Towards A Greater Toronto Charter: Implications for Immigrant Settlement

By

Laura Simich, Ph.D.

For

September 11, 2000

Towards a Greater Toronto Charter: Implications for Immigrant Settlement
By Laura Simich, for The Maytree Foundation, September 11, 2000

Table of Contents:

TOWARDS A GREATER TORONTO CHARTER: IMPLICATIONS FOR IMMIGRANT

SETTLEMENT

"Integration into Canadian society in fact means integration into a local community somewhere in Canada. The success of national immigration policies depends on local community based programs and initiatives turning the potential benefits of immigration into tangible results. Many of the impacts of immigration occur at a local level, and municipalities and local service providers are most aware of how federal policy affects local communities."[1]

1.0   Introduction

This paper is an initial attempt to ask what greater local autonomy for the Toronto Region could mean for the immigrant settlement sector in terms of policy and practice. It lays out basic issues and asks questions about what changes are needed and how they might be made. The goal is to provoke more in-depth discussion by specialists in the immigrant settlement sector and related fields. Some of the information in this discussion paper will be familiar to leaders in the immigrant settlement sector and to scholars of the issues. Indeed, the paper leans on their expertise. The discussions that ensue from it, however, may be an occasion to collectively re-think what is taken for granted in the sector. It is also an opportunity to involve others from outside the sector who are interested in the implications of the Toronto Region Charter movement from a range of perspectives.

It is widely accepted in the immigrant settlement sector that existing service gaps could be better filled if there were more coherence between federal immigration policy and local needs and integration practices. But to advance this proposition, specific questions should be answered: Would settlement services be *defined* differently if local institutions played a policy role? If there were municipal input, would settlement services be *delivered* differently, perhaps in more cross-sectoral, comprehensive and cooperative ways? What local organizational *structures* would move policy and practice to those ends? While the Toronto Region immigrant settlement sector today is uniquely qualified and experienced, are there *lessons to be learned* from related sectors, from the past, or other cities? Finally, are subsidiarity and fiscal accountability sufficient as governance principles for the Charter to succeed, or should the *guardianship role* of local government in protecting human rights be added.

In a discussion about planning Jane Jacobs once said: "Don't tell me about zoning. Tell me about good design." In other words, let's not dwell on legalisms and current jurisdictional problems and restrictions; instead, let's talk about the possibilities, what's good, and what would work even better. After summarizing the current political context, this paper describes the immigrant settlement sector in terms of *what, who and how*. First, it looks at what immigrant settlement covers, and what we might like it to cover, in The Toronto Region. Next, it looks at who is responsible for what, and what models exist for expanding and improving current roles and responsibilities. Finally, it offers examples of how to create changes, partly by comparing The Region's situation with that of other cities.

This approach echoes the series of questions raised at the Local Voices meeting, November 1999, hosted by the Maytree Foundation: Do the conditions exist for change? What things are not working or are missing? What are the models for improvement? What are the paths to move ahead? More specific questions are suggested for response at the end of the sections. There are obstacles to change, of course, but one question should be kept in mind throughout, and that is, "Why *not?*"

This paper augments the overall Toronto Region Charter discussion. The GTA charter discussion so far has focussed primarily on issues of governance and structure, as a means of enhancing the Region's ability to plan for its future. Hence, there appears to have been an emphasis on physical planning. Social planning requires different expertise, sources of revenue and guarantees of protection. The issue of immigrant settlement differs from other topics in the inescapable pertinence of national policy. This discussion is not only about the "impact" (often read as "costs") of immigration on the Toronto Region, but also about implications for local decision-making, investment and action. What is the Toronto Region going to do about immigration in terms of policy and in terms of serving half its current population? The Charter should not only be about the Toronto Region affirming its right to decide how it should be financed and governed, the rights of form and structure. It could also affirm the rights and obligations of citizens to benefits, to community services and transportation, but also to socio-economic rights and civic participation.

While the idea of a charter movement seems radical, it is dismaying how overdue such the change in the relationship of the city to senior governments really is. The Province of Ontario is lagging behind "most of Canada and much of the Western world in its relationship with the fifth largest city in North America."[2] According to Donald Lidstone, a constitutional lawyer and expert on municipal acts,

> *"Ontario does not measure up to the international standards of what the United*

Nations or the European Economic Community would expect of a senior level of government. It is retaining central control. It is not providing adequate powers. It is not providing adequate financial resources. It is abdicating its social responsibilities without consultation."[3]

2.0   The political context

Canada's long history as an immigrant receiving country may have predisposed its city-regions to become centres of the contemporary globalized economy. As the external forces of globalization reduce the autonomy of nation-states everywhere, large cities have confronted national governments with claims to decentralize polices to lower levels where the concrete manifestations of globalization require polices geared to their particular circumstances. In the field of immigration, policies are mainly national, but consequences are dealt with by the cities that attract immigrants as direct and indirect results of globalization. The current mass movement of people and capital that converges on Canadian cities, especially The Toronto Region, creates both opportunities and challenges. The conscientious efforts of many people, including policy-makers, services providers and advocates, who work on behalf of immigrants in many sectors have been admirable and fruitful. Even so, a new approach to the tasks and responsibilities of immigrant settlement that involve a greater local role should be considered.

Canada's social history colours its present. Always a country of immigration, and officially multicultural for decades, Canada still rests uneasily on its historical division between two official language groups and dominance of indigenous groups. In governance, Canada maintains a contentious balance in provincial-federal relations, which in turn affects how cities, as legal "creatures of the province," serve their citizens and the country as a whole. Regardless of their *de jure* minor role, Canada's cities have always been *de facto* major actors in immigration history. And while large cities have always been diverse in terms of class, religion and languages, this situation is intensifying. The present qualitative and quantitative leap in diversity resulting from recent immigration means that social cohesion has to be recreated, political structures reformed, and newcomers encouraged to participate more in the process.

Against this multi-layered cultural and political backdrop, the composition of Canada's population continues to change dramatically. Immigration represented more than half of the country's population growth from 1991-1996, although the impact of this flow is unevenly distributed across the country. Having this replacement migration as an objective, Canada fully expects to benefit from the overall growth in the immigrant working population in order to support and replace its existing aging population. The Canadian public remains largely uneducated about this rationale for immigration and its long-term advantages. But as the primary node of

reception and settlement of newcomers, The Toronto Region is acutely aware of its responsibilities and privileges in absorbing the impact and furthering the project of Canadian immigration. Immigration accounted for 85% of the total population growth, an average of 79,000 people a year, in the Toronto CMA from 1991-1997.[4]

Ongoing immigration and evolving concepts of diversity have deepened the discussion of what citizenship means, that is, who 'belongs', and what rights and obligations are conferred in judicial, socio-economic and cultural senses, as many immigrant receiving countries are learning. Typically, formal citizenship is determined by a nation-state and given in the national interest, although informally, citizenship can be ambiguous. Citizenship rules may confer equity in principle, but in practice newcomers face many barriers. A trend toward transnationalism further complicates the contemporary picture, as personal attachments and identifications multiply. However, in the most fundamental classical sense, citizenship (derived from "city") refers to direct civic participation in one's immediate political community. The stage on which the abstract scenario of nation building unfolds first is the place newcomers settle, live their daily lives and begin community building. In actuality, many new Canadian citizens learn what citizenship really is through their settlement, and political experience, *in Toronto*.

Whatever complex forms of national or cultural identity they may develop, newcomers commonly arrive seeking what liberal democracies espouse: opportunity, security, and freedom to preserve that identity and, through civic participation, to play a role in the wider society to the greatest extent possible. Local institutions and agencies are instrumental in shaping this experience of ever-widening civic participation. As localities and experiences vary, particular circumstances foster different ideas and needs and warrant particular applications. Intergovernmental practices that share responsibilities and recognize local or regional needs are not unprecedented. Quebec has obtained significant concessions in immigrant selection policy; New Brunswick and Saskatchewan have signed agreements with Ottawa to coordinate recruitment efforts in immigration.[5] But federal selection of immigrants and provincial interests in housing and community and social services should also intersect.

3.0   Settlement in the GTA
What implications for citizenship does the Charter for the Toronto Region have in relation to immigrant settlement?

Rapid demographic changes in Canada's urban centres have outpaced national policy changes. Nearly half a million newcomers have settled in the Greater Toronto Area in the last decade. The GTA has a unique

function as a gateway metropolis, having received 43% of all immigrants to Canada since 1991. In 1996, 40% of the population of the Greater Toronto Area was of immigrant origin. The GTA, with 16% of Canada's population in 1996, has 37% of all Canada's immigrants. Over 60% of the GTA's immigrants, and over 70% of its recent immigrants, live in the City of Toronto.[6] The Toronto Region also receives almost all of Canada's refugees (those who are sponsored for humanitarian reasons as well as refugee claimants), an estimated 10,000 or more per year. They arrive under different conditions than immigrants and have different needs, many of which are not well met. More than half of these newcomers speak English, but approximately 40% speak neither English nor French.

The geographic concentration of immigrant populations in the city and surrounding regions, has been increasing over time, with no change in this pattern expected.[7] Immigrant populations, especially among those from India and Hong Kong, are shifting toward the suburbs of The Toronto Region, although the city core still captures most of those from Somalia, Sri Lanka, Vietnam and Philippines and Iran. In other immigrant receiving countries, there is debate about whether such geographic concentrations may create an immigrant "underclass," but the implications for the GTA are as yet unclear. The benefits of the diverse knowledge, customs, and links to their home economies that newcomers bring are spread throughout the city-region, as are settlement supports, albeit thinly and unevenly.

The diverse origins of the GTA's immigrants is as remarkable as their high proportion in the population. By the 1990s, East Asia and South Asia had replaced Europe as the main immigrant source, but the population is more heterogeneous than this suggests. At the time of the last census, each of 106 nations were the places of birth for at least 1,000 GTA residents. The variety of source countries, as well as linguistic proficiency and diversity, has tremendous implications for access, equity and service delivery in immigrant settlement and public services such as health and education. In the current idiom, "diversity" no longer refers merely to ethnicity or nationality, as it is increasingly recognized that there are as many variations within population groups as among them — educational, class, gender and generation differences add further complexities.

4.0   Current government roles and impacts on the sector

The assumption of this discussion paper (and the purpose of a great deal of current federally sponsored Metropolis research) is that it is worthwhile to devise immigration policies and programs that are appropriately tailored to urban areas. As things stand, the bulk of the responsibility for immigration *policy and funding*– allocated on the basis of the number of arrivals from a source country and on the number of arrivals who do

not speak one of Canada's official languages—lies with the federal government. The bulk of the responsibility for settlement *services* lies with local institutions, particularly community-based agencies funded by the federal government to provide specific services primarily through the Immigration Settlement and Adaptation Program (ISAP) and the Language Instruction for Newcomers (LINC) program. Over the last few years, federal funding levels have risen for immigrant settlement services in the GTA and, in 1998-9 for example, amounted to over $5 million for ISAP and over $50 million for LINC.[8] But some of the increases to these and other programs follow a trend toward privatization and project funding that does not contribute core funding and stability to community-based agencies.

None of the GTA municipalities, or any regional representatives, are "at the policy table" now, nor are they directly involved in the symbiotic relationship between the federal government and settlement agencies, but municipalities assist immigrants in many ways: they house refugees through their emergency shelter system, manage cases of tuberculosis that may originate in the newcomer population, in some cases offer income support to immigrants and refugees in need, and address issues of access and equity throughout their municipal corporations and their various services. Local schools and health care institutions are also expected to serve immigrants as part of the general GTA population. In the City of Toronto, about two-thirds of the inner city schools offer ESL classes to students, and many community health centres and hospitals provide cultural interpretation and culturally appropriate care, though it is difficult for them to provide these services in a comprehensive and regular way.

