facilities are collectively known as State Specific Migration Mechanisms or SSMMs. State and territorial governments determine the extent of their involvement in these mechanisms in relation to their own development priorities.

More than 11,000 immigrants have been admitted under SSMMs during the five years since their inception (Table 6.1), their impact on the geographic distribution of immigrants in Australia is limited, as the country has taken in close to 100,000 immigrants per year during this period. The SSMM categories are as follows:

Skilled - Regional Sponsored Category: Skilled relatives - brothers, sisters, nephews, nieces, non-dependent children and working-age parents - are allowed to be sponsored for migration to areas of Australia designated by state and territory governments. Currently all of Australia except for Sidney, Newcastle, Wollongong, Perth, Brisbane, the Sunshine Coast and the Gold Coast are designated areas.

Under the national immigration program, skilled immigrants have to pass a points test and meet these basic requirements: The applicant must be under 45 years of age, have skills equivalent to an Australian diploma level or higher (i.e. most trade certificates) and have functional English. Sponsorship by relatives counts for a certain number of points, and this reduces the entry barrier. Under the *regional* sponsored category, however, applicants only have to meet the basic requirements.

Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme: Employers and some capital cities nominate overseas workers when they are unable to recruit suitable skilled personnel through the local labour market. Approved certifying bodies, generally regional offices of state and territory development authorities, assess nominations. They verify that a genuine full-time vacancy is available for two years or more, and that it cannot be filled through the local labour market. As with the regional sponsored category, the applicant must be under 45 years of age, have skills equivalent to an Australian diploma level or higher (i.e. most trade certificates) and have functional English.

On January 1, 2001, there were 42 certifying bodies covering all of South Australia, Tasmania, the Northern Territory, the Australian Capital Territory and most regional areas of the other states.

State/Territory Nominated Independent Scheme: States and territories select applicants who have a sound chance of gaining employment in the state or territory

within a short time of their arrival. Applicants tend to be identified through a Skill Matching Database. The South Australian, Victorian and Australian Capital Territory Governments currently use this scheme. The settlement destination is not restricted to designated areas within the state or territory, as is the case with the two programs mentioned earlier.

State Sponsored Business Skills: States and territories can sponsor business skills applicants. By so doing they make it easier for the applicant to be admitted, as the applicant is awarded a certain number of points towards the point test, and as the required net assets in a qualifying business are reduced by one-half (A$ 100,000 instead of A$ 200,000 for applicants who are not sponsored). States and territories may also sponsor senior business executives, who must be employed by a business with a turnover of A$ 10 million, compared to A$ 50 million for non-sponsored applicants. As with state nominated independents, the settlement destination is not restricted to designated areas within the state or territory.

Regional Established Business in Australia: People temporarily in Australia may apply for permanent residence if they have successfully established a business in a designated area of Australia. This is a variant of the national Established Business in Australia (EBA) program. The criteria are the same as for the national program[42] but applicants attract a certain number of qualification points on the basis of sponsorship by the state or territory. The designated areas are the same as for the skilled regional sponsored category.

Table 6.2: Geographic distribution of various immigrant groups and of the population in Australia[43]

State/Territory	SSMMs, year 2000 Number	SSMMs, year 2000 Share	Immigrants 1999-2000	Population Immigrants	Population Total
New South Wales	164	7%	43%	36%	34%
Victoria	1,064	48%	21%	27%	25%
Queensland	165	8%	19%	14%	18%
Western Australia	152	7%	12%	12%	10%
South Australia	404	18%	3%	8%	8%
Tasmania	68	3%	0%	1%	3%
Northern Territory	48	2%	1%	1%	1%
Australian Capital Territory	131	6%	1%	2%	2%
Total number	2,196		92,257		

First two columns: immigrants admitted under state specific migration mechanisms (SSMMs) between July 1, 2000 and January 31, 2001. Middle column: intended destinations of immigrants arriving between July 1, 1999 and June 31, 2000. Last two columns: Immigrants and total population of Australia as per the 1996 census.

[42] The applicant must have owned and operated a business for at least two years, have at least a ten per cent share in the business, have net assets in Australia of at least A$ 200,000 of which at least A$ 75,000 must be invested in the business, be actively involved in the business, and meet the pass mark on the business skills points test.

[43] Sources: Column 1 and 2: program data supplied by the Australian High Commission. Columns 3, 4 and 5: [Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs], pp 67 and 68.

Australia's challenge of dispersal of immigrants is somewhat different from the challenge facing Canada. As shown in Table 6.2, immigrants and the Australian-born are distributed across the states and territories in much the same way. In Canada, by contrast, immigrants are more concentrated than the Canadian-born in Ontario and British Columbia. In Australia, immigrants are found in the large cities. In Canada, Toronto and Vancouver draw far more immigrants than other large and medium-sized cities.[44]

Anywhere but Montreal: The regionalization of immigration in Quebec

The current three-year plan

Since 1990, the Government of Quebec has made efforts to make immigrants settle outside Montreal. This approach is called the "regionalization of immigration in Quebec". The term "regionalization" is fitting since the immigration process has been restructured along regional lines. We do not know what the result of the policy has been to date, but the government of Quebec apparently is of the view that the groundwork has been laid for a major increase in settlement of immigrants outside Montreal.

The three-yearly immigration plan for 2001-2003 sets ambitious targets for settlement outside Montreal:

- An increase in the share of immigrants destined outside the Montreal metropolitan area from one eighth (13%) to one quarter, and this while the number of immigrants is to increase from 35,000 in the year 2000 to between 40,000 and 45,000 by 2003. Thus, the number of immigrants destined outside the Montreal area is to more than double.
- Quebec City should welcome 9,000 to 11,000 immigrants during 2001-2003, compared to 4,500 during 1997-2000.
- The central regions of Quebec should attract about 17,000 immigrants during 2001-2003, compared to 7,400 persons during the previous four years.