Currently the provincial government is in the background of this scheme of responsibilities, having cut back or bowed out of many settlement programs in the mid 1990s. The Province, of course, retains general responsibility for health, welfare and education, all of which overlap extensively with immigrant settlement, but it has drastically diminished its role in multicultural issues relating to those areas and cut back resources in related ministries. In 1995, the province restructured its primary immigrant settlement program, now called the Newcomer Settlement Program, cut funding by nearly 50% (to less than $4 million in 1998-9), shifted from core to project funding and eliminated many useful programs entirely. Other across-the-board cuts to community services have also affected immigrants, who may have more difficulty accessing non-settlement services that others take for granted.

In the Settlement Renewal process beginning in 1995, the federal government attempted to devolve responsibility for immigrant settlement to the Provinces. Agreements were reached with British Columbia and Manitoba, but not Ontario. While discussions were going on, both governments proceeded to cut spending

on programs to assist immigrants. The cutbacks and unwillingness to negotiate, let alone to construct a formal agreement, left the settlement sector dealing with considerable uncertainty, undermining its ability to sustain programs and planning. Related to the federal Settlement Renewal initiative, Citizenship and Immigration Canada provided over $100 million in a special three-year allocation in acknowledgement of previous federal under-funding.

Related to the federal of Settlement Renewal, the federal Ontario Region Settlement Directorate of Citizenship and Immigration Canada has provided over $100 million in additional short-term project funding in the last few years.

Immigration and policy legislation has also undergone revision in recent years. Some settlement organizations had limited input into the legislative review process in 1997-98, and many, such as the Canadian Council on Refugees and the Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI), responded to new federal policy in 1999, with support and constructive criticism of specific policies. These organizations have welcomed the ideas of giving separate consideration to the situations of immigrants and refugees, assigning more weight to education and transferable skills in selecting economic immigrants, and the continuing commitment to family reunification, but they have also objected to the absence of positive human rights language and recognition of the equal role community-based organizations and settlement services agencies now play in partnerships with government.[9] Generally speaking, local and national organizations representing immigrant and refugee interests are very interested in maintaining the federal funding role, but would like to enhance their own role in making meaningful policy.

In the absence of agreement on devolution, settlement programs in the GTA have become accustomed to operating in a climate of instability and chronic shortages in key areas at a time of growing needs. Without municipal and provincial involvement in decision-making, a great deal of power now rests with the regional settlement office of Citizenship and Immigration. For its part, the CIC regional office struggles to balance the competing needs of existing immigrant settlement agencies and emerging ethnic populations. Some of the agencies serving immigrant interests are large, well-established and multi-purpose, while some are small and with a specific issue or ethnic focus. With the arrival of many new ethnic groups in the Toronto Region over the last ten years, it is increasingly difficult to match government funding with anticipated settlement needs by the formulas used in the past. Research and internal discussions about alternative funding models and how to integrate or coordinate local efforts better is underway.

5.0   Municipal potential
How would existing pressures and instability in the immigrant sector be resolved by greater local autonomy?

Impetus for change on the local level has come about because of growing needs and consequent pressures on senior levels of government and the sector to rectify a lack of coherence in policy and planning. Made up largely of community-based organizations, the immigrant settlement sector operates *by definition* on the principle of subsidiarity. The organizations are accountable to clients and funders. They are of course not accountable to the residents of the city as a whole, nor to the potential service users who are never reached. Those who "fall through the cracks" often end up in the care of the city, but is this last resort role the best role for the municipality? The federal government is practically outside the spheres of subsidiarity and accountability entirely, except as it selectively acts through the sector.

Given the starting point of the existing roles of the federal level and settlement agencies, a reasonable responsibility of local government may be to enhance policy cohesion and to ensure access and equity in service provision. Would the system be enhanced if local governments were to take a more deliberate role in service planning and coordination, helping the settlement sector help immigrants, for example by facilitating inter-agency referrals, holding meetings to discuss common problems and other policy facilitation? It is important that coordination efforts not limit the flexibility of community-based organizations to meet specific local needs. Ideally, local government also would be able to do public education and promote social cohesion among various communities. More pragmatically, it would help ensure that the immigrant workforce is a viable resource for local economic development.

It is debatable how separate immigrant settlement services should be from a consideration of socio-economic rights in general and municipal service in particular. Immigrants and refugees do have special needs, especially in early stages after arrival, but, in the view of municipal staff, it might be artificial and impractical to regard immigrant settlement as a discrete activity of local government. Instead, some staff suggest, serving immigrants should be integral to all municipal services and responses to diversity. Further, municipal policy on immigrant settlement should be framed "as an investment strategy".[10]

The untapped potential is common to other urban areas in Canada. The Toronto Region is Canada's primary reception centre, but the implications of immigrant settlement on cities is not confined to the GTA; how cities experience immigration is a national issue. Other cities report similar necessity to address the primary needs of immigrants and refugees – orientation, housing employment language training, information services and

public health - and to create access and equity policies and programs, including support for community organizations. At the same time, they report the need for more creativity and more intergovernmental cooperation.[11]

Certainly, as noted, a major problem in immigrant settlement is the incongruity between national immigration selection policies and local integration practice - for example, the importance of economic immigration policy and the lack of labour market policy. The questions remain how to ensure policy cohesion in the current situation of political disengagement, and how to assign appropriate roles to the various potential players, including the senior levels of government, the city, settlement agencies, interested sectors such as education and health, civic organizations and citizens in general. With the background of demographic trends and lack of coherence in immigrant settlement policies, it would seem that local conditions are not only ripe for change, they constantly *are* changing. There is interest in better coordination, but given the diversity of both service agencies and the populations they serve, it is important for public and private organizations both to retain flexibility in order to be adaptive under the prevailing conditions.

6.0   Defining settlement services
Are current definitions of settlement services adequate, and would enhancing local autonomy remedy the inadequacies?

For decades, the federal and provincial governments have defined immigrant settlement according to mandates and political constraints, which may be politically reasonable, but also can seem arbitrary in light of the actual social experience of settlement. Settlement can be a very long-term process, unique to every individual. Normally it begins with meeting immediate material needs for employment and housing. After the initial adjustment, there are longer periods of social and economic adjustment, including re-establishing family or social support networks, regaining professional status or career advancement opportunities, and usually in later stages, engaging in civic life and politics. Realistically, the process takes much longer than the three years of residence formally required for citizenship in Canada. Ideally, the process should be facilitated at many points by community-based agencies, public institutions and various levels of government, including at the local level where newcomers live, work and participate in society.

Today's immigrants are poorer, but more highly educated than ever before. For some immigrants, personal resources and a relatively established receiving community facilitate settlement, but for others settlement is harder. Many newcomers have well-honed survival skills and capital to rely on, but services are still required for others to ensure eventual self-sufficiency. Pressures in the 1990s - such as the increasing movement of

populations from developing countries, the poor Canadian economy, government cutbacks, and barriers such as the lack of access to suitable employment and housing in The Toronto Region - combined to make settlement much more difficult for recent arrivals.

The ultimate goal of settlement is successful integration, usually defined as the ability to contribute, free of barriers, to every dimension of Canadian life, that is economic, social, cultural and political. Settlement services in The Toronto Region are relatively well-developed and are geared to facilitate this process, particular in the early stages of adaptation. Yet, in spite of hard work and good intentions, service needs in the settlement sector persist, not only because of a growing demand, but because of overly-narrow concepts and unacknowledged settlement issues on the local level. In fact, because needs exist many service agencies and local institutions are providing services to immigrants and refugees whether they are technically funded for doing so or not. Perhaps the most obvious drawback in defining settlement and integration is in the definition of eligibility for services. Ordinarily immigrants are only eligible for some federally funded services within the first three years of arrival, though settlement needs realistically continue for years. Refugee claimants and citizens are not eligible for services at all.

Describing what settlement services exist - and what's missing in this picture - may reveal areas of potential local redress in policy and coordination. Settlement services are commonly defined as follows:

- general orientation and settlement counseling, including initial intake, orientation information, referrals to other government and community services, and individual advocacy and hosting to help negotiate the bureaucracy.
- language training, largely through the LINC program
- interpretation and translation
- employment services
- sectoral advocacy

In each of these areas, services are also inadequate because of loss of previous funding, or difficulties with anticipating changing settlement needs. A huge loss occurred, for example, when the Province closed the three Ontario Welcome Houses it had operated in Scarborough, North York and downtown Toronto prior to 1995. These organizations provided comprehensive settlement services, including translation and interpretation no longer readily available. Another general program eliminated in 1995 was the provincial Multilingual Access to Social Assistance Program (MASAP), which helped clients receive social assistance.

Currently gaps in services result from agencies being funded to provide services to immigrants from one country, but not another, residing in the same catchment area. This does not mean that people are turned away, but it may mean that funding is insufficient or that outreach to underserved groups cannot occur.

In language training, some provincial programs that met the particular needs of women and children were eliminated, while the existing federal programs struggle to keep pace with the variety of language levels and types needed, especially for the contemporary labour market. Refugee claimants and non-English speakers who have become citizens are not eligible for these language classes. As for interpretation and translation, including translation and notarization of educational transcripts, essential services have been eliminated. Cut backs mean that many orientation materials cannot easily be provided in translation. Existing interpreter services are chronically overburdened, as are the settlement agencies.

Employment training and job placement services for newcomers with significant employment barriers are scarce, although demand is extremely high. This is true especially among highly educated immigrant professionals who are also in need of mental health services due to the stress of unemployment. Most newcomers do not qualify for programs available under the Employment Insurance program, and many other provincial training programs used by immigrants have been eliminated or restricted severely. Federal funding for employment services is currently focused toward larger institutions, rather than smaller non-profits such as settlement agencies, and funding is paid to individuals who in turn are *supposed* to pay the provider, but may not. The resulting lack of stable program funding for employment services has hurt smaller non-profit providers such as settlement agencies. Lack of devolution of the Labour Market Agreement has impeded progress. Progress in breaking down barriers to the trades and professions also has been exceedingly slow.

A final gap of particular relevance here is in sectoral advocacy, for which regular funding from senior levels of government has been phased out. Sectoral advocacy takes the form of umbrella organizations or special interest groups that serve immigrants by providing information and guidance to community-based agencies, as well as education on immigration issues for policy makers, mainstream organizations, and the media. This is one more immigrant settlement area which could be strengthened and broadened. Clearly, there are many issues, even in currently defined areas of common settlement services such as language and employment, for which locally coordinated service provision and planning could increase the effectiveness of the sector and ability of immigrants to make a contribution.

7.0   Overlapping settlement policy issues

There are many areas related to immigrant settlement, but not strictly defined in the federal mandate as immigrant settlement, in which the overlap of immigration, public services and regional concerns is too strong to ignore. To broaden the discussion beyond "business as usual," it should be readily acknowledged that settlement involves other policy and service issues effecting the municipal and regional level. We can, for example, consider some economic, health, education, welfare, housing, and civic participation issues. In this way we may pin point what is missing from the usual approach to immigrant settlement and raise new ideas. Research produced by the Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Settlement (CERIS), Toronto, is exploring many of these issues.

7.1   Immigration and the local economy
How could the Toronto Region play a role in creating coherence in economic immigrant selection, in training and integration into the local labour market, and in local economic development ?