When considered in light of the extent of control over immigration exercised by the province of Quebec, these targets seem even more ambitious. The family class and asylum seekers are administered by Canada. In 2001, these account for more than 40 per cent of immigrants to Quebec. Family class members typically join their families, which almost all live in the Montreal area. Canada makes no efforts to direct asylum seekers away from the large centres, and most of those who apply in Quebec probably will decide to live in Montreal.

[44] In the course of gathering information on state involvement in immigration in Australia, the author has come across some features of Australian immigration policy that are outside the scope of this paper but seem worth further investigation. Contrary to Canada, for instance, Australia requires all skilled immigrants to have a working knowledge of its language. The minimum skill requirement does not seem to be very high, however. Business immigrants in Australia seem to do very well, in contrast to immigrant entrepreneurs in Canada as described in section 3.

Quebec controls immigration of skilled workers, the business class, and refugees from overseas. According to the three-year plan, the number of immigrants selected by Quebec should increase to two-thirds of the total from 57 per cent in the year 2000. Assuming the lion's share of "federal" immigrants will head to Montreal, the regionalization target means that one-third of immigrants processed by Quebec are to settle outside the Montreal area.

Policy development during the 1990s

The Government of Quebec has been concerned that immigrants are overly concentrated in Montreal, and that Quebeckers outside Montreal have virtually no direct experience with immigrants. The distribution of immigrants could hardly be more skewed. As of 1996, thirty per cent of the population of the Island of Montreal was born outside Canada. For the Montreal metropolitan area the share of foreign-born is 18 per cent. Only 78,000 foreign-born, one-eighth of Quebec's immigrant population, live outside the Montreal area, and they make up only 2.1 per cent of the population outside the Montreal area. The contrast between Montreal and the rest of Quebec is much greater than that between Toronto (where the immigrant share is 42 per cent) and the rest of Ontario (where the share is 15 per cent). Toronto has less than two-thirds of Ontario's immigrant population, while Montreal has 88 per cent of Quebec's.[45]

By drawing immigrants to other parts of Quebec, the government of the province hopes to integrate immigrants into the francophone milieu. It also aims to have all of Quebec share in the experience of living with immigrants. This is intended not only to share the economic benefits of immigration more widely, but also to maintain social cohesion in the province, i.e. to reduce the cultural differences between ethnically diverse Montreal and the more homogeneous Quebec outside the metropolis.[46]

During the 1990s, Quebec has dispersed a significant share of its annual intake of some 2,000 government-sponsored refugees to Chicoutimi, Trois-Rivières, Victoriaville, Joliette, Rimouski, Hull, Sherbrooke, Quebec City and Saint-Jerome. This was the first step in the regionalization policy. It caused the Quebec department to allocate resources to the regions and to set up a partnership with regional government bodies to receive and assist immigrants. It also created an appetite for immigrants, and not just refugees, in some of the regions. However, as elsewhere in Canada and in other countries, the dispersal of refugees met with mixed success. Many refugees have chosen to live in the metropolis after first settling somewhere else.

Quebec created a fund (le Fonds de développement de l'immigration en région) to lay the groundwork for greater receptivity to immigrants in the regions. In the mid-1990s, more than $1 million was spent on various projects, including recruitment of immigrants living in Montreal to the regions through visits and job interviews.

[45] Recent Immigrants in the Montreal (Toronto) Metropolitan Area. A Comparative Portrait Based on the 1996 Census, CIC, May 2000, Table 1.
[46] Quebec, MCCI 1992 (as per Bolduc page 18).

The department decentralized its operations by setting up five regional directorates outside Montreal: in Quebec City, the Eastern Townships, Montérégie (the area adjacent to and to the south of Montreal), the Outaouais, and in Laval/Laurentides/Lanaudière (to the north of Montreal). The main task of the regional directorates was to prepare the regions for a greater influx of immigrants.

By 1997, seven framework agreements were concluded with administrative regions in central Quebec. These five-year agreements set out broad goals regarding immigration and link immigration to the development plan for the region concerned. Next followed specific agreements detailing funding for recruitment of immigrants and services to immigrants (language training, job search assistance), and joint management structures. In some regions, facilitating the socio-economic adjustment of immigrants was the main objective; in others, attracting more business immigrants was a priority.

In short, Quebec has put in place a regional organizational framework to attract immigrants to the regions around Montreal and to Quebec City. Regional government bodies work closely with regional directorates of the immigration department. The regions participate in the selection of immigrants, and may attract immigrants away from Montreal. The allocation and delivery of adjustment assistance has been devolved.

Immigrants are presented with possible destinations outside Montreal during the immigration process, and also after landing if they opted for Montreal. The focus is put on employment, and efforts are made to match real needs of regions with the characteristics of immigrants. These efforts are directed at families rather than single persons.

The result of the considerable efforts made up to this point is largely unknown. In a recently published study, Jean Renaud traces the settlement of a cohort of 286 immigrant families that landed in 1989. More than one-half of the families initially settled in the city of Montreal, and all but two families on the islands of Montreal and Laval. Ten years later, many families are living outside the city of Montreal, but only a handful of families moved off the islands, and these remain in close proximity. Whether any of the families was offered jobs outside Montreal the study does not say.[47]

The new three-year immigration plan of the Quebec government does not report past outcomes with respect to settlement location. That the targets are more than double the targets of the previous plan suggests the government is confident that it can make big strides.[48] In future, the Quebec government may introduce new measures such as reduced

[47] These are the only data available, apart from the 1996 census, which is not recent enough to show the effect of the new policies.