Since most immigrants are of working age, it is critical to understand their economic participation, performance, and impact on The Toronto Region. This type of information increases understanding of labour markets changes and the potential for local economic development. While some may need assistance on arrival, generally immigrants bring long-term economic benefits. In the 1990s, Canada's business investor program brought $2-3 billion dollars to Canada, and close to one billion dollars to Ontario alone.[12] Another benefit immigrants bring is education. Newcomers are on average more highly educated than people born in Canada*,* representing an enormous saving in the cost of university and post-graduate education. In The Toronto Region alone, the benefit of this "brain gain" is estimated to be $1.044 billion.[13]

Researchers recently have investigated some facets of immigrants' diverse economic experiences in Toronto.[14] They have undertaken to compare the division of labour by gender and ethnicity, and the industrial distribution of employment of immigrants; to uncover the extent of immigrant entrepreneurial activities and the nature of ethnic economies; to analyze the economic performance of Toronto's immigrants, which influences both their well-being and their contribution to the Canadian society; and to address the concerns of the Canadian public about immigrants' economic impact. Although details of this comprehensive analysis must be omitted here, several points are worth mentioning. Analysis shows that in the Toronto labour market immigrants are still concentrated in manufacturing, a sector which has suffered major losses in the last thirty years. Immigrants are under-represented in the business and government services, where job growth has

occurred. Immigrant women are the most vulnerable workers of all.

While the entrepreneurial picture is complex and ethnic economies varied, researchers have concluded that class assets matter more to business *start up* than does the presence of ethnic networks, which are more likely to be important in *sustaining* a business. Neither factor is sufficient for success, however, because opportunities structured by market conditions and government and institutional policies, such those on ownership and equity requirements for loans, are also important.

A case-study of the maturing Chinese economy in Toronto illustrates the interaction of many of these factors. Chinese businesses are no longer confined to retail and manufacturing and wholesale firms are now dispersed across The Toronto Region. These firms are expanding and rank proportionally high in terms of sales volume and employment. As evidence of the emergence of a knowledge-based ethnic economy, one firm for example, owned and operated by a former resident of Hong Kong, is the third largest high-tech firm in Canada as well as the world's biggest maker of computer graphic chips. This is an example of the "upper tier" of an ethnic economy, but as the research suggests, it is also an indication of a sizable mixed economy, which "gives rise to a more porous social boundary, and paves the way for social and economic integration."[15] Whether "engines of growth" or "economic lifeboats," the report states, consideration of ethnic enterprise often neglects governmental and institutional barriers and should be placed in the context of metropolitan economies.

Participating successfully in ethnic economies is an avenue more restricted to recent immigrants. They experience higher unemployment that in the past, in spite of most being selected for their skills and education. Unemployment tends to be higher for some groups than others and for visible minorities in general. Unemployment rates for immigrants progressively drop with length of time they reside in Canada. Similarly, length of residence is a key factor in the attainment of economic parity. Those who immigrated before 1971 have lower rates of unemployment than non-immigrants and the average Toronto population. According to the research, "In comparison with the Toronto CMA average income, men and women from both visible minority and European groups earn less that the average non-immigrant income until they have resided in Toronto (or Canada) for approximately 20 years."[16] In terms of employment rates, then, parity is achieved after about ten years; in terms of income, after about twenty. Implications of this analysis for access to trades and professions have been recognized in the sector for some time. The problem is currently in the hands of senior levels of government and professional associations, who are aware of the importance of speeding up the job finding process through professional accreditation and prior learning assessment to reduce

immigrant under - and unemployment.

There is no evidence that the Toronto Region's immigrants are a drain on the host society. On the whole they make positive net contributions. One way of measuring the contributions of the City of Toronto's immigrants is by comparing income taxes paid with welfare/UI benefits collected by the same immigrants in the same tax year. In 1995, 507,300 immigrants (representing 62% of the population arriving between 1980 and 1995) reported $1.5 billion in income taxes. In the same year, 9% of that population received welfare benefits and 8% received UI benefits. Subtracting the amount of both types of benefits, immigrants in the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area made a net contribution of $578.2 million to Canada's treasury in 1995.[17] Furthermore, although immigrants paid less income tax, they also have a lower welfare dependency rate and lower UI usage rate that the general population. Contrary to popular belief, immigrants accepted for family reunification also made a significant positive contribution to Canada's treasury, with a net contribution of $229.6 million in 1995.[18] Again, the figures also generally show that the contributions of immigrants rise over a reasonably long period (about 10-15 years), instead of in the short term. Although 76% of refugees make tax contributions, 24% use welfare and 11% relied on UI, resulting in a negative balance -the exception rather than the rule.

The economic experiences of immigrants in The Toronto Region are obviously not homogeneous, yet there are several implications for local economic policy and programs. These include the necessity of reviewing settlement programs to determine whether they adequately prepare immigrants for the The Toronto Region job market with appropriate employment and language skills and information, and whether they are accessible to all who could benefit, including immigrant women. The variations in experiences and demographics in immigrant communities suggest the need for flexible services and government funding which allows considerably more local autonomy. The continued underutilization of a skilled immigrant labour force has serious implications for local economic development as well as national productivity.

One significant parallel to the lack of devolution of immigrant settlement services from the federal level to the province is the lack of devolution of a labour market training agreement. It has similar consequences for the sector, in which many of the service providers are immigrant settlement agencies. Formal provincial-federal negotiations on the Labour Market Training Agreement went on inconclusively throughout 1998 and until July 1999, when both parties walked away from the table. The labour market training system consequently is fragmented and becoming privatized as well. Many training providers have suffered considerable loss of program funds as a result of new Employment Insurance grants shift training funds training from agencies

directly to individual clients, who may not pay the service providers in turn.[19]

7.2   Lessons from education
What features of the accomplishments in immigrant education can be continued today,and how can local autonomy be reasserted in common with other sectoral interests?

Education overlaps extensively with immigrant settlement, because schools are one of the first points of contact and primary channels of socialization for most immigrant families. It is a public sector where there is a history of relatively successful examples of locally-developed and coordinated immigrant settlement initiatives and structures. For four decades, education has played a leading role in immigrant education in the GTA through policies and activities of more than half a dozen senior government bodies, eight school boards and numerous NGOs, rendering the picture of governance and accountability extremely complex. Because responsibility for education is vested in the province while that for immigration is vested in the federal government, negotiating the division of powers has become highly problematic.[20]

The continuing need to address immigrant educational issues is, however, indisputable : over 20% of all newcomers are children. Nearly half of Toronto Board of Education students are from non-English speaking families representing over 76 language groups.[21] A third of the students have come from over 170 countries, and nearly one-half of secondary school students were not born in Canada. Two-thirds of foreign born students are recent arrivals, and nearly two-thirds of *those* are from "high need" (including refugees) background. Overall, about one-quarter of the students require ESL assistance, and one-fifth are from "high need" source countries. To meet their needs, the Board of Education has offered ESL programs to over 15,000 students annually, in addition to first language tutoring and support. Since the 1980s, two reception centres have served immigrant students and families, in recent years registering approximately 300 immigrant families per month. In 1995, there were nearly 30,000 adult ESL non-credit students. At the time these statistics were reported, Boards of Education became concerned that such programs would be reduced or eliminated, and specifically warned that program losses were liable to increase drop-out rates for students new to Canada, increase conflict between different cultural, ethnic and racial groups, and prevent the integration of adult ESL students into Canadian society.[22]

Support for citizenship and language education for immigrants originated in the immediate post-WWII years, but it was in the 1960s, when the point system for immigration was established, that concerted occupational and ESL training for immigrants got underway in Toronto through federal Manpower programs. The

Province also became active in the 1960s, when its Citizenship Branch piloted innovative televised English language learning programs, combined ESL and preschool programs and began training ESL teachers. School boards dealt with ESL programs and cultural integration of children by developing their own policies and relying on new-found, local expertise and their own revenue sources. NGOs such as COSTI-ILAS began its adult education programs in this period as well.

Each of these players had their own constraints, interests and resources. It was a time of experimentation and coping from which a number of programs were created, but fertile though it was, coordination became an issue. A report at the time recommended that a broad - based Immigrant Education and Citizenship Advisory Council be set up to deal with everything from ESL methods and culture conflicts to starting social services reception centres and multimedia outreach. As institutional costs rose, public visibility declined in favor of ability to maneuver policies and control budgets.

Pluralistic influences replaced assimilationist approaches in the 1970s. The Provincial Citizenship Branch continued to be pro-active in immigrant education, consolidating a number of useful services in the Ontario Welcome Houses. It also continued to administer funding for ESL and Manpower training. The Ministry of Education allowed school boards to decide how to teach ESL, and used weighting factors to give proportionately more funding to schools with certain characteristics, such a percentage of the population speaking non-official languages. The Toronto Board lobbied for the Heritage Language Program and initiated rudimentary research in order to keep track of numbers and placement of immigrant children with the periodic Every Student Survey, still in use. With the arrival of the Southeast Asian refugees in the late 70s, the involvement of the NGOs in immigrant education became even more important. The federal ISAP program has its origins in this period, as did the Ontario Coalition for Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI), formed to coordinate NGOs and lobby governments for support.

On the federal level in the 1980s, complex pressures and public opinions about the Official Languages Act, the Multiculturalism Policy, the Charter of Right and Freedoms, and criticisms of federal language training programs, led to proposals for contracting out immigrant education services and eventual downloading. Apparently, the government thought it appeared wiser to turn its attention to domestic problems such as literacy, rather than the "imported problem" of immigration.[23] At the time, Provincial immigrant education programs were so numerous, overlapping and divided among ministries as to sow confusion, but this reportedly allowed some freedom of alignment among various constituencies. A Task Force on Access to Professions and Trades in Ontario was also initiated by the province in the late 80s, when the idea emerged

that teaching immigrants English for the workplace was insufficient, and multiculturalism dictated that barriers to employment were also systemic and had to be addressed. In 1987, the school boards asked the federal government to bear some of the responsibility for integrating immigrant children in public schools with social workers and interpreters, but lobbying was ineffective and no funds have been provided since. The central role of NGOs as essential service providers and members of various consortia was acknowledged, but core funding from governments for their work was becoming more unstable and inadequate. Lack of coordination remained a common complaint.

While raising immigration levels to 250,000 per year, the federal government completely revised its language programs for immigrants in the 1990s, replacing employment - oriented programs with much criticized general LINC programs restricted to immigrants in their first three years. Over 80% of these are delivered by community agencies under challenging educational conditions. School boards provide many of the teachers, who are well-qualified but are expected to work at lower wages on a part-time basis, for lack of funding. The federal government anticipates further devolving responsibility for language training to the Province, which has streamlined its education and training programs. As a result of this upheaval, NGOs are experiencing more competition with the private sector, more stringent funding rules and procedures, and a breathless and unexamined pace of change which threatens to drain the sector of its human-scale community responsiveness.

Scholars remark that little is revealed by this history of immigrant education in Toronto other than chronic lack of coordination and funding, yet they also recognize that there are implications for governance today. A great deal of innovation on the local level did take place in education. Senior government abdication of responsibility in the 1980s was seriously detrimental and community-based organizations have struggled mightily. But more positively, there has also been growth since the 1970s in program development, research and lobbying efforts by the school boards, and valued cooperation between mainstream institutions and now expert NGO service providers. Since the federal government keeps a low-profile and is still attempting devolution to the provinces, continuing support for immigrant education does not appear to be guaranteed, unless new forms of cooperation and funding arise.

7.3 Health and well-being
What role could local Public Health departments and other health care providers play in advancing local autonomy in settlement policy?

Health, like economic development and education, is not a immigrant settlement issue *per se*. Like other

public policy areas, it overlaps with immigration concerns by virtue of urban diversity and the particular responsibilities of public health. Because of strict admissions criteria, most immigrants are healthy on arrival, but problems can occur as a result of difficulties in accessing health services. Technically, the health of immigrants is a shared federal-provincial responsibility: federal immigration policies help ensure that immigrants are healthy at the point of entry to the country; after immigrants achieve landed status, their health care becomes a provincial responsibility, as is the case for citizens. The provinces remain accountable for upholding federal health care standards, including the guarantee of accessibility. In doing so, they rely on local institutions. Progress in providing appropriate multicultural health care was made by local agencies and institutions in the 1980s, but further efforts have been hampered in the last decade.

Immigrant settlement agencies now report a tremendous need for accessible and culturally appropriate health services, especially mental health counseling.[24] Immigrant health care needs encompasses primary care, mental health and stress-related illness, health sexuality, dental care, and special care for heart problems, tuberculosis and asthma (conditions which increase *after* immigration). According to a recent survey, nearly 20% of immigrant settlement agencies in Ontario offer health services to their clients, and 16.5% identified health services for immigrants as an emerging need, and expressed concern that there would not be adequate mental, dental and health services in the future.[25] Immigrant settlement agencies use organizational referrals and networking with other services as a primary means of reaching and providing services to immigrants, so coordination on the local level is critical.

Toronto Public Health, like virtually all health care institutions across the Region, including hospitals and community health centres, are currently trying to meet the demands of immigrants and refugees, who may require culturally appropriate services and health care specific to their situation as newcomers. Even though budget cutbacks and shifting priorities have curtailed access and equity advances in health care in the 1990s, multicultural health care is not new, nor entirely absent. Public Health traditionally engages in services and programs in health promotion, health protection and disease prevention and deals with population health as a whole. They also focus on diverse and underserved groups, such as newcomers. Moreover, they try to incorporate an approach to health as a product of social determinants - such as income, social status, employment conditions, social support networks, education, and access to health services - that are similar to the goals of settlement integration.

Provincial legislation dictates that Public Health services be "accessible and equitable," and mandatory guidelines dictate that services must be provided "in response to local needs."[26] These statements, combined

with the City of Toronto Human Rights Policy, are the basis for reaffirming access and equity, and serving immigrants and refugees, in many public health service areas. Thus, Public Health is committed to developing policies and programs in partnership with communities, including over 60 ethno-racial community groups in order to respond to the needs of immigrants and refugees. In a program called Healthy Babies, Healthy Children, for example, lay home visitors from various ethno-racial communities have been hired to provide young families with professional and peer support. In 1999, approximately 10,000 mothers and children were visited.[27] Public Health also plays a protective role in taking on health care needs of vulnerable populations that are hard to reach or fall through the social safety net. Immigrant settlement overlaps here with health-related issues and housing shortages. For example, in Scarborough Public Health nurses have provided services to occupants of family shelters, a third of who are newcomers.

As a final example of local implications of health and immigrant settlement, Toronto Public Health has responsibility for investigating and managing communicable diseases, including tuberculosis (TB). The spread of tuberculosis has been linked to population movements and poverty world-wide, but control and treatment of the disease is manageable in the majority of the relatively small number of cases that reach Toronto. Most significantly, this has required the cooperation of all levels of government: the Canadian federal government sets health screening policy and funds some medical services for refugee claimants. The provincial government funds TB care, including drugs. Public Health Units ensure that people with active TB get the treatment they need. Public Health does not receive federal funding for TB control, although it has been requested. (Other jurisdictions do, however. In recognition of its unique situation as an immigrant reception centre, New York City now receives 60% of its funding for TB control from the U.S. federal government.)

The most adversely affected by lack of access to health care and other services among immigrants and refugees are non-status individuals who have come to Canada seeking asylum. These undocumented persons pose particular challenges for local institutions and service providers. Some of these are people who have not been determined to be Convention refugees, but fear returning to their countries of origin. Even among Convention refugees there are many who experience long delays in obtaining their landed status, and who consequently do not have access to health and social services, because their identity documents are not considered acceptable. As many come from war-torn countries where "proper" documentation is practically impossible, they are kept in an indeterminate limbo.

According to the testimony of Dr. Marlinda Freire, Chief Psychiatrist, Toronto District School Board and others working in the sector, the undocumented fear "surfacing" in official institutions such as schools and

hospitals.[28] They are not entitled to any services and their children may not receive immunizations. Refugee claimants are temporarily covered by the Interim Federal health Program for basic emergency care, but this coverage does not include medical exams for the purpose of immigration, mental health treatment, or care for pregnant or assaulted women, among other services. Most physicians are not willing to participate in the federal program because it is highly bureaucratic. Refugee claimants and non-status individuals can turn to volunteer physicians or community health centres for care, but these channels are limited.

Catholic Cross-cultural Services, an agency that provides settlement counselling services in over 30 languages in east Toronto, notes that there are several specific health system issues that present difficulties for immigrants and refugees.[29] For example, immigrants have a waiting period of three months before they are eligible for OHIP. Some are not insured for this period prior to arrival. This can be critical when immigrants are pregnant or require medical attention, for which they seek help at a community health centre. If referred to the emergency room of a local hospital, they will have to pay a deposit before receiving services, or if admitted, may be expected to pay a prohibitively high bill prior to discharge from the hospital, which often they cannot afford. While they can advocate for a reduction of fees, they usually do not realize this.

Related to health needs for newcomers, of course, is meeting basic survival needs, usually associated with finding employment. Refugee claimants may apply for an Employment Authorization, but the process takes months and isn't even possible unless they can produce proof of a job offer. At the same time, they cannot legitimately look for work without the permit. Those who cannot obtain work permits are left with no alternative other than dependence on Social Assistance for extended periods. Understanding the intricate social services system can be difficult even for those who speak English, and impossible for those who cannot find their own interpreters. These combined factors prolong the settlement process and adversely effect entire families.

The problems are complex and doubtless affect well-being and successful integration. The children of non-status persons are supposed to be able to attend school, but are usually prevented by bureaucratic and jurisdictional issues, and sometimes because of imposed fees. Securing adequate housing is difficult because of lack of availability, high costs and discrimination. Undocumented refugees hoping to be reunited with family members wait for a minimum of five years, and can wait as much as ten or twelve, again with psychological and social consequences. For rejected refugee claimants not immediately deported (because no country can take them), access to employment, health care, housing and social services is simply cut off. Because immigration retains their documents, they are forced to rely on charity or to go underground.

Advocates have recommended changes, so that refugee claims are settled more quickly and all newcomers to Canada are eligible for health services on arrival.

The public health role of local government in immigration is already substantial if under-recognized, and further policy and program development and coordination is certainly needed. There may be potential for greater local autonomy, however, in developing an "urban health policy framework," a nascent idea coming from several quarters. Organizations such as SETO (the community health planning project in Southeast Toronto) and the Toronto District Health Council already have suggested the need for such policy. In one possible parallel with funding formulas for immigrant settlement services, Community Care Access Centres are funded by the Province according to a formula specifying the numbers and ages of clients (funding is higher for older clients). After the Toronto CCAC advocated for the special needs of its urban population due to the high incidence of AIDS cases and immigration, more funding was made available through negotiation even though the funding formula was not explicitly altered. Research is also in progress, for example, by Dr. Rick Glazier of the Inner City Health Program, St. Michael's Hospital, [30]and other community and university researchers, to map health status information and the relationship of demographic variables to health. This and other research may lend credence to idea that urban health needs may differ due to immigration, and a specific urban health policy is warranted. The foregoing issues also suggest that immigrant health and related issues should not be marginalized, but rather considered integral in policy and planning in order to safeguard basic rights.

7.4   Housing and immigration
How would autonomy enhance our ability to provide appropriate housing for newcomers?

One of the basic needs to be satisfied in settlement integration is finding appropriate and affordable housing, a notoriously difficult feat across the Toronto Region. Strangely enough, housing is not even currently considered a part of settlement services funding, although settlement workers attempt to bridge the gap by serving as housing advocates. For decades, immigrants have settled in the inner city, and often moved on to more affluent suburbs, but recent settlement patterns (1970s-1990s) are not as simple, with more suburbs becoming direct reception areas resulting in a mixture of ethnic patterns discernable across the GTA.[31] Some of the suburbanization of immigration, for example the movement into MTHA housing, was due to the confluence of waves of new immigrants at the time that social housing was built. While scholars in the US and Europe tend to believe that segregated settlement patterns reinforce the inequities of an immigrant "underclass," Canadian scholars have suggested that there is a positive side to ethnic segregation that first

enhances community and self-sufficiency, then full integration in a wider society. Whatever emphasis is chosen, real success in finding housing depends on the local market, in terms of low-cost home ownership, vacancy rates and the availability of social housing.

Although global migration and federal policy have resulted in increased flow and diversity of immigration, the changes are felt at the local level, in Toronto's tight labour and housing market. In contrast to many European cities, Toronto has little rent-geared-to-income housing, and waiting lists are long.[32] As a result, most immigrants must resort to the private market, where high cost and lack of knowledge of tenant rights creates barriers. For higher income immigrants, home ownership is attainable. However, the lack of affordable rentals combined with discriminatory practices (such as those documented by the Centre for Equality Rights in Accommodation) have reduced opportunities, particularly for lower income immigrants.[33] In this respect, the major policy issue is providing appropriate, secure housing, and is not a problem confined to immigrants and refugees, but a clear concern of many. The absence of senior levels of government's responsibility in this matter is obvious.

7.5 Civic participation
What will the GTA Charter movement do to encourage wider participation among immigrants?

The implications of the Greater Toronto Charter for immigrant settlement not only have to do with entitlements such as services and basic socio-economic rights that are the means to successful integration. The Charter also is fundamentally about the responsibilities of civic participation, for without it, subsidiarity and accountability are one-sided. Civic participation is the way citizenship is given meaning. To the extent that civic participation means voting and gaining political representation, who are politicians accountable to, if turnout is low among immigrants or immigrant populations are ignored as constituents? Most newcomers focus first on basic necessities such as language, employment and housing acquisition. In intermediate stages, civic participation, such as volunteering in settlement agencies and creating cultural spaces and events might be undertaken. Longer term immigrants may be more likely to be politically active.
Citizenship is not merely an abstract national construct. Cities are places where actual citizenship is brought to life, where individuals create identities, engage in politics and claim rights as part of cultural groups and social movements. As a political space where diverse interests are expressed, cities have become catalysts for new ideas about citizenship.[34]   Observers in many cities of immigration have noted that some of the most critical issues in civic participation have been cultural, not strictly political or economic. Issues arise over religious practice (for example, local zoning for mosques) not necessarily ethnic identity, and though symbolic,

these have had contentious practical consequences. This expression of civic participation tests social cohesion, which, to accommodate diversity, must emphasize mutual respect as much as common values.

The implications for the Charter Movement need to be explored much further if the movement is to be effective and truly broad-based. Keen though The Toronto Region may be to promote itself as "home to the world," as Prof. Myer Siemiatycki has noted, many newcomers still feel like outsiders.[35] Diversity challenges the proposal to build a politically inclusive culture, whether citizenship is understood as a national or as a local concept.

7.6   Municipal impacts and initiatives

Municipal governments lack the resources to address the full scale of problems facing urban areas today. Quality of urban life has been damaged by the growing gap between rich and poor and the unraveling of the social safety net. Since the mid-1990s, there has been a legacy of withdrawal by the federal government from housing and health care, coupled with provincial cutbacks in income support programs and education. As a result of provincial downloading on to the limited property tax base, municipalities are now responsible for social housing and part of the costs of social assistance and emergency hostels. While some costs are pooled across the GTA, this not an entirely satisfactory way to alleviate the disproportionate burden on Toronto. For one thing, social service costs are unpredictable, linked as they are to local social and economic conditions, including immigration. Local municipalities are required to provide social services with practically no control over the costs or the conditions, which create them.