[48] In a recent series of articles in *La Presse*, it was suggested that there are still some barriers to full social adjustment of imigrants in Quebec. For instance, in Quebec City immigrants report that many residents will address them only in English, even when the immigrant uses French; immigrants regard this as being treated like a tourist. Immigrants in small-town Quebec find that they were welcomed, but then do not progress beyond superficial contacts with other residents, and they feel isolated. One observer notes that government, media and other bodies in small-town Quebec are very homogeneous and still have to be sensitized to immigrants. *La Presse*, March 3-5, 2001.

entry requirements or financial incentives in order to achieve its regional goals. While the goal seems to be firmly established, the means to the end will continue to evolve.

Manitoba: First out of the gate with the nominee program[49]

Manitoba is making efforts to attract more people.[50] It has tried to bring Manitobans back from other parts of the country and from abroad. And it was quick to use the provincial nominee program, and did so to the fullest extent possible, bringing in 200 nominees and their families in 1998, and 500 in 1999 and 2000.

The nominees are skilled workers, brought in to fill vacancies in the province.[51] These vacancies were not among the occupations that were in short supply nationally, and could only be filled by immigrants on the basis of conditions in Manitoba, which the nominee program allows. Many nominees come with their own family.

The province is expecting more immigrants to arrive through the family class in years to come, and is aiming to attract more government-assisted and privately-sponsored refugees. The province has a population growth objective which it is pursuing by meeting current labour market needs. The Canada-Manitoba Immigration Agreement sets out as an objective a share of the number of new immigrants equal to the share of the province in the country's population, 3.8 per cent. In the year 2000 the province welcomed 4584 immigrants, 2 per cent of the Canadian total. Of these, 1088 were provincial nominees and their immediate family.

The province is involving three communities in its immigration process: Steinbach (population 9,000), Winkler (pop. 8,000) and Arborg (pop. 1,000). Each of these towns has some industry with a demand for labour that cannot be met locally. The communities have there own recruiters who find candidates for the provincial nominee program. In the year 2000, Steinbach welcomed 186 immigrants, Winkler 214, and Arborg 39. These numbers are remarkably high for communities of this size. By comparison, Winnipeg attracted 538 provincial nominees, but also has the lion's share of other immigrants.

Manitoba has also recruited nurses from the Philippines through the nominee program, as described in section 2. The province also actively recruits other immigrants and regularly sends missions abroad. A mission is about to set out for Argentina.

---

[49] This section is based on a presentation by and telephone interview with Deborah Barkman, Senior Poilcy Consultant with the Manitoba Ministry of Labour and Immigration. The purpose of this section is to provide information about Manitoba's approach, not critical evaluation.

[50] During the 1990s, Manitoba lost about two thousand persons every year as a result of migration. The province attracted between three and five thousand immigrants per year. More than one thousand Manitobans emigrated from Canada each year, and the balance of interprovincial migration was a negative three to seven thousand per year. As the natural increase dwindled from eight thousand to four thousand during the decade, the population of the province was in fact rather stable, with increases of less than five thousand per year.

[51] No entrepreneurs have immigrated yet under the provincial program, although they can be nominated and are being recruited.

Naturally, the province is aware of the high rate of outmigration of immigrants generally and the very high rate for refugees. By matching skilled immigrants with jobs, the province is meeting the first requirement for successful adjustment to Manitoba. It is believed that the large majority of immigrants to the three communities are still there.

7. Attitudes of Canadians and the concentration of immigrants

Although economic conditions and the presence of an ethnic community are important to new immigrants, attitudes can also influence the adjustment of immigrants to Canadian society. Several components of attitudes, of immigrants and non-immigrants alike, can influence whether an immigration policy will be successful. These components include opinions, expectations, hopes and apprehensions, all of which can interact with economic forces to defeat policy objectives. In this section we ask: "Is wider dispersal of immigrants likely to create more friction between immigrants and other Canadians or reduce friction? Are different parts of Canada equally receptive to immigrants?"

Public attitudes with respect to immigration have been repeatedly surveyed. Douglas Palmer has examined surveys conducted during the past two decades from a regional perspective and finds that there are "…marked differences between the various regions of the country in attitudes and perceptions surrounding immigration…[Palmer 1998, p.v.]".

Palmer defines as regions the metropolitan part of each province (urban agglomerations of more than 100,000 inhabitants, taken together) and its non-metropolitan counterpart, as well as Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver. On average, non-metropolitan areas show the lowest support for immigration, as measured by support for the level of immigration and the perception of negative effects of immigration on employment and of positive effects on culture. The metropolitan areas show support similar to that in the three large cities [Palmer 1998, Tables 2 and 4].

However, there are marked differences among the provinces. For instance, during 1996 to 1998, support for immigration levels was above the national average in metropolitan areas of all provinces except Ontario and British Columbia, and it was highest in the Atlantic provinces and in Manitoba. Non-metropolitan New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Manitoba also were relatively favourable to the level of immigration [Palmer 1998, Table 2].

Palmer demonstrates that attitudes towards immigration generally are related more strongly to the perceived effect of immigration on unemployment than to its perceived effect on culture. He also shows that the survey results vary considerably over time, in a way that corresponds closely to the rate of unemployment. The higher the unemployment rate, the more likely people perceive a negative impact of immigration on jobs, and this erodes support for the level of immigration. During the first half of the 1990s, support for the level of immigration fell significantly in the four largest provinces [Palmer 1998, Table 5].