The federal government is already recovering costs due to immigration, and not just in the long term. Immigrants pay a *right of landing* fee of $975 per person, and refugee claimants must pay a processing fee of $500 per person. As we have seen, immigrants also contribute their fair share to Canada's treasury through income taxes without being a drain on social support, but that revenue source is not effectively shared at the municipal level. If thought of as a long-term investment, and handled in such a way as to take into account local level needs for socio-economic development, could immigrant settlement not help arrest the decline of the city? Like any investment, the pay off is not immediate.

On the positive side, The Toronto Region receives almost one-half of the skilled workers who come to Canada, a valuable, but untapped resource. Our share of business class immigrants is about one-quarter, as is Montreal's, and Vancouver receives 28%.[36] Across the GTA, immigrants comprise over 60% of Toronto,

nearly 20% of Peel, about 12% of York, and almost 5% each of the Durham and Halton region's populations.[37] Newcomers to The Toronto Region are better educated than the Canadian population in general; over 80% have finished high school, and 40% of these have completed university.[38] Even though the City of Toronto does not directly fund settlement services, six City of Toronto grant programs provide just over $2M to ensure the participation of diverse communities in community-based services.[39] The municipal impact of unmet immigrant and refugee needs in the early period is not negligible. The City directly supports newcomers by providing emergency shelter, social assistance and public health services as needed, in spite of the fact that there is no federal commitment to share these costs. The Toronto Region also takes in far more refugees than other urban centres.

In spite of these high skill and educational levels, and because good jobs are hard to find, many newcomers are poor at first. Some rely on income support, although they do so at the relatively low rate (compared to their proportion in the population) of 12.5% of the Toronto CMA welfare caseload.[40] Many of those assisted are dependents that, in the case of sponsorship breakdown, have little recourse. The 50% of refugees who arrive without sponsorship do not initially receive federal support and are not eligible for settlement services. In the waiting period for federal documentation, they are not eligible for social assistance or health care and have no option but to live in emergency shelters. The City's position on providing supports and services to immigrants and refugees in need is clear: "The issue is not whether these services should be provided, but which level of government has access to adequate resources to appropriately fund these services to best meet newcomer needs."[41]

The City would like the federal government to continue to show leadership in funding settlement services in light of lack of devolution for administration of services and the city's current inability to influence immigration policy. However, as the municipality most affected by immigrant settlement, the City would like to *become* a policy partner because of the impact on city services. In 1999, the City of Toronto was excluded from consultation on the federal immigration legislative review, but nevertheless responded to then Minister Lucienne Robillard's subsequently announced directions in immigration policy[42] in a report to City Council's Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee. The Advisory Committee on Immigration and Refugee Issues, headed by Councillor David Miller, recommended that the City request the federal government to consult on relevant policy issues with all major cities in Canada that receive large numbers of immigrants and refugees and to reimburse the city for the costs incurred by providing municipal services to immigrants and refugees. The City also urged action on reducing long delays in landing undocumented refugees and in eliminating barriers to access to trades and professions.

In its response to Bill C-31 regarding immigration, the City's staff report to council notes that the bill "is silent on consultation and collaboration with municipalities," and even "deletes a stated objective of the current Immigration Act, which promotes cooperation between the Government of Canada and other levels of government."[43] The Minister is required to consult only with provinces.

City of Toronto staff recommended to City Council that the bill be amended in three ways: 1) to make provisions for the Government of Canada to formally consult with municipalities receiving

large numbers of immigrants and refugees on relevant policy and program issues, 2) to maintain a strong emphasis on providing support for the settlement and integration of immigrants and refugees and recognizing their contribution to Canadian society, and 3) to reflect Canadian core values, democratic principles and human rights standards. Further, it was recommended that Council request a formal process to include the city as full participants in the development of regulations following from the bill and that the Government of Ontario facilitate federal consultation with municipal governments.

The City's response recommended once again that the federal government reimburse municipalities regarding public health expenditures related to refugees, social assistance and hostel costs provided to refugees, and social assistance to immigrants because of sponsorship breakdown, and that the federal government explicitly support federal-provincial agreements in these areas. In addition, the City supports the requests made by the Toronto District School Board to senior governments to provide assistance in language training for immigrant and refugee children and adults, and to admit undocumented refugee children to the schools. It also requests the federal government to consult with Toronto and to increase support in accelerating professional recognition and skills upgrading for newcomers.

The City of Toronto rightly has appealed to the federal government on its own behalf, and on the behalf of community agencies serving immigrants and refugees, and has advanced the cause of access and equity corporately through its Task Force on Community Access and Equity as well. But as Myer Siemiatycki has also observed,

> *"Perhaps Toronto's current inertia in responding to diversity reflects the limits of good intentions leaning on received wisdom. The time for imagination and risk may be at hand. Participation and equity cannot be willed; they need to be cultivated from the bottom up....Particularly helpful would be the development of institutions and*

programs aimed to stimulate civic engagement among marginalized communities." [44]

Stimulating civic engagement among immigrant communities is a requirement the Greater Toronto Charter movement likely must meet in order to honour its principles of subsidiarity and accountability and to catalyze the "critical mass" of active citizens that demography has provided.

Other local issues have to do with "horizontal" relationships, as the perspectives of the City of Toronto and other regions vary in some respects, although there is also recognition of the need for unity where possible.[45] At issue are different ideas about the priorities given physical development and social planning in the various regions, as well as straight forward bottom-line reasoning. The process of reaching any common goals, such as greater local autonomy in immigrant settlement, has to provide an acceptable answer to the question, "who pays?" Given the political differences that do exist, it may be very important that the federal government remain the key player in guaranteeing human rights and requisite supports for immigrant settlement, while local governments work with their own communities on appropriate services.

A project on planning and coordination between settlement services and other areas of the human services sector was recently completed by the Social Planning Council of Peel for the GTA Consortium on the Coordination of Settlement Services, an *ad hoc* group formed at the request of Citizenship and Immigration. Related research on the municipal role in urban policy making undertaken by Professors Frances Frisken and Marcia Wallace has examined municipal council initiatives in Peel and York regions and contrasted them to municipal council initiatives in the former cities of Toronto and York.[46] Frisken and Wallace found that municipalities do have flexibility in responding to immigrant settlement needs, and that they differ from one another across the GTA in how they respond to these needs. The policy options municipalities in the GTA have exercised include: politically inclusive representation; access and equity in service delivery; employment equity programs; programs to foster employee awareness of immigration-related issues; anti-racism and multicultural programs; and municipal grants to support community agencies.[47] While governments of the City of Toronto and the former Metro Toronto were *proactive* in their responses to immigration, other jurisdictions in the GTA tended to be *reactive*.

The researchers found that neither sheer numbers of immigrants, the period of their arrival, nor their electoral strength influenced municipalities to respond to immigrant settlement issues. More influential, however, was the passage of time, a more advanced stage of local community development and fiscal capacity or spending priorities. Also important were triggering circumstances or events, such the influx of Southeast Asian

refugees in the 1970s, and sympathetic local leadership. Other variables were pressures from voluntary and non-profit agencies that speak for immigrants, and the extent of interaction with senior government policy-makers that facilitates local responses to immigrant issues.

Frisken and Wallace conclude that,

> "*It appears unlikely that even the most proactive municipal governments will attempt to fill gaps left by cuts in senior government programs and financial support. Municipal governments can nonetheless play an important role in easing the absorption of immigrants into Canadian society by creating an environment that supports the work of community agencies (with office space or administrative help, for example); increasing the diversity of municipal workforces and their links with ethno-cultural communities; reducing or removing language and other barriers to acquiring information about settlement services; and bringing representatives of ethno-cultural communities into local decision-making.*"[48]

In a sobering general assessment, the authors also surmised that there is no indication that suburban officials see the need to become more proactive in their efforts to absorb immigrants or to assist the City of Toronto. From the point of view of municipal officials in different parts of the GTA,

> "*immigrant settlement is a uniquely local phenomenon calling for uniquely local approaches; it is not part of a regional process that calls for efforts to work with officials in other communities to devise regional approaches. Moreover rising demands and shrinking resources may lead municipal governments to attach even less importance than in the past to activities they are not required by law to perform, that they must fund entirely out of local taxes, and for which there is limited community support, particularly in the suburbs.*" [49]

This view suggests that there are good reasons to continue open discussion of the varying perceptions of immigration issues across the GTA. It also suggests, as the authors conclude, that it is necessary to look beyond the political role of municipal councils to the operational activities of the various agencies involved in the delivery of services to immigrants.

To summarize, policy coherence in immigrant settlement could be enhanced if there were greater local autonomy because the sector and related policy areas would work in concert on local settlement objectives. These objectives could be more comprehensive, including housing; more oriented to the local labour market and economic development; and better integrated with local education and health institutions. They would give community-level meaning to civic participation and social cohesion as fundamental to citizenship. They would recognize the critical role already played by municipal government in immigrant settlement.

8.0 Changing a delicate balance
How *will the Charter help the region achieve a unity of social and economic purpose in settlement integration policy?*

As non-governmental service organizations, immigrant settlement agencies have come to play a special role in Canada's social and political system. They are considered fundamental to carrying out government policy in integrating newcomers in the labour market and in the Canadian polity. Though indispensable, they are not true partners in terms of equitable power and resources.[50] They are contracted by the government to provide services to immigrants and refugees, and therefore dependent. By virtue of their expertise, they have developed advocacy capability and political weight, though this is sometimes ignored and underestimated. Even though they do not directly engage in policy making, it is practically impossible for the federal government to operate without them, particularly in the absence of local and provincial government partners. In fact, a relationship of mutual dependence and benefit exists, with each party contributing certain strengths – the federal government its national policy guidelines and financial resources, the agencies, their expertise, cost-effectiveness and responsiveness to specific communities.

The relationship is not without tensions, of course, having to do with competing interests, limited resources and growing needs. Pressure may come, on the one hand, from being locked in the relationship and not having alternate financial and organizational resources, and on the other, from an unwillingness to jeopardize the current symbiosis. To be sure, most of the pressure is felt by the agencies, which work in an increasingly competitive environment and have felt their advocacy role curtailed, which has created an adversarial atmosphere at times.

Possible pitfalls of changing the *status quo* have been suggested in previous discussion, such as the reluctance to add a structural layer that, in agencies' experience, could bring more restrictions rather than more freedom. But would local autonomy necessarily disrupt the already delicate balance between immigrant serving agencies and the federal government? While any loss of flexibility in the sense of subsidiarity is understandably feared, there seems to be very little flexibility in terms of alternate funding streams left to lose. Apart from the knowledge that they are needed, immigrant settlement agencies have no reliable guarantee of being able to sustain, let alone develop, their programs and services. As funders, the senior levels of government have asked the immigrant settlement sector for accountability, but this is a one-sided relationship. As Tim Owen of COSTI, speaking on genuine partnerships between goverments and NGOs, has pointed out,

"The ability of agencies to deliver services effectively on behalf of government depends on a significant degree of trust between agencies and governments. This Scan be both strengthened and demonstrated through good communication, the proactive distribution of information, and transparency in each other's planning and decision making. Not only trust, but also public accountability is improved by organizations' and governments' willingness and ability to be transparent in their operations...open dialogue which welcomes innovation is critical to the ability of government and civil society to successfully pursue common goals."[51]

There are other attempts being made to find cooperative mechanisms. The Community Social Planning Council of Toronto and other partner organizations, for example, have nearly completed CIC - funded research on models of integration for settlement services. Part of the research group's mandate was to find ways to apply social planning principles to serve the needs of heterogeneous ethno-specific groups representing settlement agencies. The research will address persistent gaps in information and provide more detailed policy statements for immigrant settlement. One common thread tying together this research and previous discussion is that "collaborative" terms or "cooperative" structure and function are preferred to any integrative models that require existing settlement organizations to be subsumed in other bodies that would limit their own autonomy.