Attitudes vary over time also in response to the size of the inflow. For instance, Vancouver became less receptive to immigrants during the 1990s, not because the public perceived a more negative impact of immigration on unemployment, but because so

many new immigrants arrived.[52] As well, Palmer makes a case that attitudes are influenced by events like ethnic conflict that are highlighted in the media.

The surveys reviewed by Palmer give information about attitudes towards immigration in general, and do not inquire directly about the response of respondents to the local situation. In particular, they do not ask whether respondents approve of the number of immigrants coming to live in their community. Many inhabitants of metropolitan areas probably have some direct contact with immigrants and a sense of the impact on their community from what they see and hear. Indeed, as shown above, Palmer finds a connection between local conditions and attitudes towards immigration. The more than 40 per cent of Canadians who live outside the larger urban centres are less likely to have significant direct experience with immigrants. Their responses may reflect their perception of what goes on elsewhere, in the larger cities, rather than something that affects them and their communities directly.

Surveys conducted by Environics from 1989 to 1996 show that only a small percentage of the population is opposed to immigration by non-whites. During 1991 to 1996, the share of the population opposed to immigration by visible minorities was highest, at 14 per cent of the population, in Toronto, where there incidence is very high, and in non-metropolitan Quebec, where there are virtually none. Opposition to non-white immigration was also above the national average in Newfoundland outside St John's, and in Nova Scotia including Halifax. Opposition to non-white immigration was particularly low in Vancouver as well as in the rest of the province of British Columbia. [Palmer 1998, Table 4]

New Brunswickers, including those living outside the metropolitan part of the province, are rather favourably disposed towards immigration [Palmer 1998]. Even so, Rosemary Clews recently identified rural racism in New Brunswick as a problem for immigrants and their children [Clews]. While her narrative of the experiences of immigrants is suggestive, she made no attempt to show that racism is a greater problem in rural areas than in cities. She also points to lack of knowledge about immigrants as a factor in the early experience of immigrants in rural New Brunswick, especially but not only on the part of the medical profession.

A recent study of settlement experiences of refugees in Alberta presents profiles of seven communities where refugees settled initially: Calgary and Edmonton, Red Deer, Lethbridge and Medicine Hat, Grande Prairie and Fort McMurray. Openness to immigration and the diversity it brings appears to be greater in the five smaller cities than in Edmonton and Calgary, where twice as large a proportion of the population expressed the view that too many immigrants were coming to the city (about 30 per cent of respondents in Edmonton and Calgary), and that they threaten the way of life in the city

[52] A large inflow represents major change within a short time frame, which tends to be resisted by many. In the case of Vancouver in the early 1990s, one hears of objections to the high demand for housing exerted by the many affluent immigrants from Asia and its effect on housing prices. Not that home owners would necessarily complain, of course.

(about 25 per cent) (Table 7.1). As regards attitudes towards immigration generally, the study finds no significant differences between the seven Alberta cities.[53]

Interestingly, in 1991 the Economic Council found support for the "contact" hypothesis, which argues that contact between different ethnic groups leads to positive intergroup attitudes [Economic Council of Canada]. The Council rejected the idea that prejudice would be greater where visible-minority immigrants are more numerous. Since then, and in no small measure as a result of sustained high levels of immigration, both these ideas are needed to explain the distribution of attitudes in Canada. There seems to have been enough contact generally for the large majority of the population in any part of the country to accept and support immigration from all over the world. But in the large metropolitan centres resistance has increased because of the large number of immigrants living there and a lack of employment growth during much of the 1990s.[54]

Table 7.1: Attitudes of Albertans towards immigrants in their city

	Percentage of respondents who agree or strongly agree with statement	
City	"I feel there are too many immigrants coming to city"	"I worry that the way of life in the city is being threatened by high levels of immigration"
Edmonton	28	23
Calgary	31	28
Lethbridge	17	8
Red Deer	13	12
Medicine Hat	14	16
Grande Prairie	15	7
Fort McMurray	16	12

Derived from: Prairie Centre [1999] Table 4-22.

This short review is far from exhaustive, but it suggests that urban Canada and more particularly smaller cities are open to receiving more immigrants. To the extent that opposition in smaller centres still derives from lack of familiarity with immigration,

[53] For what it is worth, the author would add, on the basis of what he has heard from many persons in Canada but more so in Europe, that resistance to immigration most often centres on the number of foreign-born and their possible impact on the way of life of the country. In particular, the possibility that Europeans may become a minority strikes fear in the hearts of many, and it is not uncommon for people to have an exaggerated notion of the number of non-Europeans in their midst.

[54] And perhaps political correctness has become so pervasive that those who doubt the wisdom of the country's immigration policy are uncomfortable saying so, even in a survey that guarantees anonymity.

greater dispersal of immigrants, if not pushed too rapidly, may reduce resistance to immigration overall by reducing resistance in metropolitan areas and increasing support in the smaller cities. Interestingly, the Alberta study suggests that smaller urban areas may be more receptive to immigrants than suggested by general attitudes of residents towards immigration. Dispersal to rural areas may be more problematic.[55]

This is encouraging. There is no reason to think that immigrants flock to the large metropolitan centres because the rest of Canada does not welcome them. We also see that attitudes towards immigrants are not carved in stone, but vary over time in response to perceived effects of immigration. Attitudes can be influenced for the better by positive experiences.

[55] As argued by Clews. As another example, consider the opinions of community leaders in rural Manitoba polled in 1994 [Lam et al]. While the leaders expressed strong support for immigration into their communities, many emphasized a need for compatibility and expressed a preference for Europeans.

8. Conclusion: Strategies and instruments for dispersal of immigrants

This paper reports on a search for facts and ideas that can help to design effective policies for a more balanced geographic distribution of immigrants throughout Canada. The interest in the location choices of immigrants stems from various concerns: pressure on the absorptive capacity of the country's largest cities; an interest, in various parts of the country, in sharing in the benefits of immigration; a desire to reduce social and cultural differences between the metropolis of Montreal and other parts of the province in Quebec; and population growth as a policy objective, most clearly seen in Manitoba. The paper does not analyze these concerns, but explores what analytical framework may be appropriate, how qualified people are attracted to areas where their services are in short supply, where immigrants settle and why they move, how other countries are dealing with refugee settlement, and what Canadians in different parts of the country think of immigration and immigrants. In this conclusion, these various explorations are brought to bear on a discussion of some general policy questions.

The main finding is this: Influencing where immigrants end up living in Canada is not all that easy. Many new immigrants demonstrate a strong preference for a particular destination. In the first few years after arrival they tend to be quick to move, mainly to the large metropolitan centres with a large immigrant population. Immigrants will settle permanently in a region and the population of a region will increase if the regional economy expands and generates more jobs.

The framework: regional economic development

Provinces, regions and cities will have to be successful at economic development if they want to attract and retain immigrants. Employment is a vital concern for the large majority of immigrants. As an inflow of immigrants to a region cannot be expected by itself to generate a sufficient number of jobs for the new arrivals, it will induce an outflow of people, unless employment growth occurs for other reasons. The new immigrants themselves are rather likely to move to other parts of the country where there are more job opportunities.

In the long run, supply creates its own demand. If Canada's population increases, whether through natural increase or immigration, the economy will eventually expand. But economic growth does not occur necessarily when and where it may be desired. While human resources of high quality are a *sine qua non* for economic growth, their presence alone is not a guarantee of economic growth. Throughout Canada's history the country has grown because people moved to areas of opportunity. This remains true today, even if economic growth is not as much driven by natural resources as it used to be.

Which parts of Canada?

Today, economic growth occurs mainly in the cities. Larger cities are capable of self-generated growth; small towns generally are more dependent on the vagaries of a few external markets for their growth. Thus, the most promising alternatives to Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal as destinations for new immigrants are the next largest "second-tier" cities: Calgary and Edmonton, Winnipeg and Quebec City, Ottawa and metropolitan areas in southern Ontario. Other, smaller metropolitan areas in Canada may also be able to accommodate a larger number of immigrants, perhaps more readily than small-town and rural parts of Canada.

This is not to suggest that population size and density are all-important. Recently, Manitoba has been showing that small provinces and small towns can attract immigrants when they have job openings. The provincial nominee program is a step towards greater dispersal of immigrants, as the provinces aim to match skilled immigrants with specific job openings and, with involvement of local organizations, in smaller cities and towns.

Ideally, new immigrants should go to where there are suitable jobs for them. In practice this is difficult to achieve, and this is why a ranking of destinations is proposed. It is intended as a general rule that can lead to better outcomes, in the same way that maintaining a steady flow of immigrants to Canada is advocated as a rule since it is so difficult to tailor the immigration level to the needs of the labour market.

Greater dispersal also seems possible within metropolitan areas. Parts of the central regions in Quebec to which the province wants to attract more immigrants are within the metropolitan area of Montreal.

Which immigrants?

Jobs are the key factor in the locational choices of skilled workers. A skilled worker may have a specific job to go to when he lands in Canada. Those who do not will generally prefer to go to places where the job market offers a range of possibilities. Such immigrants are likely to be sensitive to the urban hierarchy discussed earlier. Skilled workers may opt for second-tier cities when informed about them, but are less likely to go to smaller places without a job contract.

Refugees are most readily influenced in their choice of destination, but also exhibit little attachment to the places where they settle upon landing. Government-assisted refugees should not be ignored as candidates for dispersal. Refugees are distributed more evenly across Canada than other immigrants in spite of their high mobility following arrival and the pull of the large centres. More can probably be done in the refugee settlement process to promote geographic dispersal. The key to lasting dispersal is to give the refugees reasons to stay from the moment they arrive at their initial destination.

The business class is not likely to be a major instrument for achieving a different distribution of immigrants across the country. It is not suggested that provinces should

not try to attract immigrant entrepreneurs, merely that the numbers will be small. Moreover, a province that follows the existing approach may well find that entrepreneurs develop little or no attachment to the province itself.

Immigrant investors are highly concentrated in Vancouver and in Toronto. We know little about what motivates their choice of location in Canada. The family class, finally, is not a good candidate for spearheading greater dispersal, since family members generally come to join those who came before.

Unattached young people seem to be quick to move to the large cities, but families may be more inclined to consider various destinations. Changing the mix of immigrants by source country will also affect where immigrants settle. However, immigrants from all major source countries exhibit similar tendencies regarding choice of location, i.e., they concentrate in the largest cities.

Finally, regions that want to boost - or stem the decline of - their population should consider a range of options, not just immigration. These regions may find it easier to retain the existing population. A region's sons and daughters may want to return after going to college or university or spending part of their working lives elsewhere. And Canadian-born persons generally have more familiarity than new immigrants with parts of the country where they have not lived, and probably would adjust more readily after moving.