One adaptive trend within the climate of constraints described has been an increase in inter-agency collaboration and brokering functions, especially on the part of larger agencies. This has strengthened the institutional importance of multi-service agencies, endowing them with growing political influence as well as the potential for a mentoring capacity. From this experience may come valuable lessons for breaking out of the current phase of inertia. Within the current framework, some of these may include creating more balanced partnerships and more holistically designed programs with community input in terms of resource and ideas. Outside the current framework, these may be more cross-sectoral information and referral, more service coordination, or intermediate accountability bodies such as citizens' forums or "watchdog" organizations responsive to community members as well as service agencies.

8.1 A new needs-based model for settlement services
What qualitatively different expression of interests could evolve if local autonomy involved a wider coalition representative of all relevant sectors, including the municipality and other players, were devised?

Professor Usha George is attempting to re-think settlement services and propose innovations that are instructive when greater local autonomy is considered. Her work-in-progress is valuable as "bottom-up" research in which she consulted clients as well as service providers. She has reviewed existing theoretical and practice-based models of settlement services, including, for example, ecological, empowerment, and acculturative models, all of which illuminate the complex factors involved in immigrant settlement that service providers may use to frame their work.[52] Her model for settlement services is based inductively on the input of newcomers and service providers, particularly of more recently arrived groups. Service providers suggested model components which tended to meet organizational needs, such as an umbrella organization or centres to provide centralized intake and referrals, without diminishing expectations for continuing support for the direct services of ethno-specific agencies and cultural sensitivity in mainstream institutions. The newcomers participating in the study, for their part, expressed frustration because their needs had not been met by any existing settlement or social service agencies. Their suggestions highlighted the unmet needs of pre-immigration preparation and a continuum of services on arrival, plus specific services such as access to professions and trades and counseling for family stress and mental health.

To devise a feasible and cost-effective model, the resulting model had to address the resource needs of providers as well as the settlement needs of newcomers. In general, George has proposed that settlement funding be based on *needs* as well as *numbers* of arrivals from source countries. To deal better with the *specific* needs of various groups of newcomers, *service specialization* at various centres is suggested. To deal with the need for better follow-up, more comprehensive *case-managemen*t is also proposed. The model advises three levels of service: first is pre-migration information, with subsequent basic orientation at common reception centres where a wider range of services than are currently available can be provided, such as translation, mentoring, and housing assistance. Second are labour market entry services, particularly to address the special needs of highly educated and foreign trained processionals. Third are specialized services, especially referrals to culturally sensitive services such as individual and family counseling. These are to cope with the widely felt stresses of settlement, such as professional and social setbacks and resulting loss of status and self-esteem. This research has begun to reveal what's missing in settlement services and to propose solutions that could potentially be met through coordinated efforts on the local level.

Another type of model for improvement comes from the international arena. The Greater Toronto Area is not alone among the world's receiving cities in searching for solutions to the problem of enhancing local autonomy in the context of global migrations and nationally determined policy. Each city has its own history and political conditions, none perfect. Despite many differences among the cities listed below and in the Appendix, there also may be similarities in immigrant settlement issues that have led to local initiatives and political structures of possible interest to The Toronto Region.

8.2   Rotterdam, The Netherlands

One comparable example is Rotterdam, a modern port city and the second largest metropolis in the Netherlands.[53] Rotterdam has received immigrants for centuries. In the post-war period, immigrants came from the former Dutch colonies. In the 1950s, "guest workers" arrived from Turkey, Morocco, Spain and Cape Verde and have since become permanent residents. Since the end of the 1980s, Rotterdam has also received many refugees due to international developments and stipulations of the central government. In 1995, for example, 30,000 people sought asylum in the Netherlands. Today, the city's immigrants experience disproportionate levels of unemployment and housing problems, as well as a problematic "generation gap" between young and old in immigrant families. This history has much in common with other European centres of immigration and some similarities with The Toronto Region.

Also similar is Rotterdam's need for new, specifically urban policies. The sixties and seventies were characterized by economic growth, the promotion of social equality and the development of the welfare state. Urban renewal programs brought large-scale investments in affordable housing. In the eighties, the economy declined and pockets of deprivation, an almost exclusive problem of big cities, grew. To prevent the further economic slide and societal divisions, the Dutch government, at the request of a coalition of the city councils of the four major Dutch cities (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, and Utrecht), established the Major Cities Policy in 1995. A special undersecretary of state was appointed to shape the policy. Intended to strengthen the economic structure, the Major Cities Policy approach is based on socio-economic problems rather than the ethnic dimension, but in fact, the new urban policies involve largely immigrant populations in the cities. The policy was based on in part on ongoing "social renewal" principles intended to produce concrete results: *customization,* policy geared towards specific needs and local situations; *cooperation*, mutual coordination of the efforts of various bodies; and *activation*, linking up with self-motivated target groups.

The policy perspective was one of *development,* which synthesized social and economic policy to create added value and to break new conceptual ground. For each policy field covered in the agreement–work, education, safety, care and livability–objectives and measurable outcomes were to be achieved within four years. "Work" included reduction in long-term employment, increase in small and medium business, and large-scale job creation. "Education" involved not only learning measures, but also improved coordination between education and the labour market and an expanded municipal role in education policy. "Safety" aims included neighbourhood-level crime reduction as well as drug use prevention and treatment and recreation and job opportunities for youth. "Care" targeted vulnerable people such as the homeless and ex-psychiatric patients for assessment and registration for social pensions. "Livability" has had to do with combating the impoverishment of the residential environment and the spatial segregation of deprived populations.

As a result of the agreement between the federal government and the city council, more energy has gone into an "area-specific approach," which is aimed at breaking through a compartmentalized structure and combining forces of various municipal and community organizations. Along with budget allocations, important tasks were delegated from central government to the cities:

> *"By strengthening the director's function of the municipalities, it must be possible to tackle the problems of the big city more effectively. After all, the complexity of the big-city problem can only be reduced by means of an integrated approach at the level and on the scale at which this complexity is rooted. It is also here that the cities must act, and they will be enabled to do so. They will have to utilize the position they are afforded by virtue of this Covenant to tackle the problems at the level of the urban district and neighbourhood."* [54]

Employed in five selected areas of the city, the area-specific approach involves project groups that integrate economic development with education, safety, livability and care, by following practical steps such as information sharing on policies, practices and progress made by the various bodies implementing the programs. The approach also seeks the support of target populations, measured by their perceptions and participation in partnerships, which are intended as a step beyond mere consultations.

The area specific approach gave added impetus to urban policy programs on certain themes already in progress throughout the city. One of these priority policy themes is the reception and integration of immigrants, for which the particular goals are reducing deprivation and facilitating integration. Given priority by city council, the policy is organized at the municipal level and implemented at the neighbourhood level.

Social organizations and the business sector take part in the programs. In addition, the municipality of Rotterdam itself also has a code of behaviour; similar to the City of Toronto's Human Rights Policy, aimed at creating access and equity.

There is no categorical municipal policy aimed solely at immigrants. However, wherever necessary, extra attention is paid to specific matters important to immigrants. These matters are specifically the reception of refugees and asylum seekers, the integration of newcomers, a policy on mosques, and a minorities monitor research project to assess policy benefits. The central government initially receives asylum seekers, and, the municipality is given the task of caring for and providing permanent housing for those allowed to stay. Municipal facilities are geared to acknowledged refugees and those with temporary residence permits who cannot return to their countries of origin because, for example, of war. There is intensive cooperation between the municipal departments, organizations representing the interests of the refugees and the police. Though a small scale project (serving about 3,000 clients in 1995) compared to The Toronto Region, the integration project is comprehensive: it provides orientation, language instruction, and simultaneous practical work experience, followed by vocational training and entry into the labour market. This program is offered to official refugees and immigrants alike, who are entitled to all social provisions, including housing.

Also a part of the urban policy framework is job creation within the economic structure of the region, for which the city has received financial allocations from the State. This is significant in the Charter discussion primarily because municipal research and planning on business creation is important in shaping the policy priorities and targeted economic sectors. The job creation strategy is connected to strengthening the "spatial-economic policy" in terms of investment, and the environmental policy in terms improvement to the quality of city life in transportation and housing.

Rotterdam acknowledges that its contribution is somewhat limited because much of the responsibility, for example in job creation, is the State's, but it does play an important role in bringing and keeping together all parties who support these urban policy goals. With respect to the future, Rotterdam city council has undertaken to open a city-wide discussion via the media and working groups, followed by a civic congress, in order to follow the principle of "co-production of policy." This is distinct from public consultation which occurs at the implementation stage, after directions are determined. This method has been promoted in the broader context of "revitalization of the urban culture." In the future, two groups will be given more attention: the business community, which is approached in terms of their civic responsibility for alleviating social hardship, but also their needs as entrepreneurs; and ethnic minorities in terms of increasing their level of

civic participation. In the case of ethnic minorities, research has revealed a "participation paradox" by which local-level political individual activism was not popular among ethnic minorities, but willingness to help collectively in neighbourhood initiatives was quite high once initiatives were begun. Recognizing the barriers to political participation has been a first step toward a new city policy of activation.

9.0 Choosing the means to the end
What are the paths to move settlement ahead in the Toronto Region?

Is there is a role for a local level government or a coordinating body to play in creating channels of accountability and subsidiarity in monitoring policy and practice? a citizen's forum? an inter-governmental and inter-agency referral office? a coalition group which preserves the unique nature of each participating organization? Not as a substitute for an umbrella advocacy group but a way for agencies and other institutions and community groups to interact on the municipal level?

To sum up, the questions are how to bridge existing gaps and to widen the exchange of resources, when the simplistic two-way (government-agency) exchange of funding and services that is the current way of operating, seems fragmented and inadequate. More funding, expressly for partnerships, coordination, and mentoring relationships is one way to go. One could look ahead, also, to unexplored areas, such as immigrant-focused community economic development, planned and applied according to local needs and priorities, not just observed as if the globalization of cities were a natural experiment, and to civic participation that includes latent constituencies, such as recent arrivals or underserved groups such as newcomer women or youth in general.

Another approach is to look back at creative periods in immigrant settlement in Ontario, when policy and practice were not the sole reserve of the federal government and established service agencies, but also tapped a wider range of inter-governmental partners who helped ensure the protection of the most vulnerable members of the community. The key to the success of these cooperative networks was personal trust and commitment on the part of mid-level bureaucrats, neither too high nor too low to be constrained in taking the initiative in meeting new needs.[55] These networks utilized not only ethnic service and advocacy organizations, but also mobilized larger membership organizations and interfaith communities, allowing individual citizens room to contribute actions and resources. Related sectors in which teachers and health care professionals, for example, also created innovative programs from the ground up in cooperation with specific communities hold lessons, too. These avenues rely on past and existing strengths.

Whatever new responses are proposed, new bodies or structures should not be invented for political reasons alone. It should be clear how immigrant settlement services, broadly defined, will be improved as a result of any new forms of collaboration, so as to avoid duplication and further confusion. As long as goals and responsibilities are clear, partnerships can work on many levels, including governments, institutional and community partners, policy and research, program development and delivery, and funding. With a multi-dimensional model based on local needs in mind it may be possible to preserve the positive functions of each party contributing to a wider form of local collaboration than currently exists.