Clustering

While immigrants migrate mainly in search of jobs, communities of people from the same country exert a strong pull on most immigrants. The chances of longer retention are enhanced if the origins of new arrivals correspond to those of the existing community. There are immigrants all over Canada, and most towns of any size have an immigrant population with a diverse mix of origins. Hence there is a community to build on wherever one goes, small as it is in many places.

Bunching of arrivals of immigrants by destination and source country may help establish the critical mass needed for higher retention in smaller centres, providing always that there are jobs. Experience with clustering of refugees in Britain, and the tendency of immigrants to concentrate in large groups, suggest that such an approach may work.

Greater concentration of immigrants by country of origin and time of arrival may also facilitate the delivery of services such as language training, job placement assistance, credential recognition services, interpretation services in health matters, and trauma counseling for refugees. This would probably enhance the locale in the eyes of new arrivals and give immigrants reasons not to depart for the larger centres, and this is crucial. When immigrants stay in a location for a few years they tend to set down roots deep enough that their tendency to leave is no greater than that of people born and raised in the region.

In principle, clustering seems feasible in the case of government-assisted refugees, and it may also be possible with other immigrants, for instance through the provincial nominee programs. More analysis is needed to determine the scale on which it can be reasonably attempted, how the refugee settlement process should be revised, and what methods should be used with immigrants other than refugees.

Although clustering would enhance contact among persons from the same country or region, it may also affect the acquisition of language skills and reduce contact with other Canadians. These probable effects may be drawbacks of the clustering approach. However, the aim of the policy would be to draw people away from larger centres with very large communities of people from the same source country, where newly arrived immigrants may have even less contact with other Canadians.

Policy instruments

There is only limited scope for using financial incentives to influence settlement choices. In principle, financial incentives can be used as an instrument of population policy – witness the baby bonus – and for attracting specialized human resources to areas where there is a shortage – witness what provinces offer physicians. However, providing financial location incentives to new immigrants and not to Canadians and earlier immigrants would be discriminatory. Forgiveness of fees associated with immigration for immigrants who agree to practice their profession or trade in a designated location for a period of time may be an option. Contracts committing persons to a number of years of service (in locations determined by the military) following training are known in the armed forces. But elsewhere contracts of this type are not common - they do not seem to be used by industry.

Entry requirements could be reduced for independent immigrants who plan to settle in designated areas. The quality of immigrants will drop if skill requirements are reduced, and if immigrants move away from designated areas after arrival, then lowering of standards cannot be justified. The interesting thing about the Australian approach of lowering entry requirements is that sponsorship by employers and family members gives some assurance of ties to the designated areas.

There is considerable scope for pursuing geographic dispersal with the long-standing tools of immigration policy: informing applicants, selecting immigrants, choosing refugee destinations, allocating support services. The provincial nominee program is likely to lead to greater dispersal. It gives the provinces that want to have more immigrants a way of attracting them directly; provinces can involve regions and towns in the process.

References

Abu-Laban, Baha et al: *The Settlement Experiences of Refugees in Alberta.* A Study Prepared for Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Volumes 1, 2 and 3, 1999.

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency: *Report to Parliament 1993-1998.*

Atlantic Provinces Economic Council: *Atlantic Canada Pursues Economic Immigrants*. Report Card, May 2000.

Berton, Pierre. *The Promised Land. Settling the Canadian West 1896-1914*. 1984.

Bolduc, Marie-Claude. "La déconcentration de l'immigration: à la rescousse des régions?" Mémoire présenté comme exigence partielle de la maîtrise en géographie, Université du Québec à Montréal, Avril 2000.

Bourne, L.S. and Mark Flowers. *Changing urban places: mobility, migration and immigration in Canada.* Research Paper 196, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, 1999 (summary).

Bourne, Larry S.: *Migration, immigration and social sustainability: The recent Toronto experience in comparative context.* Toronto, 2000 (summary).

Brenner, Reuven. *Labyrinths of Prosperity - Economic Follies, Democratic Remedies*. University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Brown, A.J. and E.M. Burrows: *Regional Economic Problems. Comparative Experiences of some Market Economies,* 1977.

Canadian Rural Information Service. Recruitment of Rural Doctors Pathfinder. http://www.agr.ca/cris/recruit/recruit2_e.html, as at January 2001.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada

- [1997] *Minister Robillard announces new Immigrant Investor Program.* News Release 97-17.
- [1998] *The Longitudinal Immigration Data Base (IMDB) 1980 to 1995*.
- [2000A] *Coming to Canada as a Business Immigrant*.
- [2000B] *The Interprovincial Migration of Immigrants to Canada*. IMDB Profile Series, January 2000.
- [2000C] *The Landed Immigrant Data System (LIDS),* special tabulations.

Clews, Rosemary. "Diversity, immigration and rural communities: New Brunswick – a case study. Paper presented at the 5th International Metropolis Conference, Vancouver, 2000.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, Government of Australia. *Population Flows: Immigration Aspects 2000 Edition.*

Desbarats, Jacqueline: Indochinese Resettlement in the United States. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 75(4), 1985, 522-538.

Devlin, Russ: "Techniques for Analysing the Determinants of Economic Health in Regional Economies." University of Minnesota, 1995. Available at http://members.aol.com/russdevlin/planb.htm.

Eberts, Edmond: Arvida and Kitimat – The Story of Two Industrial Community Development Properties. *Canadian Labour* 3, No. 1, January 1958.

Economic Council of Canada. *New Faces in the Crowd. Economic and Social Impacts of Immigration*. A Statement by the Economic Council of Canada. 1991.

Employment and Immigration Canada [1990]. *Evaluation of the Business Immigration Program; Entrepreneur and Self-employed categories.* April 1990.