Conditions for change certainly exist, if only because social and political strains exist and will necessarily lead to adaptations. But beyond social strains, a political or social movement relies on a popular sense of identification with purpose and a "critical mass" of civic participation. One might think that Toronto Region, where half the population is immigrant-born, would lend its demographic critical mass to produce changes that could benefit newcomers and new citizens. Apart from policy and practice issues, there may lie ahead issues of civic participation, which is after all, citizenship in action.

10.0   Appendix: *Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities*

A broader set of comparative examples comes from a project, entitled **Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities,** adopted by the UNESCO MOST (Management of Social Transformation) Program in 1996. The reason for the project is that post-war immigrants and ethnic minorities, many originally temporary workers whose families are now in their second and third generation, have become permanent residents in many European cities. As such, they have legitimate unmet demands, rights and duties with respect to their host societies. They have contributed though their labour, taxes, commercial services, culture and neighbourhood participation, yet suffer disproportionately from a variety of forms of exclusion in policy decisions.

To examine immigrant civic participation, the project includes a general framework for comparative data from seventeen cities on the evolution of local authority frameworks and public policies as they involve immigrant populations.[56] Each city involved has submitted information templates that describe how cities' top-down opportunity structures have facilitated "channels of activation," and how bottom-up initiatives taken by immigrants have also created "channels of mobilization." In most descriptions, information on municipal level initiatives is given, but sources of revenue are not mentioned, which may indicate simply that it is not as significant an issue as in The Toronto Region.

Selected highlights from information provided by some of the cities participating in the project (listed below) may act as "mirrors" for The Toronto Region and help demonstrate a range of comparative municipal experiences, some pitfalls, and possible "best practice" recommendations regarding municipal policies and the involvement of immigrants.

Amsterdam, The Netherlands

One of the cities covered by the Dutch Major Cities Policy, Amsterdam theoretically has substantial scope in developing a newcomers policy. Yet, having undergone an earlier decentralization process, some administrative tasks are delegated to districts within the municipality, and some to private organizations. According to the available information, this weakens municipal control over the newcomer's policy, as does the fact that a considerable amount of available funding flows directly from higher levels of government to private organizations that receive funding from several sources.

A network of immigrant organizations and their supporting organizations form a non-hierarchical consultation structure: organizations or sub-groups form coalitions on different levels of policy and bureaucracy to create a power basis for consultations with government organizations. At the top level are the immigrant support organizations financed by the municipality and the province. Their tasks are agreed upon with the authorities, and they in turn support general immigrant organizations to do direct social or community work. The second level consists of consultative bodies, also created and financed by the municipality, that have offices in city hall. They advise the city government, develop projects and provide information. Immigrant self-help organizations form the last level. Since 1996, the civil affairs offices of municipalities have had the responsibility of filing naturalization requests from newcomers.

Zurich, Switzerland

Basic features of the Swiss democratic political system have actually worked against immigrant interests. The popular initiative (*Volkinitiative), which* permits launching political proposals for a constitutional article, has been used several times since the 1960s to express populist and anti-immigrant sentiments, even though the initiatives have so far been rejected. Also, the balance between the interests of the whole population and the interests of the 23 highly autonomous *cantons* of the Swiss federation gives a great deal of weight to small, often conservative, low-density jurisdictions.

Another important factor in the politics of immigration, interestingly, is that the naturalization procedure is largely a municipal decision. According to the Constitution, a foreigner must become first the citizen of a municipality and then of a *canton* in order to get the Swiss nationality. The local level, based on values of the local community, is the most difficult stage to pass. Many of the features of Swiss democracy are copied on the municipal level as well, where only 4000 signatures can launch a city-wide initiative. In the area of immigration, these political instruments have most often been used by the extreme right to block policies supporting immigrants. For example, in 1981, 1982, 1983 and 1994 constitutional changes proposed by the government to ease the naturalization process for second-generation immigrants were rejected in popular votes.

Even in this xenophobic climate, however, a federal commission has been established since 1970 to provide public information and communication on immigration issues and to support local commissions with the same function. Because it avows that solutions must be adapted to local conditions in conformance with democratic customs, each municipality "has to find its own way." While there is no clear policy concerning

immigration, Zurich has had a municipal commission since 1968, which serves to make recommendations and to coordinate administrative services for immigrant settlement.

In recent years, higher unemployment and segregation in major cities has put immigrant integration on local agendas, and Zurich, Bale, and Bern have elaborated "integration policy designs" to create comprehensive approaches to the problems. In June 1998, the Swiss parliament voted for a federal proposal of an article added to immigration legislation giving the Swiss federation the power to subsidize local integration projects. Nevertheless, controversy over local integration policy resulted in suggestions for restrictions on immigration policy rather than educational programs to facilitate settlement. The left, including multicultural parties and the Green Party, have also criticized the integration policy for being too "assimilationist.".

Antwerp, Belgium

Immigration policy in Belgium was initially under national jurisdiction, but local consultative councils have been formed on the municipal level, with little provincial involvement. Complicating the picture are two additional levels of government in between the national, provincial and municipal levels: these are the Regions and the Communities, which were substantially empowered in management of integration policies after 1980. The Flemish regional administration has within it an interdepartmental commission for immigrants aimed at coordinating and concentrating expertise in integration matters that has direct impact on the local level. In 1990, a network of local and regional integration centres was also established and their diverse initiatives and funding coordinated by a supporting body. The centres themselves have the responsibility for the analysis of the socio-economic position of their target groups and for formulating appropriate approaches.

In addition, the Flemish region officially recognizes nine federations of ethno-specific immigrant self-help associations which are given umbrella funding to channel to their local sections. These nine organizations officially constitute a Forum to advise regional authorities, train leaders, and develop projects. In Antwerp city government, the coalition parties controlling the executive body agreed to specifically recognize the local consultative immigrant council as "the representative and most important negotiating partner in the policy process." Recently, a new interdepartmental approach to integration policies has been tried, with the appointment of a civil servant in charge of local integration policy.

The development of Flemish integration policy has also gone hand in hand with the availability of new financial resources, mostly channeled into local anti-poverty and urban renewal projects. These were not

specifically directed toward immigrants, but 25% of the funding was designated for the needs of immigrant communities. The funding has been designed to help consolidate local policies, and has increased by over 50% from 1996 to 1999.

A final issue in comparing Antwerp's situation with that of The Toronto Region's is that the city of Antwerp is the result of the merging of eight formerly independent municipalities. These remain the main actors in a decentralization policy based on administrative district councils, which have competencies at the neighbourhood level. There is increasing pressure to give them a role in local integration policies because the lack of immigrant representation on these councils, as well as socio-economic marginalization of immigrants, is a product of factors at the neighbourhood level. The modification of the administrative functions of municipalities is, however, under the jurisdiction of the federal parliament.

Birmingham, England

The Metropolitan County Council governing the Birmingham area was abolished in 1986, leaving six city councils most of the former council's responsibilities, including housing, education and urban regeneration. The Birmingham City Council, composed of 117 councillors, is dominated by the Labour Party, traditionally quite supportive of ethnic minority interests. Ongoing racial and ethnic violence in the 1980s led to the establishment of a Standing Consultative Forum with the support of a race relations unit to act as an official channel for ethnic groups to voice concerns. Having acquired more funding and strength in the 1990s, the Forum is now an umbrella group that covers nine ethnic-related, sub-umbrella groups. Each group received start up funds and salaries for two officers with the goals of representing member interests, influencing decision-making and rationalizing the council funding received for service delivery. At the time of the report, the Forum was reportedly in decline because of internal divisions and disorganization. Instead, the city council has set up a more issue-based independent body, the Racial Equalities Partnership, comprised of representatives of council, the health and education authorities, and ethnic groups to have a more consultative, less direct role in council business. Whatever structure is adopted, Birmingham notes that development of policies against racism has had a direct correlation with such participatory frameworks and the increase in the numbers of ethnic councillors, who are largely recruited by grass-roots Labour Party sections.

Rome, Italy

Italy has changed from a country of *emigration* to a country of *immigration*, focused on large cities. In the

mid-90s, a form of radical devolution from the central government took place in which legislative and planning passed to the regions and operative powers, such as social assistance, were redistributed to local levels. Along with the decentralization went some privatization. The immigration policy of the government of the City of Rome primarily addressed emergency problems in assisting new arrivals with basic needs. In this, it relied on existing volunteer organizations to fill service gaps. Friction and public conflicts over integration eventually led to devising a city network of hospitality structures, which were operated by the volunteer organizations seen as having the requisite expertise. Other longer-term city strategies have included creating agencies for immigrants regarding work, housing and cultural issues.

The city first played a mediating role in conflicts resulting from the over concentration of immigrants in unsatisfactory housing. Later, in 1992, the Roman City Council decided to create a Special Immigration Office with management autonomy and within the framework of the Department of Social and Human Services to shift from emergency response to planned integration initiatives. Two of these were the creation of a multi-ethnic service centre offering extrascholastic help for immigrant children, and the creation of cultural centres for immigrant youth. As of 1998, a new Italian immigration law includes provisions regarding social rights of foreigners, including the undocumented, in health, education, emergency housing, social integration and participation in public life.

Athens, Greece

Athens is illustrative of problems arising from lack of clear policies and structures on the local level. The vast majority of immigrants to Greece arrive without residence permits and are deprived of citizenship rights, but remain in the country and begin to integrate through their cultural communities. The lack of immigration policies means that government offices, business and voluntary organizations strategize and collaborate on an *ad hoc* basis, to prevent crises, satisfy economic interests or assert ethnic identities. In the process, humanitarian ideals alternate with discriminatory practices. In the absence of clear jurisdiction, budgets, and policies, local authorities are forced to improvise services.

There are numerous ethnic organizations serving immigrants and refugees, but there are no unifying consultative bodies, which could grant them a way to participate in political decision-making at either the state or local level. This situation of flux generates differences, even conflicts, among ethnic organizations which act as intermediaries for clients, who also may receive informal help from a variety of municipal and state agencies. An Inter-party Committee on Foreigners and Minority Issues of the municipal council, as a result,

is occasionally called in to act "as a fireman," mobilized primarily in emergencies. Ethnic associations do have links to political parties, and though numerous, are more likely to organize festivities than political activities.

Tel-Aviv-Yafo, Israel

Defining "immigrants" in Israel differs from other places, but as a country of immigration, its settlement services offered through the Ministry of Immigration Absorption are exemplary: Jewish immigrants are automatically granted citizenship, given language classes, vocational assistance, and rental and mortgage subsidies. The situation of non-Jewish immigrants such as foreign workers is quite different. The most interesting cases for our purposes are the Russian immigrants (many of whom are not Jewish) arriving since 1989, and the economic migrants who have become a significant factor since 1993. The latter are not referred to as "immigrants," but as "foreign workers," (in words, which actually have biblical connotations of paganism).

The Tel-Aviv Metropolitan Area has experience exponential growth in the post-war years from Europe, North Africa and the Middle East. Between 1989 and 1994, over half a million immigrants arrived from the former Soviet Union, over 30,000 in Tel Aviv, where they have clustered in Yafo. They are characterized by a high educational level and experienced downward mobility in the years immediately after arrival, but within a few years managed to improve their position. The neighbourhoods they abandoned as they did so have been filled by the newest wave of migrants, the foreign workers.

These economic immigrants were imported in the early 1990s to fill the labour shortages created when employment of Palestinians, on whom the national economy had become dependent, was banned following the Palestinian uprising. Current estimates of foreign workers with permits, (most from Romania and Asia) in Israel point to about 90,000, and for illegal migrants (resulting from African and Latin Americans who stay when tourist visas run out) the estimate is even higher. Altogether, over 80 countries are represented in the foreign worker population in Tel Aviv. Most work in construction and the service sector. Unlike the Palestinians who returned home every night, these foreign workers concentrate in Tel Aviv.