Finnie, Ross. *Interprovincial Mobility, 1981-95: A Longitudinal Analysis*. 1999.

Fiscal Studies (4 papers) in: The Immigration debate, 1997

Gingrich, Paul: *Refugee Settlement and Integration in Regina.* Presented at the Canadian Population Society Annual Meeting, 1996 (summary).

Gouvernement du Québec. Planification triennale de l'immigration 2001-2003 - Faits saillants; la régionalisation de l'immigration; Bilan de l'exercise triennale 1998-2000; Immigration au Québec de 1995-2003. Available at http://www.immq.gouv.qc.ca/francais/, mars 2001.

Government of British Columbia.
- [2000] Northern and Isolated Allowance (NIA) Program. Eligibility Criteria Effective April 1, 2000.
- [2001A] BC's Health Action Plan – Nursing. http://www.bchealthactionorg/nurses.html as during January 2001.
- [2001B] Ministry of Multiculturalism and Immigration. *Provincial Nominee Program*. http://www.gov.bc.ca/mi/key/pnp.htm as during January 2001.

Government of New Brunswick. *Physician-Friendly New Brunswick. A Comprehensive Approach to Physician Recruitment and Retention.* http://www.gov.nb.ca/0053/3n/pphysicians.htm as during January 2001.

Government of Nova Scotia. Incentives for General Practitioners in Underserviced Areas. http://www.gov.ns.ca/health/physicians/benefits.htm as during January 2001.

Health Match BC – Recruiting Physicians and Nurses to B.C.
http://www.healthmatchbc.org/

Higgins, Benjamin and Donald J. Savoie [1997]. *Regional Development Theories & Their Application.* Transaction Publishers, New Jersey, 1997.

Himelfarb, Alex: *The Social Characteristics of One-Industry Towns in Canada*. Study No. 30, Royal Commission on Corporate Concentration, 1976.

Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC: Interprovincial Mobility in Canada. Bulletin Volume 5, Number 21, 1997.

Kim, J.E. [1998]. *Korean Business Immigrants in the Greater Toronto Area – Immigrant Entrepreneur Study*. Report prepared for the Korean Business Advisory Group, December 1998.

Kotkin, Joel. *Tribes. How Race, Religion and Identity Determine Success in the New Global Economy.* Random House, New York, 1992.

Krahn, Harvey, et al: Educated and Underemployed: Refugee Integration into the Canadian Labour Market. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, Vol. 1 No. 1, Winter 2000, 59-84.

Lam, Y.L., C. Emdad Haque, and Carol West. *Economic Development and Immigrant Employment Opportunities in Rural Manitoba*. The Rural Development Institute, Brandon University, 1994.

Levitt, Cheryl. Stop taking away the doctors. The Globe and Mail, February 16, 2001.

Ley, David [2000]. *Seeking Homo Economicus: The Strange Story of Canada's Business Immigration Program.* Working Paper #00-02 Vancouver Centre of Excellence, Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis, May 2000.

Lin, Zhengxi: *Foreign-born vs. Native-born Canadians: A Comparison of their Inter-provincial Labour Mobility*. Paper presented at the Conference: Immigration, Employment and the Economy, Richmond BC, October 1997.

Manitoba Government News Release. *Manitoba to Train and Keep More New Doctors: Ministers.* December 14, 2000.

Markusen, Ann, Yong Sook Lee and Sean DiGiovanna, editors: *Second Tier Cities. Rapid Growth beyond the Metropolis.* 1999.

Martin, Anne: "Thoughts on the Regionalization of Immigration based on Collaborative Experiences between the Montreal Region and Other Regions in Quebec." Paper presented at the 5th International Metropolis Conference, Vancouver, 2000.

Martin, Ron and Peter Sunley: Paul Krugman's Geographical Economics and Its Implications for Regional Development Theory: A Critical Assessment. *Economic Geography,* Vol. 72, No. 3, July 1996, 259-292.

Metropolitan Halifax Chamber of Commerce: *Discussion Paper on Immigration to Nova Scotia*. 2000.

Moore, Eric G., and Mark W. Rosenberg: "Modelling Migration flows of Immigrant Groups in Canada." Environment and Planning A, vol. 27, 699-714, 1995.

Moore, Eric G., Brian K. Ray and Mark W. Rosenberg: *Redistribution of Immigrant Groups in Canada.* A report prepared for Policy and Program Development – Immigration, Employment and Immigration Canada, 1989.

Moore, Eric G., Brian K. Ray and Mark W. Rosenberg: *The Redistribution of Immigrants in Canada*, Population Working Paper No. 12, Immigration Canada 1990.

Morton, Desmond: *A Short History of Canada*. 1983.

Palmer, Douglas L.
- [1998] *A Detailed Regional Analysis of Perceptions of Immigration in Canada* (Report; Key Findings). For Strategic Policy and Planning, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, June 1998.
- [1999] *Canadian Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding Immigration: Relations with Regional Per Capita Immigration and Other Contextual Factors*. For Strategic Policy and Planning, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, August 1999.

Policy Options December 2000: Three Views of Atlantic Canada's Future: Interviews with Elizabeth Beale, Brian Crowley and Wade Locke.

Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration and Population Research Laboratory [1999]. The Settlement Experiences of Refugees in Alberta. A Study Prepared for Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Volumes 1, 2 and 3.

La Presse: "Régions cherchent immigrants", and other articles by Rima Elkouri, March 3, 4, and 5, 2001.

Proceedings, Workshop on Developing a Regional Immigration Policy, 4th National Metropolis Conference, Toronto March 2000, unpublished, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2000.