Africans, who began to arrive in the 1980s, comprise the largest and most established group of foreign workers in the city, including Ghanaians, Nigerians, and Congolese. They are the most highly organized, having created a large number of self-help associations of three types: socio-cultural organizations, including

churches; national origin-based associations and rotating credit associations. It is the only migrant community to have created a supra-national organization for the purpose of political mobilization. Israel had no colonial relationship with Africa, but it established ties in the 1950s and 1960s. These ties, combined with making pilgrimages, are possible reasons for African immigration and make it politically and economically difficult to stem any illegal immigration.

An African Workers Union (AWU) was formed in 1997 in reaction to deportation efforts, and negotiations led to a formal invitation to African community leaders to visit the Knesset. There they were encouraged to form an official body to produce a solution to government policy regarding migrant workers in Israel. Interestingly, this body composed of mostly illegal migrants has been officially registered as a non-profit organization in Israel. The AWU has demanded regularization of work visas and participation in welfare services and national health insurance and continues to meet with national and municipal officials, lectures at the main universities to solicit support from academics, and is aided by Israeli NGOs concerned with civil rights. According to reports, its most significant accomplishment has been in public relations, by raising the plight of migrants before the public using all forms of media. Its spokesmen use "elegant English mixed with Hebrew expressions to convey a positive image of the African migrant community that breaks the stereotype of 'illegals'," and have successfully used the theme of a "community of suffering" in diaspora to "deliberately speak to the Jewish conscience."

Since there is little published migrant policy and legislation is not specific, a great deal is left up to the decisions of government officials. Relevant political structures are limited to the national government ministries, but Tel Aviv is considered a special case because of its economic centrality, which translates into a high municipal income from local taxes. Government payments accounted for only some 12% of the 1997 municipal budget; however, it contributes a greater proportion in welfare (45%), education (31%) and health (22%) budgets, which "limits the city's autonomy in these areas, which are important in local policy toward migrant residents."[57]

Tel Aviv is ruled through a council governed by a powerful Mayor, elected in 1998, who decides policy issues within broad coalition agreements and is rarely opposed. Until 1998, immigration policy was ignored at the mayoral level, but the Welfare, Public Health and Education Division had developed informal special treatment policies for immigrants, especially children. Municipal policies have been formalized only partially by the new Mayor, who addressed a seminar on foreign workers organized by the Welfare Division, and set up a municipal Forum on Foreign Workers chaired by his appointed City Manager. It includes representatives

of municipal departments, but excludes representatives of local NGOs. Relevant service units for migrants are found within various administrative departments, most significantly within the Social Services Division, where an Aid and Information Centre for the Foreign Community for information and referral services was established in 1999. It has been criticized for opening at a time when budget cuts are eliminating other existing services.

Cologne, Germany

This case is more an admonition than an example. Germany is not officially a country of immigration, although most immigrants who were guest workers came on contract, and have reunited their families, now in their second and third generations. Cologne, the third largest city in Germany (with over a million inhabitants) and a centre of tourism and the print, broadcast and performance media, demonstrates how different a city's self-image may be from its reality. Its immigrant population is about 200,000 coming from 173 countries. While German, English and French translations are available on the City's Web site and visible in public spaces and transit stops, no Turkish signs, for example, are visible, even in places where Turks congregate such as the cathedral square, symbol of the city. Cologne presents itself as a tolerant, multicultural progressive city, yet critics also note a significant absence of ethnic programming and employment in the important media sector and altogether insufficient attention to immigrant concerns in the city.

Every fifth resident of the city does not have German citizenship.

Many immigrants are concentrated in distinct districts of the city due to the location of industrial jobs at the time of their arrival and poor quality but lower cost housing. Structural changes in the economy since have resulted in high unemployment among immigrant youth. Ghettoization has resulted in particular problems of conflict, on the one hand, among low-income Germans who perceive immigrants as competitors, and on the other, for upwardly mobile immigrants are pushed into such "powder keg" zones. The initial migrant workers have turned to self-employment including cleaning, hair dressing and auto repair, and observers say it is now difficult to imagine the city without the numerous small and medium-scale shops and businesses they operate. Nevertheless, one-third of all welfare recipients is foreign-born.

Problems are being tackled very slowly across sectors. One solution to disenfranchisement observed is rising labour union membership, still at a very modest rate, but at least giving a voice to some immigrant workers. Another is lower rates of school dropping-out, especially among young immigrant women and higher

educational qualification among second-generation immigrants in general, though they have not yet reached parity with German students on average. There are specially funded welfare organizations to assist foreign-born senior citizens, but overall the social and medical services are under-utilized by immigrants because the service sector is unprepared to offer linguistically or culturally appropriate care in spite of the fact that some large immigrant groups have lived in Cologne for at least 35 years.

Endnotes

1. City of Toronto staff report on Bill C-31 prepared for City Council, June 2000.

2. *The City Strikes Back,* The Toronto Star, Saturday, June 10, 2000.

3. Ibid.

4. City of Toronto staff report on Bill C-31 prepared for City Council, June 2000.

5. *Cities Dialogue on Immigrant and Refugee Issues,* March 22, 2000, Toronto City Hall. Meeting held in conjunction with the Fourth National Metropolis Conference hosted by CERIS.

6. Profile Toronto, Bulletin #2, Urban Planning and Development Services, City of Toronto, 1998.

7. Census of Canada, 1996. The trends discussed are explained further by Larry S. Bourne in his working paper, "Migration, Immigration and Social Sustainability: The Recent Toronto Experience in Comparative Context," May 1999, Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Settlement (CERIS), Toronto.

8. *Diverse Cultures, Common Ground: A Review of Immigration Settlement Services in Toronto,* written by Diane Hill, The United Way of Greater Toronto, June 1999, p. 32.

9. *Response to "Building on a Strong Foundation for the 21st Century: New Directions for Immigration and Refugee Policy and Legislation,"* submission to The Honourable Lucienne Robillard Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, March 22, 1999, OCASI; and *Comments on Building on a Strong Foundation for the 21st Century*, March 1999, Canadian Council for Refugees.

10. Scotti, Rosanna, *Access, Equity, Civic Participation and Municipal Government: A Toronto Perspective,* presentation at the Fourth National Metropolis Conference, March 2000, Toronto.

11. *Cities Dialogue on Immigrant and Refugee Issues*, March 2000.

12. *Diverse Cultures, Common Ground, p. 9.*

13. *Brain Drain or Brain Gain? What do the Data Say?,* a presentation by Scott Murray, Policy Conference, Ottawa Congress Centre, October 1, 1998.

14. Lo, Lucia, Valerie Preston, Shuguang Wang, Katherine Reil, Edward Harvey, and Bobby Siu, *Immigrants' Economic Status in Toronto*: *Rethinking Settlement and Integrations Strategies,* March 2000, CERIS, Toronto.

15. Ibid. p .31.

16. Ibid. p. 43.

17. Ibid. p. 51.

18. Ibid. p. 53.

19. Interview with Karen Lior, Advocates for Community Based Training and Education for Women, June 2000.

20. Burnaby, Barbara, Carl James, and Sheri Regier, *The Role of Education in Integrating Diversity in the Greater Toronto Area,* March 2000, CERIS, Toronto.

21. *Meeting the Special Needs of Students in the Toronto Board of Education,* Research and Assessment Department, Toronto Board of Education, April 1997.

22. *Unique Program Needs of the Etobicoke Board of Education,* Etobicoke Board of Education, 1997.

23. Ibid. p. 59.

24. *Diverse Cultures, Common Ground,* p. 23.

25. George, Usha and Joseph Michalski, *A Snapshot of Service Delivery in Organizations Serving Immigrants, Final Report,* Settlement Directorate, Ontario Region, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 1996, pp. 3 and 13.

26. Section 9, *Mandatory Health Programs and Services Guidelines*, Public Health Branch, Ontario Ministry of Health, December 1997.

27. Communication from Commissioner Shirley Hoy regarding 1999 achievements to staff of Community and Neighbourhood Services Department, City of Toronto, December 1999.

28.   *Issues of Access to Services for Undocumented Individuals and their Children*, Presentations to the Advisory Committee on Immigration and Refugee Issues in Toronto, Toronto City Hall, May 3, 1999.

29. Ibid. Testimony of Miranda Pinto, Regional Director, Catholic Cross-cultural Services.

30. Dr. Rick Glazier, P.I., *Changes in the Demographic Composition and Health Status of Immigrant Populations in Toronto's Inner City: Time Trend Analysis and Innovative Mapping, 2000-2001,* a CERIS Major Research Initiative and project of the National Health Research and Development Program (NHRDP).

31. Robert A. Murdie and Carlos Teixeira, *Towards a Comfortable Neighbourhood and Appropriate Housing: Immigrant Experience in Toronto*, March 2000, CERIS, Toronto.

32. Ibid. p. 41.

33. Ibid. p. 65.

34. See for example the discussion of urban citizenship in Engin F. Isin and Myer Siemiatiycki, *Fate and*

Faith: Claiming Urban Citizenship in Immigrant Toronto, June 1999, CERIS, Toronto.

35. Siemiatycki, Myer, *Immigration and Urban Politics in Toronto,* paper presented to the Third International Metropolis Conference, Israel, 1998.

36. Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Facts and Figures, 1998,.

37. 1996 Census of Population, Statistics Canada.

38. CIC Facts and Figures, 1998, prepared by the Social Development and Administration Division, Toronto Community and Neighbourhood Services

39. *Impacts and Implications of Immigration Policies and Programs: the City of Toronto*, presentation by Shirley Hoy, Commissioner, Community Neighbourhood Services, City of Toronto to the Pragma Council, University of Waterloo, October 29, 1999.

40. *Impacts and Implications of Immigration Policies and Programs: the City of Toronto*, presentation by Shirley Hoy, Commissioner, Community Neighbourhood Services, City of Toronto to the Pragma Council, University of Waterloo, October 29, 1999.

41. Ibid.

42. *Building on a Strong Foundation for the 21st Century: New Directions of Immigration and Refugee Policy and Legislation*, announced by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration on January 6, 1999.

43. City of Toronto staff report on Bill C-31 prepared for City Council, June 2000.

44. Siemiatycki, Myer, *Immigration and Urban Politics in Toronto,* paper presented to the Third International Metropolis Conference, Israel, 1998.

45. *GTA mayors endorse regional charter*, The Globe and Mail, Saturday, May 13, 2000.

46. Wallace, Marcia and Frances Frisken, *City-Suburban Differences in Governement Responses to Immigration in the Greater Toronto Area,* Research Paper 197, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, January 2000.

47. Ibid., p. 17.

48. Ibid., p.38.

49. Ibid., p.39.

50. *NGO/Government Partnerships,* address delivered at the Fourth International Metropolis Conference, Washington, D.C., November 1999, by Tim Owen, Associate Executive Director, COSTI.

51. Ibid.

52. *A Needs-Based Model for Settlement Service for Newcomers to Canada,* unpublished paper by Usha George, Ph.D. Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto, May 2000.

53. The information on which this example is based is taken from the Metropolis Project Web site, at <http://www.international.metropolis.net/research-policy/rott>.

54. Ibid.

55. Personal communication with Naomi Alboim, former Deputy Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation, currently Visiting Fellow, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University.

56. Detailed information about this project is found at <http://www.unesco.org/most/p97.htm>.

57. Ibid. see the link to "city templates."