Province of Manitoba / Manitoba Health / Nurses Recruitment and Retention Fund, at http://www.gov.mb.ca/health/ nurses/index.html, as during January 2001.

Registered Nurses Association of British Columbia. *Assess and Intervene*. Report to the Minister of Health on the recruitment and retention of registered nurses and registered psychiatric nurses in British Columbia. 1999.

Renaud, Jean, chercheur principal et al. *Ils sont maintenant d'ici. Les dix premières années au Québec des immigrants admis en 1989.* Les Publications du Québec, Etudes, recherches et statistiques Numéro 4, MRCI, 2001.

Robert, Jacques and Yvan Turcotte. Presentations at the Workshop "Developing a Regional Immigration Policy" at the 4th International Metropolis Conference, Toronto, March 2000 (as reported in Workshop Proceedings, prepared by Citizenship and Immigration Canada).

Robinson, Vaughn and Caroline Coleman. Lessons learned? A Critical Review of the Government Program to Resettle Bosnian Quota Refugees in the United Kingdom. International Migration Review, 2000, 1217-1244.

Shearmur, Richard: Quebec signs on to The New Barbarian Manifesto. *Policy Options* December 2000.

Simard, Miriam: La politique québécoise de régionalisation de l'immigration: enjeux et paradoxes. *Recherches sociographiques*, 37(3): 439-469, 609. (summary).

Statistics Canada.
- [1998] *1996 Census Public Use Microdata File – Individuals*. Cat. No. 95M0010CB.
- [2000] *1996 Census, special tabulations.*

The Northern Miner (weekly paper), recent issues (ads for engineers)

Waslander, Bert. *First Contact: The Falling Earnings of New Immigrants to Canada*. Unpublished paper.

Western Economic Diversification: Web site

Wright, Richard A., Mark Ellis and Michael Rebel: The Linkage between Immigration and Internal Migration in Large Metropolitan Areas in the United States. *Economic Geography*, Vol. 73, No. 2, April 1997, 234-254.

Annex: A slice of rural boosterism

A 1994 paper by the Rural Development Institute at Brandon University in Manitoba stated the case for stimulating immigration to rural Canada [Y.L. Lam et al]:

… the general trend of rural depopulation cannot be concealed. Left alone, fewer and fewer communities will survive in the years ahead. From an economic point of view, rural Manitoba remains relatively undeveloped and underdeveloped. There is no lack of raw materials or human resources, but there are some challenges in socio- and industrial infrastructure to support further development in these regions. Neither is there evidence of a lack of initiative and planning on the part of community leaders in trying to stimulate growth in their areas. Left in the present state, however, many business and industrial opportunities remain unrealized…

The recruitment and settlement of new immigrants in Manitoba's rural communities provide a much needed thrust in revitalizing the rural economy. This thrust must be viewed both as traditional and new. Canada's historical development is traditionally tied with waves of immigrants from other countries. Thus the recruitment and settlement of new immigrants is actually a traditional aspect of breaking away from economic stagnation. On the other hand, the approach of trying to match community needs and immigrant abilities in achieving regional revitalization must be considered new. Sharing some common characteristics of the past attempt of matching national needs and immigrant skills, the current approach aims to stimulate depressed areas to reduce regional disparity. There are some distinct advantages to adopting the present approach:

1. The settlement of immigrants should provide a general benefit to rural communities. Nationally, regional disparity can be amended.

2. Immigration could reverse the trend of rural depopulation and economic decay. Without infusion of new immigrants, many rural communities in the Prairie Provinces will continue to decline.

3. Immigration should consolidate more effectively the infrastructure of the rural economy. In contrast to the present programs, which produce short-term and limited results, the settlement of new immigrants should bring a radical improvement to the resources, capital and markets critical for sustaining local economic structure and long-term stabilization of the fragile rural economy.

4. The infusion of new immigrants, particularly those with entrepreneurial spirit and capabilities, could provide rural communities with an alternative to the Canadian over-dependence on government assistance in undertaking large-scale projects for job creation and economic renewal

5. The receptivity of many rural communities, in contrast to the current hostility of urban centres to new immigrants in a period of economic recession and high unemployment, should ensure that social tension will not be a deterrent to attracting immigrants to rural communities.

This long excerpt is presented here as an example of unfounded belief in rural development potential and in the benefits of immigration to rural areas. The paper does not at all support this wishfull thinking about immigrants. It does not even attempt to evaluate what immigrants may bring to the communities involved. There is no discussion

of how immigrants are different from the existing population, or why they would stay when others leave.

The study makes a faint attempt to assess the economic growth potential of communities, but fails to show a need for a new influx of people:

- Only seven of 40 communities identify occupations and skills in current demand; two of these mention only "entrepreneurial skills" (Table 8).
- A large number of "available" jobs are listed but there is no indication of the need to bring in people from outside to fill these "openings" (Table 7, page 21).
- The authors note that this list of "openings" supplied by community leaders is very different from vacancies listed by the regional employment centres, which are based on positions advertised. The latter lists are dominated by low-level jobs in the service sectors.
- Community leaders complain about lack of funds for business projects. This is a familiar complaint from community leaders, which generally means that the business opportunities they would like to see taken up are not good enough for people to risk their energy and capital.

As for point 5 on attitudes, it has some merit, but it turns out that the community leaders are highly selective regarding desirable characteristics of immigrants. They expect immigrants to have a background that is compatible with that of the communities (i.e. they have a strong preference for Europeans), and to adapt to the ways of the community and not try to change them.